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Overview of the workshop
Debra Nestel and all participants
Learning objectives

- Describe the prescriptive objectives and outcomes of the workshop
- Reflect on personal objectives for the workshop
- Outline the structure of the workshop
- Navigate the workshop materials
- Acknowledge ground rules or expectations of participation
Workshop objectives

- Share good practices for CBE evaluation relevant to the needs of MEPI institutions
- Identify approaches and tools that can be used for CBE evaluation in the African context
- Strengthen a supportive network of CBE collaborators
Workshop outcomes

- A draft CBE evaluation framework and plan for each participating school
- Agreement on concrete next steps for continued collaboration between the participants over the next six months
Ground rules or expectations of participation

- Respect – listening, checking understanding, agreeing to hold different views, avoiding talking over others, one conversation at a time in large group work

- Participation – everyone is valued and has something to offer

- Mobile phones – silent/vibrate and step outside to take calls if you think they are necessary

- Timeliness – start and finish on time

- Permission to photograph – to help us reflect on the workshop

- Parking lot!
Personal objectives

- Read your objectives as set out in your preparation for the workshop
- Adjust, edit, refine…
- Revisiting across the workshop
Theoretical approaches to program evaluation

To develop a common understanding of different theoretical approaches to evaluation that could be applied to CBE programs
Introduction

Learning objectives

- Describe the landscape of theoretical approaches to program evaluation
- Identify the historical origins of program evaluation
- Review elements of the Systems Evaluation Protocol (SEP)
- Consider and use qualitative and quantitative approaches to measuring programs
A program is...

- A set of planned systematic activities
- Using managed resources
- To achieve specified goals
- Related to specific needs
- Of specific, identified, participating human individuals or groups

- In specific contexts
- Resulting in documentable outputs, outcomes, and impacts
- Following assumed (explicit or implicit) systems of belief (diagnostic, causal, intervention, and implementation theories about how the program works)
- With specific, investigable costs and benefits

(Joint Committee, 2010)
Evaluation is…

“the act of judgment of the value of …”

(Collins English Dictionary in Goldie, 2006)
Why evaluate?

- One minute thinking....
- Paired sharing
- Share responses with the large group
Why evaluate?

- To determine the effectiveness of programs for participants
- To document that program objectives have been met
- To provide information about service delivery that will be useful to program staff and other audiences
- To enable program staff to make changes that improve program effectiveness

(After Muraskin, 1998 in Goldie, 2006)

- Accountability, knowledge, development
- Quality improvement
Areas of evaluation activity

- For project management
- For staying on track
- For program efficiency
- For program accountability
- For program development and dissemination

(After Muraskin, 1998 in Goldie, 2006)
Who is involved in program evaluation?

- One minute thinking....
- Paired sharing
- Share responses with the large group
Stakeholders

- Downstream
  - Recipients

- Midstream
  - Delivers

- Upstream
  - Funders

(Scriven, 2007)
Stakeholders

- People who have authority over the program including funders, policy makers, advisory boards
- People who have direct responsibility for the program including program developers, administrators, managers, and staff delivering the program
- People who are the intended beneficiaries of the program, their families, and their communities
- People who are damaged or disadvantaged by the program (or who lose funding or are not served because of the program)

(Greene, 2005)
Theoretical and historical approaches to program evaluation

- Long history!!!
- Contemporary history (1960’s)
- Social programs in the US
  - Community, health and education
  - Accountability in funding
  - Policy makers
- Program evaluation traditions
  - Social accountability (use)
  - Systematic social inquiry (methods)
  - Epistemology (valuing)
**Evaluation planning phase**

**Preparation**
- Enter the system
- Form working groups

**Modeling**
- Stakeholder analysis
- Life cycle analysis
- Evaluation scope

**Evaluation plan development**
- Evaluation plan overview
- Measurement and measures
- Data management and analysis
- Finalize evaluation plan

**Development**
- Memorandum of understanding
- Assess evaluation capacity
- Program review
- Logic model
- Program system links
- Program boundary analysis
- Pathway model
- Reflection and synthesis

---

Measuring programs

- Metaphors...
- Use your imagination
- Fruit as program outcome
  - How might you measure it?
- Four small groups
  - 6 minutes
  - Need to work quickly
  - Take as many different measures as you can
- Share your group’s measurements
Systems Evaluation Protocol (SEP)
Summary and review

Learning objectives

- Describe the landscape of theoretical approaches to program evaluation
- Identify the historical origins of program evaluation
- Review elements of the Systems Evaluation Protocol (SEP)
- Consider and use qualitative and quantitative approaches to measuring programs
Communicating the results of program evaluations

Session 2
To share the results of recent evaluations in Uganda and Zambia
To raise awareness of the needs and challenges in communication evaluation results
Presentations

- 10 minutes each
  - Uganda – Rhona Baingana
    - COBERS Impact Evaluation
  - Zambia – Moses Simuyemba
- Q&A on each program
Communicating evaluation results

1. Who?
2. Audience?
3. What?
4. When?
5. How?

5 minutes in small groups...

Share discussion points
Characterizing the state of CBE programs

Session 3
To characterize CBE programs and identify similarities and differences, especially in the evolution and overall program lifespan
Sharing CBE program experiences

- 5 minutes
- CBE program at your school
- Stage of program development – lifecycle
- Purpose of the evaluation – based on stakeholder discussion
- As you are listening think about the similarities and differences to your own program
Talking about programs

1. Dr. Danjuma Bello, University of Jos
2. Dr. Aluonzi Burani, Kampala International University
3. Ms. Margaret Kigge, Busitema University, Faculty of Health Sciences
4. Mr. Antony Matsika, University of Zimbabwe, College of Health Sciences
5. Dr. MphoMogodi, University of Botswana, School of Medicine
6. Dr. Kien Alfred Mteta, Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Center
7. Mr. James Henry Obol, Gulu University
8. Mr. Hussein Oria, Makerere, University College of Health Sciences
9. Dr. Gad Ndaruhutse Ruzaaza, Mbarara University of Science and Technology
10. Dr. Moses Simuyemba, University of Zambia, School of Medicine
11. Prof. Susan van Schalkwyk, Stellenbosch University
So what do we have…?

- Similarities…
- Differences…
Developing a logic model

Session 4
To develop draft logic models that capture program assumptions, context, inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goals (5+ years)</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our graduates are prepared and able to practice in rural areas</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Students practice management tasks at rural sites</td>
<td>X graduates per year</td>
<td>Students know how finances at rural clinics are managed</td>
<td>Students apply financial knowledge to complete a budget document</td>
<td>Rural clinics in our district are better managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural sites</td>
<td>Students complete certain clinical tasks (skills) per our curriculum.</td>
<td>X sample finance reports</td>
<td>Students can list financial inputs to practice</td>
<td>Student demonstrates inserting an IV correctly</td>
<td>Clients at rural clinics in our district are healthier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preceptors</td>
<td></td>
<td>X complete log books</td>
<td>Students can describe how to insert an IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log books Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions:**

**Context:**
**Evaluation Plan Template**

**Sections 1 & 2**

1.1: Long-term goal of the CBE program (refer to logic model)

1.2: Program description (refer to your summaries)

2.1: Purpose statement for your evaluation

2.2: Questions (refer to your logic model)
2.1 Purpose

- Why are you evaluating?
- What will you evaluate?
- What will you NOT evaluate (at least, not right now)?

THOUGHT QUESTION: Why might you not evaluate something (right now)?
2.2 Questions

1. Look at your logic model

2. How would you know if
   - The activity has been completed?
   - The output expected has been achieved?
   - The intermediate outcome has happened?
   - The outcome follows?
2.2 Questions

- Clarity – does your partner understand your question?
- Feasibility – can you answer your question, or is there a path you see toward answering it?
- Reason – if you get a favorable answer to your question, what would you be able to say?
2.2 Question examples

- **Intermediate outcome:** “Students can list financial inputs to practice.”

- **Question:** “Can the students list 80% or more of the financial inputs to a rural practice site?”

- **Activity:** “Students complete certain clinical tasks (skills) per our curriculum.”

- **Question:** “Did the students complete every required skill for this rotation at least once?”
Evaluation plan template
Sections 3, 4, & 5

3. Measurement and measures

4. Sampling plan

5. Evaluation design
Measurement and measures

- For each question, describe how you will find an answer

Example outcome: “Student demonstrates correct insertion of an IV.”

Question – “Can student correctly insert an IV?”

Measurement – structured observation (perhaps using a checklist) by a preceptor
Sampling plan

- Who will you ask the question of?
- How many people/groups will be asked?
- How would you recruit your sample?

Example question: “Does the population near the clinic feel that they will be cared for well there?”

Measurement – survey of clients

Sample: 50 potential clients from surrounding area, recruited by randomly choosing houses from a map of the area
Evaluation Design

- In what order will you do your observations?
- What needs to be done before observations can be made?
- Do you want to (and can you) get a baseline or only look at what happened after it’s done?
- Do you want (and do you have) a comparison group?
1. Define key terms such as learning objectives, learning outcomes, and competency-based education

2. List reasons for writing learning objectives

3. Describe Miller’s *pyramid* in the assessment of clinical skills

4. Describe Bloom’s taxonomy of objectives
Introduction

- Spend a few minutes thinking about why learning objectives are helpful...
Why learning objectives?

- Inform learners of what they should achieve
- Inform teachers about what they should help learners to achieve
- Form the basis of the assessment system so that everyone knows what will be assessed
- Reflect accurately the nature of the profession into which the learner is being inducted and the professional characteristics that must be acquired
  
  (Grant, 2007, p21)

- Form the basis for evaluation
Related terms

- The literature refers to other similar terms
  - Aims
  - Goals
  - Learning outcomes
  - Competencies
2: Setting and writing learning objectives

- There are three main domains for learning - cognitive, psychomotor, affective (Bloom, 1956)

- Objectives can be framed in any of these domains

- The next slide shows Miller’s pyramid for assessing clinical competence

- Think about the objectives (and the domains) relevant at these stages
Miller’s pyramid for assessing clinical competence

Adapted from Norcini (2007) in McKimm & Swanwick, 2010
Alternative version of Bloom’s taxonomy

Source: http://www.downes.ca/cgi-bin/page.cgi?post=52438
## Writing objectives in the cognitive domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Recall of information previously presented</td>
<td>Define, list, name, recall, record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Grasping the meaning but not extending it beyond present</td>
<td>Describe, explain, discuss, recognise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Using the rules and principles</td>
<td>Apply, use, demonstrate, illustrate, practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Breaking down components to clarify</td>
<td>Distinguish, analyse, calculate, test, inspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>Arranging and assembling elements into a whole</td>
<td>Design, organise, formulate, propose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Ability to judge X for a purpose</td>
<td>Judge, appraise, evaluate, compare, assess</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

McKimm & Swanwick, 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing objectives in the affective domain</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiving</td>
<td>Aware of external stimuli (e.g. listening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding</td>
<td>Complies with expectations in response to stimuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing</td>
<td>Displays behaviour consistent with a single belief without coercion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>Shows commitment to a set of values by behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characterizing</td>
<td>Behaviour consistent with a value system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

McKimm & Swanwick, 2010
## Writing objectives in the psychomotor domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imitation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observes skill and tries to reproduce it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manipulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performs skill from instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Precision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduces skill with accuracy and proportion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combines one or more skills in sequence with harmony and consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Naturalisation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging and assembling elements into a whole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

McKimm & Swanwick, 2010
Developing a logic model in the context of MEPI
Zohray Talib

- Paired work
  - Similar stages
- Review your learning objectives
- Start developing your logic model
Group work

Group 1
- Botswana and Busitema
- Nigeria and Stellenbosch

Group 2
- Nigeria (SS), Gulu
- Zambia, Mbarara
- Vincent

Group 3
- Zimbabwe, Makerere
- KIU, KCMC
- Victoria
Summary of the day

Closing session
Reflections...

- Photographic prompts
- Prescriptive vs. personal objectives
- Any QUESTIONS?
Evaluation of the workshop

1. What has worked well?
2. What needs improvement?
3. List three things you have learned
   1.
   2.
   3.
4. Any other comments?