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How does evaluation data get used to make decisions?

Data improve the quality of criteria used in problem solving and decision making—who needs the resources, what needs to happen next?
Data not only help to measure outcomes, but provide a means for continuously checking vital signs of the process.
Evaluation work plan answers the following questions:

**WHAT** do we want to know about the program?
(e.g. What CHANGE occurred and How did it occur?)

**WHO** has this information?

**WHEN** will information be collected?

**HOW** to get the information?

**WHY** did something happen or not happen?
Planning for Data use

• An evaluation design includes a plan for when, from whom, and who will obtain measurements to be gathered during the course of an evaluation.

• It may incorporate both qualitative and quantitative data-collection methods.

• Methods should match the evaluation plan and what is compatible with participants.
If You’re Not Data-Driven, You’re Not Goin’ Anywhere

I’ve got it too, Omar . . . A strange feeling like we’ve just been going in circles.
Choosing an evaluation method

• Selection of methods based on:
  - Time
  - Cost
  - Culture
  - Sensitivity of the issue
  - Tolerance for intrusiveness
  - Ethics
  - Validity
  - Reliability
Data Collection Methods

- Community surveys
- Face-to-face interviews
- Focus group discussions
- Observations
- Pre and post tests
- Document review
Participatory Data Collection Methods

- Key informant interviews
- Focus group discussions
- Observations
- Photovoice
- Videos
- Story telling, drama or role play
- Cultural activities
Key Informant Interviews

A trained interviewer asks questions of key community or participant representatives.

Should be conducted face-to-face.
Considerations for key in formant interviews

- Can be costly
- Needs trained interviewers
- Can be biased
- Require a convenience sample
Focus Group Discussions

Discussion group of 6-12 persons of similar background and experience to discuss a focused topic of interest
Considerations for Focus Groups

- Generates lots of data.
- Samples are small and maybe not representative, data quality dependent on good facilitator and note-taker
- Participants may not express sensitive opinions
- Trained facilitators & note-takers
- May be difficult to recruit appropriate representation
- Group dynamics can bias discussion & facilitator bias
- Not fully confidential or anonymous
Observations

Observation and recording of events and processes.
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THE LAB WHERE THEY STUDY DRUG INTERACTION
Considerations for Observations

- Needs trained observers
- Relatively high cost
- Can be obtrusive
- May not reflect typical reality
- Often just a snapshot of program implementation, but can provide in-depth ‘view’ of a clinic environment, for example.
Pre and post tests

Test of performance, typically knowledge and self-assessed skills.
Considerations for tests

- May be a limited or narrow picture of performance
- Doesn’t adequately assess skills (combine Pre-post test with observation of skills in the field)
- May need careful sampling
Document Review

Examination of pre-existing documents and data sources
Considerations of using documents

- Lack of quality control
- Validity and reliability may be unknown
- Can be limited in scope
- Can’t always access the key documents
Photovoice

Objectives

- Enable people to record and reflect their community’s strengths and concerns
- Promote critical dialogue and knowledge
- To reach community leaders and policy-makers

Photovoice is a method that enables people to define for themselves and others, including policy makers, what is worth remembering and what needs to be changed. Caroline Wang
Considerations for Questions

• Ask questions which explore whether the program is effective for the local population, or not.

• What and why is this happening for these particular groups?
Wording and Format

• Not prejudice the informant’s opinion
• Not ‘lead’ to a specific answer
• Be direct and to the point
• Be in local language, easy to understand, no jargon, simple, e.g. KISS
• Avoid ‘double-barreled’ questions
• Structured (close-ended) - choose from among all possible answers
  - Dichotomous - True/False, Likert scale (1- strongly agree, 5- strongly disagree)
• Unstructured (open-ended)
Sequence & length

• A good questionnaire, interview, FGD has a coherent structure and logical order of questions
• Easier questions first, but don’t leave important questions ‘til the end!
• Questionnaire or interview should be able to be completed in 30 minutes.
• FGD - 1 hour to 1 &half hours
Decide Who Will Collect Data

- Community person
- Those who deliver the program
- Program participants
- Train data collectors
What are credible data?

• Instruments and other data are relevant, reliable, and valid

Some measures of hard data:

• Insulin levels
• Pregnancy rates
• Pap smear coverage
• # of immunizations
What are credible data?

- Identified by relevant groups
- Shared by relevant representative groups
- Collected in respectful formats
- Interpreted by those who know the community and participants
Data Analysis

Program evaluation data may be qualitative, quantitative, or both.
• What comes to mind when you hear:

  Quantitative evaluation
  Qualitative evaluation
  Mixed methods evaluation
Quantitative Analysis: Descriptive Statistics

• Counts or frequencies:
  – How many times something occurred
  – How many responses fit in a particular category

• Percentages: Information as proportion of a whole
Quantitative Analysis: Descriptive Statistics

• Variability: Spread or variation in responses
  – Range
  – Standard deviation

• Central tendency: Measured value typical of the group
  – Mean
  – Mode
  – Median
Quantitative Analysis: Descriptive Statistics

- Summarize all data into tables and/or charts
- Look for patterns
- Identify what data display will most effectively communicate results
Quantitative Analysis: Statistically Significant Differences

- **Categorical variable:**
  - Cross tabulations
  - Examples: male/female, grade levels, smoking status

- **Continuous variables:**
  - T-test: 2 groups
  - ANOVA: more than 2 groups
  - Examples?
Qualitative Data Collection Methods

• Interviews

• Focus groups

• Participant observation (field notes)

• Record review
  • Written documents
  • Video recordings or film
  • Audio recordings
  • Photographs
Qualitative Data Collection Methods

- Photovoice
- Videos
- Drama or role play
Qualitative Data Analysis

- Organize and prepare the data for analysis
- Begin detailed analysis with coding process
- Generate a description of the setting/people as well as categories or themes for analysis
- Obtain feedback on themes and description from cultural experts
Qualitative Data Analysis

• Iterative, non-linear process

• Memos: Notes the researcher writes throughout the process that elaborate on ideas about the data and categories

• Qualitative data analysis software
Decide Who Will Conduct or Help with Analysis

- Community members
- Those who deliver the program
- Program participants
- Existing skills or extensive training needed
Mixed Methods

- Interpret convergence of the findings to strengthen knowledge claims or explain any lack of convergence

- To gain broader perspectives than would not be achieved by using the predominant method alone

- To gain culturally relevant perspectives than interpretation from the evaluators alone
Mixed Methods

- Triangulation
  - Methods
  - Researchers
  - Sources

Compare and identify the extent data and results between and within triangulation types converge
## Mixed Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation phase</th>
<th>Primary evaluator</th>
<th>Cultural experts</th>
<th>Other experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td><em>Who</em></td>
<td><em>Who</em></td>
<td><em>Who</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td><em>Who</em></td>
<td><em>Who</em></td>
<td><em>Who</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting &amp; interpretation</td>
<td><em>Who</em></td>
<td><em>Who</em></td>
<td><em>Who</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Validity & Reliability

• Triangulation: Corroborate evidence from different
  – Individuals
  – Theories or perspectives
  – Methods of data collection

• Member checking
  – Have one or more participants review “final” account
Validity & Reliability

• Co-analyzers or reviewers
  – Program staff and decision makers
  – Peer evaluators or researchers
  – Community members and participants

• Data review
  – Negative or discrepant information
  – Rich, thick description

• Other approaches
  – Prolonged field time
  – Clarification of bias
DATA paint the picture

The challenge is in the interpretation.
"What do you mean, ‘What is it?’ It’s the spontaneous, unfettered expression of a young mind not yet bound by the restraints of narrative or pictorial representation."
What are credible results?

• Interpreted by those who know the community and participants