

INDEX

A

- Activities (program logic model)
 - description and importance of, 21*t*, 25
 - Housing Recovery Program, 48*t*–49*t*
 - International Union, 36*t*–37*t*
 - Operation Safety Net, 40*t*–41*t*
- American Evaluation Association, 65
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 46
- America's Second Harvest's 2006 Hunger in America survey, 139
- Anonymity issue, 144–146
- Archival (historical) data, 125, 127–128
- Assumptions (program logic model)
 - description and importance of, 21*t*, 23–24
 - Housing Recovery Program, 48*t*–49*t*
 - International Union, 33–34, 36*t*–37*t*
 - Magic Carpet Ride/Traveling Party program failures due to, 52–53
 - Operation Safety Net, 40*t*–41*t*

B

- Bade, S., 104
- Bias
 - mono-method, 102
 - mono-operation, 102–103
 - publication, 65
 - unclear questions and response, 91
 - “yes,” 139
- Bickman, L., 123
- Bush, G. W., 127

C

- Campbell, D., 86, 87, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 121, 125, 126
- CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interview) system, 144
- Caulkins, J., 57
- Causation
 - necessary and sufficient variables, 72–80*fig*
 - quasi-experimental design permitting, 112–128
 - types of effects aspect of, 81–83
- Census, 141
- Center for Social and Urban Research (University of Pittsburgh), 146
- Child Advocacy Coalition (CAC), 44
- Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP)

- background information on, 44
- eligibility criteria used by, 29
- program theory application to, 44–45*fig*
- Class-Size Reduction Program, 5
- Cohort designs
 - archival data used in, 125
 - description of, 123–125*fig*
- Compensatory rivalry, 100
- Confidentiality issue, 63–64, 144–146
- Construct validity
 - definition of, 86, 100
 - issues related to, 100–102
 - mono-method bias threat to, 102
 - mono-operation bias threat to, 102–103
- Control groups
 - definition of, 5
 - delayed treatment, 118*fig*–120
 - untreated design with pretest and posttest, 112–117*fig*
- Convenience sample, 141
- Cook, T., 86, 87, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 121, 125, 126
- Cost-benefit analysis, 25

D

- Daponte, B. O., 104
- Data analysis
 - planning process of, 6
 - validity of, 86–105
- Data collection
 - computer-based technology used for, 144
 - developing plan for, 6
 - focus group interviews used for, 132–136
 - stakeholder interviews used for, 59–60, 132
 - surveys used for, 136–146
 - on target population, 24
- David, H., 127
- Delayed treatment control group, 118*fig*–120
- Dembosky, J., 57
- Different samples design, 120*fig*–121
- Diffusion of treatments threat, 99

E

- Early Childhood Initiative (Heinz Endowment), 57
- Edwards, E., 93
- Edwards, J., 93

Ethical issues, 63–64

Evaluation

- building knowledge base from, 64–65
 - confidentiality and ownership issues of, 63–64
 - high stakes, 65
 - insincere reasons for, 60
 - parsimonious approach to, 10–11
 - program description component of, 11–12
 - summative and formative, 4, 56–57
- See also* Programs

Evaluation framework

1. are evaluation activities formative or summative?, 4
 2. determining possible universe of evaluation questions, 4
 3. rigorously describe the program, 4–5
 4. revisit and narrow evaluation questions, 5
 5. develop evaluation plan, 5
 6. develop data collection plan, 6
 7. decide how data will be analyzed, 6
- summary of steps, 3

Evaluation plan

- for data analysis, 6–7
- for data collection, 6
- developing the, 5

Evaluation questions

- determining possible, 4
 - framing the, 57–60
 - program theory used to narrow, 19–20
 - revisiting and narrowing, 5
 - survey open-ended, 137–138
 - typical, 59–60
 - validity threatened by unclear, 91
- See also* Respondents

Evaluation report outline, 66–68

Evaluation tools

- grant proposal development using, 150–151
- PLM (program logic model), 4–5, 10–12, 20–29, 33–49*t*
- program theory, 4, 10–20, 30–51*fig*

Evaluators

- deciding on the, 60
- external, 61–62
- hiring external consultant, 152
- internal, 62–63
- program description by, 11–14

Evaluatory activities, 56

External evaluators

- description of, 61–62
- hiring consultant, 152

External validity

- definition of, 86, 103
- “period effects” and, 103–105

F

“Fishing,” 92

Focus groups

- data collection using, 132–136
- surveys compared to, 137

Food Distribution Research Project survey (1990s), 136

Food stamp program, 82–83, 95

Formal survey instrument, 133

Formative evaluation, 4, 56, 57

Functional form of impact, 81–82

G

Gill, B., 57

Goals (program logic model)

- description and importance of, 21*t*, 22–23
- Housing Recovery Program, 48*t*–49*t*
- International Union, 36*t*–37*t*
- Operation Safety Net, 40*t*–41*t*

Grant proposals, 150–151

H

Hammer, K., 123

Heckman, J., 94

Heinz Endowment, 57

High stakes evaluation, 65

High stakes testing, 65

Historical (archival) data, 125, 127–128

History threat to validity, 93, 112

Housing Recovery program

- background information on, 46
- PLM (program logic model) application to, 46–47, 48*t*–49*t*

Hurricane Katrina federal assistance, 2

I

“If” statements, 15

Inputs (program logic model)

- description and importance of, 21*t*, 24–25
- Housing Recovery Program, 48*t*–49*t*
- International Union, 36*t*–37*t*
- Operation Safety Net, 40*t*–41*t*

Instrumentation threat to validity, 98–99

Internal evaluators, 62–63

Internal validity

- compensatory equalization of treatments threat to, 99–100
- compensatory rivalry and resentful demoralization threat to, 100
- definition of, 86, 92
- diffusion of treatment threat to, 99
- history threat to, 93, 112
- instrumentation threat, 98–99
- issues related to, 93
- maturation threat to, 94

- mortality threat to, 95–96
- selection threat to, 94–95
- statistical regression threat to, 97–98
- testing threat to, 96–97
- International Union
 - evaluation plan used for, 34–36
 - PLM (program logic model) application to, 33–34, 36*t*–37*t*
 - program theory application to, 30–33*fig*, 34*fig*, 35*fig*
- Interviews
 - CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interview) system, 144
 - focus groups, 132–136
 - stakeholders, 59–60, 132
 - surveys compared to, 137
- J**
- “John Henry” effect, 100
- K**
- Knowledge base, 64–65
- L**
- Lagged effects, 81
- Lieberson, S., 94, 95
- Literature reviews, 19
- M**
- Magic Carpet Ride program, 52
- Making It Count* (Lieberson), 94
- Mammogram awareness program, 93
- Maturation threat to validity, 94
- Measurement error, 90
- Mono-method bias, 102
- Mono-operation bias, 102–103
- Mortality threat to validity, 95–96
- N**
- Necessary program variable
 - connections between variables, 78–80*fig*
 - cut points of variables, 76*t*–77*t*
 - description of, 72–74
 - variables of sufficient and, 73*t*–76
- NGOs (nongovernmental organizations), 2, 152
- “A Noble Bet” (Gill, Dembosky, and Caulkins), 57
- Nonequivalent groups using switched measures, 122*fig*–123
- Nonequivalent observations design drawn from one group, 121*fig*–122
- O**
- One-group posttest-only design, 109*fig*
- One-group pretest-posttest design, 111*fig*–112
- Opera Trunk Program
 - diagramming program theory of, 17–18*fig*
 - literature review of, 19
 - narrowing evaluation question for, 19–20
- Operation Safety Net
 - background information on, 39, 42–43
 - PLM (program logic model) application to, 40*t*–41*t*
 - program theory application to, 42*fig*, 43*fig*
- Outcome measures (program logic model)
 - description and importance of, 21*t*, 26–27
 - International Union, 36*t*–37*t*
- Outcomes
 - necessary and sufficient variables and, 72–80*fig*
 - PLM (program logic model) component of, 21*t*, 26, 37*t*–38*t*, 48*t*–49*t*
- Outcomes (program logic model)
 - description and importance of, 21*t*, 26
 - Housing Recovery Program, 48*t*–49*t*
 - International Union, 36*t*–37*t*
 - Operation Safety Net, 40*t*–41*t*
- Outputs (program logic model)
 - description and importance of, 21*t*, 25–26
 - Housing Recovery Program, 48*t*–49*t*
 - International Union, 36*t*–37*t*
 - Operation Safety Net, 40*t*–41*t*
- Ownership of evaluation, 63–64
- P**
- Parsimonious program models, 10–11
- Participants
 - confidentiality and anonymity of, 63–64, 144–146
 - focus group, 132–136
 - pretest-posttest of, 111*fig*–112
 - randomly assigned, 111
 - See also* Respondents
- Patton, M. Q., 3
- Permanency of effects, 81
- Posttest-only design with nonequivalent groups, 110*fig*–111
- Posttesting
 - pattern 1 design using, 113*fig*–115
 - pattern 2 design using, 115*fig*–116
 - pattern 3 design using, 116*fig*–117
 - pattern 4 design using, 117*fig*
 - untreated control group design with, 112*fig*–117
- Prenatal care program example
 - background information on, 50–51
 - program theory application to, 51*fig*
- Pretesting
 - pattern 1 design using, 113*fig*–115
 - pattern 2 design using, 115*fig*–116
 - pattern 3 design using, 116*fig*–117
 - pattern 4 design using, 117*fig*
 - untreated control group design with, 112*fig*–117

- Private food assistance network, 136
 - Program description
 - common mistakes made in, 12
 - conducting initial informal interviews for, 12–13
 - examples of, 30–53
 - models used for updating, 14–30
 - motivation behind, 11–12
 - pitfalls in, 13–14
 - Program description examples
 1. International Union, Local X, Training Programs, 30–38
 2. Operation Safety Net program, 39–43
 3. Child Health Insurance Program (CHIP) program, 44–45
 4. Housing Recovery Program, 46–49
 5. Prenatal Care Program, 50–51
 6. The Magic Carpet Ride and Traveling Party Program, 52–53
 - Program description models
 - PLM (program logic model), 20–29
 - program implementation model, 30
 - program theory, 15–20
 - Program description update
 - challenges of multiple sites for, 29
 - as continuous process, 14–15
 - program implementation model used for, 30
 - program logic model used for, 20–29
 - program theory used for, 15–20
 - Program implementation model, 30
 - Program logic model columns
 - activities, 21*t*, 25
 - assumptions, 21*t*, 23–24
 - goals, 21*t*, 22–23
 - inputs, 21*t*, 24–25
 - outcome measures, 21*t*, 26–27
 - outcomes, 21*t*, 26
 - outputs, 21*t*, 25–26
 - summary of, 20–21*t*
 - target population, 21*t*, 24
 - Program logic model (PLM)
 - applied to program description update, 20–29
 - description and evaluation use of, 4–5, 10
 - eight columns of, 20, 21*t*, 22–27
 - motivations behind development of, 11–12
 - of W.K. Kellogg Foundation’s adaptation of, 20, 21*t*
 - Program logic model (PLM) examples
 - Housing Recovery Program, 46–47, 48*t*–49*t*
 - International Union, 33–34, 36*t*–37*t*
 - Operation Safety Net, 40*t*–41*t*
 - Program staff
 - creating shared vision with, 11–12
 - summative evaluation reservations by, 56–57
 - Program theory examples
 - Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), 44–45*fig*
 - International Union, 30–33*fig*, 34*fig*, 35*fig*
 - Operation Safety Net, 42*fig*, 43*fig*
 - prenatal care program, 51*fig*
 - Program theory (theory of change)
 - applied to program description update, 15–20
 - description and evaluation use of, 4, 10
 - diagramming, 16–18*fig*
 - literature reviews and, 19
 - motivations behind development of, 11–12
 - used to narrow evaluation question, 19–20
 - Opera Trunk Program example of, 17–18*fig*
 - unit of analysis of changes component of, 16–17
 - Programs
 - building knowledge base from evaluation of, 64–65
 - description of, 11–29
 - necessary and sufficient, 72–80*fig*
 - target population reached by, 2
 - types of effects of, 81–83
 - understanding different perspectives of stakeholders on, 10
 - See also* Evaluation
 - Propensity of issues, 133
 - Publication bias, 65
- ## Q
- Quasi-experimental design
 - archival or historical data included in, 125, 127–128
 - cohort, 123–125*fig*
 - delayed treatment control group, 118*fig*–120
 - description of, 5, 108
 - different samples, 120*fig*–121
 - nonequivalent groups using switched measures, 122*fig*–123
 - nonequivalent observations drawn from one group, 121*fig*–122
 - notation to display, 108–109*fig*
 - one-group posttest-only, 109
 - participants’ pretest-posttest, 111*fig*–112
 - permitting causal inferences, 112–128
 - posttest-only with nonequivalent groups, 110*fig*–111*fig*
 - time series designs, 125*fig*–127
 - untreated control group design with pretest and posttest, 112–117*fig*
 - Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings* (Cook and Campbell), 86, 87
 - Question reliability, 136–137
 - Question validity, 136
 - Quinnipiac University’s Survey Research Center, 146

R

- Randomly assigned participants, 111
- Reliability (question), 136–137
- “Report card” evaluations, 56
- Researcher “fishing,” 92
- Resentful demoralization, 100
- Respondents
 - compensatory rivalry and resentful demoralization of, 100
 - confidentiality and anonymity of, 63–64, 144–146
 - response to unclear questions by, 91
 - See also* Evaluation questions; Participants
- RFP (Request for Proposals), 61, 63
- Romanian abortion policy (1960s), 127

S

- Samples
 - convenience, 141
 - definition of, 141
 - simple random, 142–143
 - “snowball,” 141–143
- Sampling
 - small sample size, 88–90
 - survey design, 140–143
- Sampling error, 141
- Selection threat to validity, 94–95
- Self-administered surveys, 140
- Simple random sample, 142–143
- Small sample sizes, 88–90
- “Snowball” sample, 141–142
- Staff
 - creating shared vision with, 11–12
 - summative evaluation reservations by, 56–57
- Stakeholders
 - creating shared vision with, 11–12
 - different perspectives held by, 10
 - informal interviews done with, 59–60, 132
 - outcome measures that are meaningful to, 27
- Statistical conclusion validity
 - definition of, 86
 - measurement error threat to, 90
 - questions at heart of, 87–88
 - research “fishing” threat to, 92
 - small sample sizes threat to, 88–90
 - unclear questions/bias responses threat to, 91
 - unreliable treatment implementation threat to, 91–92
- Statistical regression threat to validity, 97–98
- Sufficient program variable
 - connections between variables, 78–80*fig*
 - cut points of variables, 76*t*–77*t*
 - description of, 74

- variables of necessary and, 73*t*–76
- Summative evaluation, 4, 56–57
- Survey design
 - description of, 136–139
 - sampling approach used in, 140–143
 - simple rules in, 139–140
- Survey Research Center (Quinnipiac University), 146
- Surveys
 - America’s Second Harvest’s 2006 Hunger in America survey, 139
 - anonymity and confidentiality issues of, 144–146
 - compared to focus groups and interviews, 137
 - data collection using, 143–144
 - open-ended questions used in, 137–138
 - telephone, 143–144

T

- Target population
 - gathering data on, 24
 - Housing Recovery Program, 48*t*–49*t*
 - International Union, 36*t*–37*t*
 - Operation Safety Net, 40*t*–41*t*
 - program logic model component of, 21*t*, 24
 - program reaching intended, 2
 - Telephone surveys, 143–144
 - Testing threat to validity, 96–97
 - Theory of Change. *See* Program theory (theory of change)
 - Threat of history, 93, 112
 - Threat of instrumentation, 98–99
 - Threat of maturation, 94
 - Threat of selection, 94–95
 - Threat of statistical regression, 97–98
 - Threat of testing, 96–97
 - Thrifty Food Plan, 83
 - Time series designs, 125*fig*–127*fig*
 - Traveling Party Program, 52–53
 - Treatments
 - diffusion as threat to validity, 99
 - threat of compensatory equalization of, 99–100
 - Type I error, 88, 92
 - Type II error, 88, 91
 - Types of effects, 81–83
- U
- Unit of analysis
 - clearly defined outcome measure, 27
 - as program theory change measurement, 16–17
 - University of Pittsburgh’s Center for Social and Urban Research, 146
 - Unreliable treatment implementation, 91–92
 - U.S. Census Bureau, 24, 138
 - U.S. Department of Agriculture, 83

V

Validity

- construct, 86, 100–103
- external, 86, 103–105
- general issues related to, 86–87
- internal, 86, 92–100
- question, 136
- statistical conclusion, 86, 87–92
- threats to, 93–99
- types of, 86–87

W

- Weiss, C., 66
- W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 20–21*t*,
22–27
- Wright, N., 127

Y

- Yad Vashem Holocaust Museum, 123*t*
- Yes bias, 139

