Description of Evaluation Plan Template:

Program evaluation of policy, system and environmental change strategies is crucial to help understand the impact and implementation of this work. The guidelines below outline the components that should be in any evaluation report.

1) **Program Overview:** After reading this overview, the reader can understand the context of the strategy evaluated. Provide a description of the strategy evaluated, its goals and objectives, and a logic model in words if you have one. Please include a graphic logic model in an attachment to the report depicting linkages between activities and outcomes.

2) **Summary of evaluation questions and methods:** Provide a description of your evaluation questions, the intended use of the evaluation, the performance measures used, the methods used to collect the data, and the data analysis process.

3) **Key findings, Achievements and Lessons Learned:** Provide key findings, achievements, and lessons learned from the evaluation. Please highlight the important information about the results of the evaluation and illustrate what the strategy achieved such as who the strategy reached and/or affected and in what ways. Please highlight key successes and wins of the strategy as well as key lessons learned from the process of conducting activities of the strategy and lessons learned when conducting the evaluation.

4) **Recommendations and Next Steps:** The recommendations should address next steps for the strategy, primarily focused around how to sustain or leverage the wins of the strategy. It may also offer ways to capitalize on successes and wins found through the evaluation, or to address lessons learned in future or ongoing activities related to the strategy.

5) **Appendixes:** You can also include additional tools that can facilitate clarity in your report. It can include items such as: a table of contents to your appendix; your logic model if you have one; a copy of your surveys/instrument(s); tables, charts, and figures; and an acronym list. Appendices are another useful section to showcase items that supplement or complement the report.

---
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Evaluation Goal: To evaluate the performance of local public health jurisdictions on a statewide intervention, using a multi-modal evaluation approach.

Stakeholders:

Identify stakeholders for your project, their interest/perspective, their role in the evaluation and how and when to engage them. An example is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Category</th>
<th>Interest or Perspective</th>
<th>Role in Evaluation</th>
<th>How and When to Engage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Health Department Staff</td>
<td>Overall effectiveness of intervention</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Ongoing and at all parts of evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local public health (LPH) partners</td>
<td>Participants in project</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Throughout project; website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader LPH system</td>
<td>Lessons learned, barriers, successful models</td>
<td>Audience for results</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWJF</td>
<td>Funding agency</td>
<td>Audience for results</td>
<td>Annual reporting and final report; info provided to them as products; website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National stakeholders (e.g. other state and local public health practitioners)</td>
<td>Lessons learned, barriers, successful models</td>
<td>Audience for results</td>
<td>National presentations, issue brief(s), articles, website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policymakers in state (e.g. local elected officials, State Legislature)</td>
<td>Effectiveness of intervention and model approaches</td>
<td>Audience for results</td>
<td>Website, presentations, issue briefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Background:

Provide a short description of the project and its overall goal.
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Project Objectives:

[Please list the overall project objectives. These form the basis of the evaluation]

- Objective 1
- Objective 2
- Objective 3

Evaluation Questions:

[These are the questions you hope to answer in the evaluation. Focus should be on whether participants were able to achieve their objectives, but could also contain knowledge-based or other process goals. Some examples are provided.]

1. What was the overall performance of each grantees on their project objectives?
2. To what extent was a cross-jurisdictional sharing approach helpful in promoting and supporting this project in [state]?
3. To what extent was the technical assistance provided by state health department staff helpful?
4. To what extent were the communication strategies employed by the project helpful to participants?

Evaluation Design:

[Please describe the approach that will be used to evaluate the project. The tool/method, timing of measurement, content/approach and responsible staff should all be outlined. An example is provided below, showing a multi-methods approach to program evaluation.]

Mixed methods approach:
- Online, self-administered reporting
- Quarterly progress reports
- Key informant interviews and focused discussion groups
- Tracking technical assistance and appropriate use of program funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool/Method Participant(s)</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Content/Approach</th>
<th>Responsible Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress Reports</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Standard progress reports submitted by grantees</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused discussion groups</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Short set of guided questions to assess progress and identify additional needs</td>
<td>Evaluation Team, grant managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online reporting system to assess types of activities performed &amp; reach</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Online system (can incorporate into other LPH reporting)</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Series of measures</td>
<td>Communications Staff,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool/Method Participant(s)</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Content/Approach</th>
<th>Responsible Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>(outlined later in document) that aim to address effectiveness of communication and reach to desired audience(s)</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interviews</td>
<td>End of funding period</td>
<td>Randomly select subset of grantees to ask more in-depth questions about how initiative was implemented, barriers and supports.</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Reports</td>
<td>End of funding period</td>
<td>Identify extent to which project objectives were met.</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance Tracking</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>-Track types and amount of technical assistance provided to each grantee</td>
<td>Grant managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>-Track expenditures and adherence to grant requirements</td>
<td>Grant managers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion Groups and/or Key Informant Questions (see also, “Qualitative Interview Tool”)

Questions on Goals:
- What was the goal of your project?
- How has that goal been achieved?
- What is the most positive result of your project?
- What is the most negative result? Do you have any suggestions as to how to avoid it?
- Who championed this project within your organization?
- How did you know when you were ready to undertake your project?
- Describe how this project contributed to any lasting / long-term changes for your CHB.
- What will you do now that the project is over?

Questions on the Implementation Process:
- What were the most significant “lessons learned” from your project implementation?
- What would you do differently if given this opportunity again?
- What were the things your organization did especially well? Please relate 1-2 success stories.
- What were your biggest challenges?
- What steps did you take to overcome those challenges?
- Why was your CHB willing to participate in this innovative project?

Advice for Others:
- What aspects of your approach would you recommend as most ideal to share?
- What advice would you give an organization just starting this project?
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- If you were asked to provide a list of “best practices,” what would be on the list?
- Were there any special project management techniques you would recommend?
- How did you ensure upper management support?
- How did you get people to buy into the initiative?

Communication/Dissemination Evaluation Strategies:
- Web traffic (hits, downloads, other analytics)
- Participant self-report on what they have shared (potentially through progress reports)
- Collect examples that show grantee use of information or document in case study
- Ask participants about their knowledge/awareness of project communications: do you look at the web? Do you read the emails? Do you forward the emails? Do you read the update newsletter?
- Track presentations and discussion of project in various venues
- Participation in training events
- Media Tracking
After the evaluation is completed, the following items should be covered in the evaluation report:

**Key Achievements/Lessons Learned:**

*Identify key findings, achievements and lessons learned from your evaluation data*

- Achievement
- Achievement
- Lesson Learned
- Lesson Learned

**Recommendations and Next Steps:**

*The recommendations should address next steps for the strategy, primarily focused around how to sustain or leverage the wins of the strategy. It may also offer ways to capitalize on successes and wins found through the evaluation, or to address lessons learned in future or ongoing activities related to the strategy.*

- Recommendation 1
- Recommendation 2
- Next Steps