PS18-1802 Demonstration Project Evaluation and Performance Measurement Plan

(Updated June 21, 2017)

Note – This document should only reflect the implementation and evaluation of activities related to the FOA funded demonstration project. The implementation and evaluation of core PS18-1802 activities should be described in the Jurisdiction Evaluation and Performance Measurement Plan (EPMP).

I. Cover Page

- Name of the project
- Project period (start and end date)
- Name of jurisdiction/ agency submitting evaluation plan

II. Introduction

Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) PS18-1802: Integrated HIV Surveillance and Prevention Programs for Health Departments, allows awarded grantees to enhance their programs through the implementation of one demonstration project. Demonstration projects are funded to expand high-impact HIV prevention and surveillance interventions and strategies that are particularly novel or require additional resources for evaluation. A separate evaluation and performance measurement plan (EPMP), which must address the goals of reducing new HIV infections, improving health outcomes of PLWH, or reducing HIV-related disparities and health inequities, is required for demonstration projects. Additional guidance for completing a monitoring and evaluation plan for your demonstration project is provided in the M&E Guidance/Resources section of this document.

Section 1: Description of the Project Being Evaluated

A well-crafted program description will serve as a frame of reference for all subsequent decisions in an evaluation[i]. A thorough description of the program enables comparisons with similar programs and facilitates attempts to connect program components to their effects. The description should convey the mission and objectives of the program being evaluated and should be sufficiently detailed to ensure the understanding of program goals and strategies. It should also discuss the program's capacity to effect change, its stage of development, and how it fits into the larger organization and community.

Please provide a description of the proposed demonstration project and its related activities to include:

- Rationale for proposing the project within the specified focus area (e.g., identified need, target population, epidemiologic data or other data), including background and need, as it relates to addressing the public health problem.
- Description of how the demonstration project addresses the national HIV prevention goals of reducing new HIV infections, increasing access to care or reducing HIV-related disparities and health inequities and expected outcomes for the jurisdiction.
- Overall purpose or expected effects of the demonstration project being evaluated (i.e., reach and impact of the project)

- Developmental stage of the demonstration project being evaluated (i.e., planning, implementation, mature phase of the program)
- Context within which the demonstration project being evaluated operates or will operate (e.g., environmental, political, or population factors that affect the initiative)

Section 2: Logic Model for the Demonstration Project

Logic models are used to present a hypothesized sequence of events which are intended to effect change[i]. These models demonstrate how a proposed program is intended to work by depicting the relationship between the program elements. Logic models are a useful tool for identifying the goals and objectives of the program components or intervention you plan to evaluate. Please diagram and explain your demonstration logic model (a visual "snapshot" of the demonstration project) which communicates the relationships between the program goals, activities, outputs, and intended outcomes of your project.

Section 3: Stakeholder Engagement

Please identify the stakeholders for your demonstration project and how you plan to engage them in the program evaluation. Remember, stakeholders are people or organizations who care about the program and about the results and consequences of the program evaluation. Use Table 1 to provide the names of the persons or organizations/entities that will be engaged in the evaluation.

Table 1. Stakeholder Engagement	
Name	**Role in Evaluation**

Section 4: Focusing the Evaluation Design

The direction and processes of the evaluation must be focused to prioritize the needs and concern of stakeholders while balancing an efficient usage of time and resources[i]. A detailed plan anticipates intended uses to create an evaluation strategy with the greatest chance of being useful, feasible, ethical, and accurate. Please discuss each of the following elements in your evaluation plan:

Purpose of the evaluation: The purpose statement should communicate the intent or motivation for conducting the evaluation (i.e., to gain insight, change practice, assess effects, or affect participants). The purpose of the evaluation should consider the needs of the stakeholders, the context of the evaluation, and the availability of resources. Knowing who the users of your evaluation are (the specific persons/stakeholders who receive and use the evaluation findings) and the uses for the evaluation findings (the specific ways that program staff and stakeholders plan to utilize the evaluation findings) will help determine the purpose of your evaluation (complete Table 2).

Table 2. Primary users of the evaluation (persons or organizations)	
Name	**How Evaluation Findings Will Be Used**

Evaluation questions: Developing evaluation questions will help to further focus your evaluation[ii]. Evaluation questions should reflect the purpose of the evaluation as well as the priorities and needs of the stakeholders. Questions should be crafted to provide answers to key program components and activities of interest. When developing your evaluation questions, it is important to keep in mind 1) what should be answered to demonstrate program performance; 2) constraints of the program (e.g., resources, environmental limitations, target population, etc.); and 3) unit(s) of analysis needed and available to appropriate address the evaluation questions (e.g., a system of related programs, a single program, a project within a program, a subcomponent or process within a project).

Evaluation methods: There are several types of evaluations that can be conducted—formative, process/implementation, outcome/effectiveness, and impact evaluation. If your demonstration project intends to implement new program activities, consider conducting a process evaluation to determine if the program is being delivered as planned and if improvements are needed. If your project intends to implement mature program activities, consider conducting an outcome evaluation (with a process evaluation component) to assess program effectiveness and to demonstrate productive use of resources.

Evaluation design: The evaluation design clarifies how the evaluation will operate. The choice of design has implications for what will count as evidence toward the desired outcome, how evidence will be gathered, and what conclusions can be made (including the internal and external validity of conclusions). The design also dictates program participants; data sources and their selection; data collection methods and procedures; data management systems; and appropriate methods of analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and presentation. As a reminder, experimental designs are not permitted for PS18-1802 demonstration projects.

Use Table 3-4 to list Memoranda of Understanding Agreements and program related protocols. You will also need to address any Human Subjects Protection/Institutional Review Board requirements that may apply to your demonstration project.

Table 3. Memoranda of Understanding/Memoranda of Agreement	
Collaborator or Contributor	**Services or Resources to be Provided**

Table 4. List of Protocols:		
Title of Protocol	**Purpose**	**Status (planned, initiated, completed[1])**

[1] Attach protocol if complete

Section 5: Gathering Credible Evidence

Data collected for the evaluation should convey a well-rounded picture of the program and be perceived by stakeholders as believable and relevant for answering the evaluation questions posed. Although all types of data have limitations, an evaluation's overall credibility can be improved by using multiple procedures for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting data. Having credible evidence strengthens evaluation judgments and the recommendations that follow from them.

Describe how performance measurement and evaluation findings will be 1) reported; 2) used to demonstrate the outcomes of the demonstration project and the FOA; and 3) used for continuous program quality improvement. Please create additional table or rows as needed to reflect the strategies, outputs/outcomes, monitoring and evaluation questions (M&E) questions, measures/indicators, and numerators and denominators of the demonstration project. Quantitative and qualitative indicators should be labeled according, if included in the same table.

Strategy #:					
Output or Outcome	**M&E Question**	**Measures/Indicators**	**Specifications**	**Data Source**	**Data Type**
Output/Outcome #:		**Measure #:**	**Denominator #:**		
			Numerator #:		
		Measure #:	**Denominator #:**		
			Numerator #:		
Guidance for calculating variables:					

Section 6: Justifying Conclusions

Conclusions derived or informed by the evaluation are guided by the evaluation questions, SMART objectives, data validity and reliability, gathered evidence, and stakeholder input. Program objectives developed for the demonstration project's logic model should be used to set your accountability targets for monitoring and evaluating the program. Remember, your objectives describe the results to be achieve, the manner in which they are achieved, and are the basis for monitoring the implementation of and progress toward achieving program goals. Your objectives should be SMART. **SMART** objects are:

1. **Specific**, provide the "who" and "what" of program activities
2. **Measurable**, focused on "how much" change is expected (quantify the amount of change expected)
3. **Achievable**, attainable within a given time frame and with available program resources
4. **Realistic,** accurately address the scope of the problem and programmatic steps that can be implemented within a specific time frame
5. **Time-phased,** provide a time frame indicating when the objective will be measured or a time by which the objective will be met

Justifying evaluation conclusions involves analyzing and synthesizing the evaluation findings. As part of your analysis plan, please discuss what (i.e., qualitative and/or quantitative data) and how data will be analyzed and how data will be managed for each indicator.

Table 5. Data Submission and Processing

Data Source	Data Provider	Time Period Data will Represent	Lag Time

Data Management and Quality Assurance Plan: Protecting and securing data is a priority across all public health programs. One requirement of your PS18-1802 funding is compliance with the National Center for HIV/AIDS Viral Hepatitis, TB , and STD Prevention (NCHHSTP) Data Security and Confidentially Guidelines (http://www.cdc.gov/nchhstp/programintegration/Data-Security.htm), including plans for FOA partner(s) or subcontractor(s) compliance. If your demonstration project requires data to be collected from multiple collaborating partners and/or systems, please describe your plan for collecting, sharing and assuring data quality from each partner and or data system. Use Table 6 to report the required data management information. Please add additional columns or tables to reflect your data management plan for each partner and system.

Table 6. Data Management and Quality Assurance Plan (add additional pages for systems if more than 2)		
Plan Elements	**System 1: specify _____**	**System 2: specify _____**
Data Processing		
Data Quality Assurance (QA) Procedures		
Provisions for Storage and Backup of Data		
Provisions for Data Security		
Mechanisms for Providing Access to and Sharing Data		
Provisions for Protection of Privacy and Confidentiality		
Plans for Long-term Preservation and Archiving of Data		
Standards to Ensure all Released Data Have Appropriate Documentation		

Section 7: Ensuring Use and Sharing Lessons Learned

In this section, you will need to discuss (and list in Table 7) how evaluation recommendations and lessons learned will be actioned and findings disseminated to relevant stakeholders and other interested audiences. In addition to your evaluation reports (list in Table 8), your dissemination plan should discuss anticipated publications. How evaluation findings will be used to modify, strengthen, and improve your program must also be discussed as part of your evaluation plan.

Table 7. Feedback to primary users or stakeholders of the evaluation (persons or organizations)		
User/Stakeholder	**Purpose, Form, and Mechanism of Feedback**	**Frequency and Timing of Feedback**

Table 8. Evaluation Reports			
Report Title	**Primary Target Audience**	**Purpose of Report**	**Frequency and Timing of Report**

Section 8: Glossary

Please provide definitions for all locally defined/used terms and activities relevant to the implementation and evaluation of your PS18-1802-funded demonstration project in Table 9.

Table 9. Locally Defined Terms	
Term	**Definition**

Additional M&E Guidance/Resources

The following documents discuss strategies to identify your stakeholders, their interests in the evaluation, and what you should consider in your plan to engage them in program evaluation:

1. http://www.cdc.gov/eval/guide/cdcevalmanual.pdf
2. http://www.cdc.gov/obesity/downloads/CDC-Evaluation-Workbook-508.pdf
3. http://www.fsg.org/tools-and-resources/practical-guide-engaging-stakeholders-developing-evaluation-questions-0#download-area

The following documents provide useful tips, examples, and templates to develop logic models:

4. http://www.cdc.gov/eval/guide/cdcevalmanual.pdf
5. http://www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/birthdefects/models/Resource1-EvaluationGuide2009.pdf
6. http://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resource/2006/02/wk-kellogg-foundation-logic-model-development-guide
7. http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/pdf/lmguidecomplete.pdf

The following documents discuss strategies for focusing the evaluation questions, method, and design:

8. http://www.cdc.gov/eval/guide/cdcevalmanual.pdf
9. https://www.cdc.gov/std/Program/pupestd/Developing%20Evaluation%20Questions.pdf
10. http://www.cdc.gov/obesity/downloads/CDC-Evaluation-Workbook-508.pdf
11. http://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resource/2010/w-k-kellogg-foundation-evaluation-handbook
12. http://prevention.sph.sc.edu/Documents/CENTERED%20Eval_Framework.pdf
13. https://www.cdc.gov/std/Program/pupestd/Types%20of%20Evaluation.pdf
14. https://www.cdc.gov/std/Program/pupestd/Developing%20Evaluation%20Questions.pdf

The following links provide additional guidance and examples on indicators and other monitoring and evaluation plan components:

15. http://www.cdc.gov/std/Program/pupestd/Developing%20Evaluation%20Indicators.pdf
16. http://www.cdc.gov/obesity/downloads/CDC-Evaluation-Workbook-508.pdf

The following link provide additional guidance and examples on writing goals and smart objectives:

17. https://www.cdc.gov/dhdsp/programs/spha/evaluation_guides/docs/smart_objectives.pdf

---

[i] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (1999). ***Framework for Program Evaluation in Public Health***. MMWR, 48(RR-11): 1-40. Available at: ftp://ftp.cdc.gov/pub/Publications/mmwr/rr/rr4811.pdf

[ii] Salabarría-Peña, Y, Apt, B.S., Walsh, C.M. Practical Use of Program Evaluation among Sexually Transmitted Disease (STD) Programs, Atlanta (GA): Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2007. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/std/program/pupestd/Introduction.pdf