AMCHP 2007 ANNUAL CONFERENCE

HEALTHY COMMUNITIES

March 3rd to 7th, 2007

EVALUATING THE PROGRAM PROCESS

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Thank you Dr. Maingi. Good afternoon, everybody.

AUDIENCE: Good afternoon.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: I realize it's after lunch. And so, I appreciate tremendously that you all have a interest enough to come in the afternoon to share the information. There are handouts in the back. And three handouts that we have is some work that was already done on performance measurement by some of your colleagues, actually in the Maternal Child Health Bureau. We have a chapter that's written in a book, Maternal and Child Health, that was co-written by a colleague of myself. Actually, primary author was Mary Peeple-Shepps, who I'm sure many of you know, and I wrote the chapter. And then, there is the handout. And there is additional information in terms of references, that I'll be referring to, that I think will be very helpful to you. And then there is something else that I didn't bring with me, which I had meant to, a document that I co-wrote, actually, with several persons at the state level called Eight Steps to Objectives Leading to Program Evaluation. For you all who came in, there are handouts in the back, by the way, okay, that you might want to grab. Because you'll need that for this discussion. The other thing that I want to, I want to make sure that we understand, for this particular workshop, is the workshop is actually, you are not geared, if you're an advanced data person, who does a lot of data work already, and you know these systems, this is actually not the workshop for you. This workshop is designed for persons who are relatively, who have been in the work with states, begun state work in terms of data, either coordination, data development, those sort of things, for just about a year or two. Or, those who are coming back to this work as part of their job description, and needs a refresher on that. So, advanced data persons, I'm warning you in advance. Some of this stuff will be rudimentary to you. The rest of us, including myself, have always learned new things. The other thing is that I sort of do not teach, and when I do my classes, I don't teach as an orator. That's actually not a gift of mine and I never claimed to it. But, I am a very good negotiator. So I can talk most people into most things. (laughter) So my way of teaching is Socratic, which means that I really am best able to convey what it is we're talking about if you ask questions about curiosities. So, I have no problem, and I really ask you to feel free, in the course of my going through the slides, to stop me and ask me questions that you have for clarification, four points, if you disagree with the point that I've made, please let me know, and I'll talk you out of it. But anyway, I'm kidding.

But feel free, you know, to ask questions, to make sure of that. Because the goal here is to give you at least a general understanding of the things that I'm going to show you in a second, which are my primary efforts. And it's to learn. This workshop is designed to learn. And also, as a first step. Hopefully, Dr. Mangan will invite me back in, and I'll give you-all some more information. But for the moment, this is learned. So, before I get started, do you have any opening questions that you want me to discuss before I go move forward?

Okay, well, as we get going, this is the area in which we're going to talk about. The whole idea of a monitoring the program process—and we mean program, most of you know what I'm talking about. One of the things that is always really difficult, or always needs more clarification every year, particularly if we are to be working on our Block Grants, is clarification of the process itself. Of the program itself, and the work that really needs to be done. It is clarification on the kinds of things we need to be paying attention to and assessing. And part of it is the strategy. There's no question about it. And what I'm going to talk about is sort of a link between sort of social strategy, social assessment, and social research, and how that can be applied in the work at your program at your state level. And also, then there's always the question, because I know that many of the agencies you work with, whether they're national agencies—and that would include both federal and non-federal national agencies—are very interested in linkages. So a model that allows you to look at information that can be linked across programs and agencies is also good. So I'm going to talk about that. So, setting the stage. Why is it important? Talk to you a little bit about key definitions and concepts, in terms of clarifying what it is that we really need to know.

Talk to you about performance measurement itself. Two processes I'm going to go over. Performance measurement and then process monitoring. Talk to you about what performance measurement is, actually from a more distilled version. There is a much longer version that's actually laid out very well in the book chapter, and also in the other handout I gave you. What I'm going to do, because of time, is just sort of cut to the chase and give you a lot of examples, or even give you a model that actually was a modified version of my colleague’s, Mary Peeple-Shepp’s version of this. They also talk about process monitoring. And a little bit of how do you set up a monitoring system. Even if you are the data person, for example, you're working on your Block Grant. How do you set up a monitoring system in your program, even if the indicators themselves change? You know, which just happened. You know, when you're working with programs itself. How do you set something up? So, how do you pull that together? But, you know, give you at least a model you can work with that can be adapted to your situation. Some will be included in remarks, and then, if there's any additional questions, I'm happy to go over those as well.

First of all, just a little proverb that I think is real critical. And, this proverb says, “Tell me, I forget, show me, I remember. Involve me, and I understand.” Point here, the process of program assessment and monitoring is not a solo act. Okay? It is not a solo act. It is also not a one-time act. It is an opportunity, and it should be an opportunity, as well as a way, that you interact with those who are going to be providing you the key types of information you have. It is critical that you involve them in the process. It is critical with involvement, not to be you saying, “This is what I need, give it to me.” It is, they understand what it is that you need in a way that you need it and vice versa. You provide information to them. It is an interactive process. It is critically important, particularly for us who work with states and programs, to understand that the development of monitoring and evaluation systems at the state and national level, is an interactive process. Because, it increases the reliability and the validity of the whole process itself and all the elements therein. Including your indicators, your measures, and the ability for you to have it in terms of making it a long-term instead of a short-term process.

And it also increases the thing that we value most at MCH, the ability to communicate with each other in a way that each other understands what we're doing. So, this is why to me, you want to talk about, whenever we talk about evaluation and monitoring, this is a critical piece here. And I said, the last one there is involve me and I understand. So again, it's not a solo process, it could involve people.

Okay, so setting the stage. So why do we do this? Well, we have three primary reasons. The first reason being that you want to develop or you want to maintain an effective—and by effective means of one that actually works. One that you can actually see results from. An effective program and service delivery process at your state level, and of course we all work with those at the local level. You want to have that interaction going on. But you want it to be something that actually works, as opposed to something that is constructed and at one level, but not really understood it doesn't work at the other. The other thing is, it says, “To enhance staff understanding of the things. The factors that really contribute to what makes this happen.” You know, to what extent and what ways does it occur? So when you are developing your specific aims, when you're developing your program service targets, and when you decide what you're going to actually evaluate as opposed to what you're going to monitor—and I'll go over the differences there in a second—you have to be able to understand how that really works. All of these are being followed. You want to make sure that as you put together specific aims, service targets, and objectives, whether you’re responding actually to the guidance, the (inaudible) guidance itself, or to new programs that you and your state have come up with, in response to whatever initiatives your state may be pulling together, that you, as people in the MCH part are trying to understand, it becomes critical that you understand how this works.

So those two reasons, and the third reason, is to ensure, this is both you as staff, and those you work with. All the stakeholders. And there are many, you know, depending on which program. There are many. To assure them that by putting this process in place, that the question that they ask all the time, does this work? Can it work? Those types of things are really being answered, cause you can show them, you know, through this process, of how that's occurring. And then also, whether or not it's working. And also, the thing that we really like to see, we try to talk more about, is actually if it's working or not. It's not just rhetoric to say, things are really nice and things are going well. You actually now have a process in place that provides evidence to demonstrate that, independent of the level of evidence that it is. Okay? Questions? No? Okay. All right then.

So, let me just go over a few definitions. And, and I think it's important to understand these definitions as they occur. Evaluation of program measurement, which is really assessing that, is systematic. And this means that it is a structure, it is a strategy. It's a systematic process that allows you to get information about the services that are being delivered, the outcomes of that service delivery process, and the question of whether or not they work and how well they work, which is a question of effectiveness, so that you can go back and look and see whether or not what you've done is working well, and if you need to improve, what are the areas of improvement you really need to know? And it’s not just a simple monitoring of the process. It's actually being able to see, to do comparisons as the services are delivered. Because one of the things that we all know that happens many times is that services are delivered at different points in time, and also in different ways. And because of that, a lot of times it's not really easy for us just to assess those things. So if you have something in place systematic, and I’ll show you in a second how to pull that together, you'll be able to assess things as they are pulled out, and as they are pulled together.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can I ask a question?

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Absolutely.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Two slides prior, the second reason. When it has that--

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Two slides back?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, sorry about that.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Oh. Let's see. This one?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes. The second one.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The enhanced steps understanding of the factors that contribute to the extent to which and in what ways--

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Yeah, so specific aims, in what ways, specific aims that are set up by the program, cause all programs have a set of aims, all programs also has performance targets, and then all programs actually have objectives. All are being followed. This allows you—and it’s in a very structured way, to (inaudible). And it ensures, it enhances staff understanding. Because part of this whole thing is to make sure that the people that you're working with, who are carrying the process out, understands how this is working.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: You know, and one of the big gaps, as we all know, is that a lot of times, things are just thrust at you, you know, without really an explanation of why. So if you don't have something in place that gives you a reason why that you can follow, that's not complex, but just really straightforward, it's difficult for you to understand. So that's the point we’re making here. I know the language, the wording’s a little awkward. But I couldn't quite figure out how to say it, you know, in a more simplistic way. So, yes ma'am?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So when you say aims, you mean activities?

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Yeah, the, yeah, well, no. The aims are the things that tell you why, what are you trying to get at, you know, and why? They’re specific aims. Your activities are actually literally just that. Those are your tasks. You know, those are the things you do.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Your action steps.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Well, that’s just another term to use. But, action steps actually are the things you do to achieve the, are what you do to make the activities happen. The outcomes related to that. It's different, like, you've got to understand, the language, one of the things that we get into-- and we're very famous for this, and I know in our neck of the woods—is that we’ve sort of reinvented words. You know, many times, to talk about what we mean. The language evaluation is very straightforward. And it's also hierarchal in many ways. You have goals, objectives, tasks, you know, and activities that you do in tasks, and then you have outcomes that you assess. It's a very straightforward thing. The rest of the stuff that we add in based on logic, miles, and other things, are things we batted in, to help understand and explain. And understand too. This is the thing. I don't have it here, and I normally put this as a slide all the time, but, remember, the process we’re working on has three key elements to this. There is the social element, there is a political element, and then there is the technical element. And the reason why I say that is because the social element is when you sit down, and you have to sit across the table from people, from other programmers, and get them to buy into what it is you're trying to do, that's a social relationship. That's not necessarily a technical one or whatever. You're basically getting them onboard with you. Politically, you have to—particularly if you’re a director—explain politically to your, to people who are giving you money, or people who are over you making decisions. You have to work with them on political things to develop this, whether it be legislation oriented, whether it be your congressperson, or whatever. Those are political aspects of this. And the technical stuff is what we're talking about. We all know that even though I'm talking about technical aspects of monitoring evaluation, we all know that to actually get the work done, all those three elements play a role. And at different points in whatever work you do, they play either a small role or a big role. You know, there are points like for example, when you're sitting in here and putting together your Block Grant, you know, there's points in the Block Grant development where the ability for you to bring onboard people who really you need to target and work with, that takes precedence sometimes over the move for decisions, in terms of assessment. But then there are times when the data portion takes a big role on that. Okay? That's the point. But remember, there is language, but there is also the points you make. Is that clear, ma'am?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mm-hmm.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Okay. Sir? Okay. Okay, so, the next definition is monitoring itself. Now, monitoring, as opposed to evaluation, is really the process of assessing whether or not, you know, very simplistically, the program is delivered or is working the way it says. Basically, is the service processed, objectives being met? And was it implemented as planned? Which is a way of measuring it, but it's not necessarily assessing whether you achieve change. Okay, there is a difference. Evaluation allows you to assess change, whether or not something changed. Monitoring simply allows you to see whether or not things are working the way they're supposed to. There is a decision-making process you have to make when you do this. You have to decide, what do you want to do? Do you just want to see whether the program is working or not, or do you really want to see whether interventions or all the stuff you've done have caused a change of some type or another? One is a, one is a focus on evaluation, which is the latter. One is a focus on monitoring. And sometimes you have to use both. Most of the time, I would say, in our work that we do, you use both. You just have to be very clear about which one that you're using. And so what I was going to talk to you about today is both, but both in terms of the way of how they work together. So, this is here. And the handout I'm giving you in the chapter is this handout I'm referring to here. So, remember, by definition, we're going to talk about that. Now, evaluation of program monitors involves you looking at what you planned to do. It also looks at what outcomes that you said you were going to try to achieve, but, and then select, how are you going to assess this? You know, how are you going to assess accomplishments? Are you going simply just be satisfied with the fact that things are running the way they're supposed to, or do you really want to assess whether or not you've made some change or an invention actually worked. It involves you making decisions. But it involves you making decisions and putting those decisions in place, and then moving forward with those. You know, whether or not the timeframe is every three months, every six months, or every year, that’s your call. But you have to decide and make a call on that. The other thing it evolves is this involves using some sound methods. Things that you know exist. This is why we handed out to you the other part in terms of performance measurement, that was developed from a grant from the Maternal

Child Health Bureau, and whether or not, you know, the results themselves are related to what you are doing or something else occurs. Now we know that this is a tough area, particularly in our field, because a lot of times things do occur, and we find out much later on that they actually happened. Example is, at the state level, when we're working with groups in different communities. There may be events that occur, political events that occur, national disaster events that occur, spontaneous events that occur, related to explained and unexplained events. Those may influence the way the programs you've funded or you're working with carry out the work that they're doing. It's important for you to understand what happened there, and also, whether or not sometimes the work that they're doing actually influenced those events. Sometimes they did not. But it's important for you to understand that, such that when you are trying to make an assessment, or write up your assessment, you can sort of make, give the credit where credit's supposed to be and not. And a lot of times I think in the work that we do, I know in the work that we do, that unless we have an interaction process, which is what I suggested before, we don't always understand those things. So it becomes important in the work that we do, particularly at the state level. Okay?

So the other thing here is that we also have both quantitative and qualitative methods. And, in here is, let me just explain a bit here. And I'll show you actually, when we get to the monitoring, the monitoring process part. Mostly, a lot of times, in the work that we do, and this speaks more to the nature of Maternal and Child Health necessarily than it does to the assessment process. Many, many times, we make judgments based on gut feelings, we make judgments based on discussions we've had, and that sort of thing. We don't document those discussions. We don't document the results of agreements we make. We may go into a community and negotiate with a group of persons to enact a program, or to make a program work. The lessons we learned from that interaction, the lessons we learn from that work itself, we rarely document, you know, in terms of putting it into a report of progress and success. We rely strictly on whether or not numbers were changed, or widgets were moved, and that sort of thing. It takes away from the picture that we're trying to create, actually, to what we're really doing. So, when we talk about monitoring assessment, we have to realize that there is more than one type of assessment you can do. And, that you are really limiting the skills that you bring to the table. There is a saying that we have in the evaluation field, is that the successful evaluator does not limit the tools in the toolbox. You know, and also the same thing with a data person. It is critically important that you work with those who are very quantitatively oriented. But it's also critical, particularly now, when we’re moving towards achieving what our six core outcomes are, that there are elements of those core outcomes that are not necessarily related to the numbers and things we collect. And we need to be able to document that, and document it well. And so, that's part of what we're talking about.

So, in triangulation, just for you to explain, triangulation is actually an assessment method that allows you to ask questions, both quantitatively in terms of numbers, but qualitatively. And then, bringing the two together to help explain one another. An example is, think of how many times that you've seen numbers. You've come in and the numbers have explained something. But it doesn't quite fully explain it and it leaves you scratching your head. Well, the key there is to then have to go back and collect information through discussions or whatever. Well, if you decide that you are going to, you anticipate that part of your work that you're going to do, for example, if you see trends, and those trends are that well explained based on previous information or whatever, and you need to find out more, do the qualitative interviews or whatever, well, that’s key work. You can still ask the same question about the trends. But now, triangulation allows you to bring both quantitative and qualitative information together to help explain that. And it enhances the quality of your work. It enhances the quality of your reports, it enhances the information you pass on to your constituents, particularly key stakeholders whose primary form of communication is not necessarily numbers. You know, which, but increasingly in our states, that is the case. Okay, so I'm just suggesting to you that consider that both produce informative results and both allows you to be very effective at what you do.

Okay, so, anyway, program monitoring is carried out by assessing the extent to which a program is implemented as designed. So, you have it, it's tracking achievement, based on objectives. It is, and I feel, it is a very traditional form of assessment. And we've used it over and over again. Everything I'm talking to you about has been spoken about for years and years. And it's something, and I quote Dr. Betty Kelner, who’s done a lot of work on this, (inaudible), I mean, she's worked with Dr. Anita Ferrell, as you well know, to set up a work within MCHB on this monitoring process, which they've developed some great work on. But it's really actually pretty much an administrative function in some ways, that actually should be integrated into how things are done and how you pull things together. So my suggestion then, is that as we talk about defining program monitoring and assessment, that we think about it both as an administrative function, but also as a function that actually guides the work that you do in a constructive way. And if you look at that as that, then ownership of that becomes not only you as a state person, but those who you're going to be working with as well. And remember, the inclusive process, involving stakeholders, is important here.

Now, how are you going to move from the big picture of evaluation and monitoring to the actual concrete things you're going to do? The simplistic things you're going to do? Well, how you do that is, is that you look at, for ways to assess and measure that. And these are called performance measures. Now a performance measure is a specific either qualitative or quantitative representation, or some kind of measure of things, of capacity itself to do the work, the actual process of carrying the work out, action steps, to use your colleague's terms, and then the outcome of all that work. You know, these are the things that you are actually measuring. So you're actually measuring both the work that you're doing, the ability to get the work done, the actual process of the work itself, and what happens when that is done. And these are all part of this whole thing called the performance process, or the program process. But assessing the program process. You know. Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can I ask a question?

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Absolutely.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Do you actually see the performance measure as incorporated in all (inaudible) of those aspects, or that performance measures can move in either one of those directions? For example, process (inaudible) your computer.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Yeah, those are, performance measures allows you to assess each one of those. But there are some that you might consider on a bigger, it depends on that. Micro, micro activities, or micro-level, yes. They're separate. But on a bigger issue like distal outcomes. You know, you know, like, infant mortality. You know, something like that. Those are distal. The proximal, you know, ones, that, those are discrete. And so those discrete measures that has indicators linked to them. So the deal is, is that there is process, there's measures, but there may be indicators. So you may have more than one indicator linked to a measure. Okay? And that's where the discrete comes from. But for the bigger picture, it's usually a measure, you know, that we do all the time. And those are generally what you're asked for, in the pyramid, for example. Those are much more of the approximate, I mean, distal measures. Okay? Make sense?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: All right, so both program monitoring and performance measures depend on this. And I can't emphasize this more. One of the things that happens a lot, and this is why we end up scratching our head so many times at the end of this, is that we don't have this. Strong, meaningful measures. Not only are they strong measures, but they're meaningful. You know, meaningful is referring to the fact that sometimes we come up with things that we think measures what it is we're trying to do, as opposed to what it is that we've collectively understood, whether it's something we pulled from existing information, whether we collectively believe that's the case. This happens all the time. You know, and this is something that's pretty important. Because, if you are working at the local level, and you have a program, you know, like tobacco abatement, you know, or prevention, most prevention programs work both at the state and the local level. There is a lot of things that at the state level, you may decide is measuring change. But at the local level, it does not mean the same thing. Because change is defined very differently. The important part here is to come up with measures, you know, in terms of what is changed or what is being monitored that is well understood, that is meaningful to both everyone that's involved in the assessment process itself. That's what we mean by meaningful. What we mean by strong is that it's not something where, okay, it's going to change, if you decide today and tomorrow, it changes. This has to be something that you will be able to maintain. And so that means you have to be discrete. You have to have those measures that you're going to look at that are going to stay the same over time, and those measures that are probably going to lend themselves to changes, whether it's changes in personnel, at the local level, changes in the political climate, whatever. You have to decide to do that. You know, because these are the things that's going to affect your ability to come up at the end of the day with something that says whether the program is either working the way it's supposed to work, or whether or not changes you see are really attributable to the work that you've done. Is that clear? Okay, if it’s not, please let me know. All right.

So anyway, delivery process itself. So we're talking about how the process works in services. And services is the key here. Because services as you know, have to be defined in such a way that they’re not only discrete, but they also have to be such a way that they mean the same thing across those different programs and stuff. Which means that it's a challenge to you, who run the programs, that you may have different performance measures, you know, that you have to respond to. And let me give you an example. If you have a grant, for example, from

HRSA, you have HRSA performance measures that you have to adhere to. But, you also have these performance measures that you have some flexibility in being able to come up with for yourself, for your group or organization. But then you also have performance measures that are unique to your program, based on the program itself. So that means that you have to be able to track and report the different performance measures, based on the constituencies, as well as the program itself. So that's a real challenge there. Because they may be the same, but they may be different.

Okay. So, I'm setting that up, because I'm going to show you in a second, how you can actually keep track of all that stuff. Okay, so performance measurement, let me talk a little bit about that. Now, how do you even come up with the whole idea to do this? Well, deciding on what to measure is one of your key first steps. Because this is the thing that, and again, this goes back to working together.

Now, you have to say, when I say service delivery process, does everyone know what I mean by service delivery process? Or do you think you know what I mean? Anybody want to be brave and raise their hand and say? Oh, come on. You all working at MCH. Give me a break. You know how to say it. Speak, anybody. Volunteer. I promise, I will not shoot you down.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: These are activities, perhaps?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, these are things that you, yeah.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Basics, encounters, things like that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Things like that. Anything having to do with the actual, yes, delivery of those. And those are discrete services that you're providing. Okay, so, so when we're looking at this, that means we have to decide, given those discrete services you're providing, which one of those do you want to measure and look at, and which one of those do you just want to monitor? Okay. And monitoring, seeing whether or not they're being delivered the way they should, and to whom they should, as opposed to whether or not they're making a difference, and making a change. Okay, why do I bring that up? Because, if you go back and you take a honest look like we've done so many times, with what it is that services people are providing, there's this whole thing of the tidal wave effect. Do you all know what I mean? You're shaking your head. Okay, tell me if this is correct. It is the, what I mean by tidal wave effect is that you have decided, over the cumulatively, generally providing this massive list of services that you actually lose your way, and are trying to figure out what it is this has to do with this. And, that's because some of them are real discrete, and some of them overlap so much with others, it's harder to see whether or not they're working or not. Yes?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (inaudible).

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Okay. So, that means that when you go back and you decide on assessment, you have to make a decision of what are discrete things, which are clearly identified things you want to do. The other part that you have is this challenge here. If you decide, we’re going to look at a certain set of services and not at a set of others to measure, then you have the other issue. What about those that you decide that you're not going to measure? You know, those things you're not going to look at. And someone in your group or your constituency comes along and says, “Well, we think those are important." You have a decision to make. So again, the thing that I recommend, as always, is to look at the services that you think are critical for one group, and a group you're working with. Work with them and decide on that. So at the end of the day, you do have a list of discrete ways of doing that. We’ve developed many, many ways. Our colleagues have developed many ways of doing this. And it is a process that takes time. Now sometimes you don't have the luxury—I understand that—of sitting down with groups of people and deciding on what you're going to measure. But I can tell you, if you do have it, or if you can come up with a way to expedite the process, it is truly to your advantage to do so. Because many, many times, things will occur.

And I'll give you an example. This is not, I give you an example here, and this is actually a true example of things that were missed. One of the programs that I've worked with a lot of times was a program that was very oriented towards looking, of delivering services to very at risk groups of people. And one of the things that was missed here, and I'm sort of being, I'm not going to say what the program is for confidentiality reasons, but one of the things was, is that, this is a program where the risk of crises occurring, because of the nature of the people they're working with was not unknown. The problem is, is that the crises themselves were, as a lot of hours are, unpredictable. So, how do you actually decide on that? And that's what happened, is that they decided they wanted to look at broad indicators, as opposed to some discrete ones, and missed some of the key aspects of this population. Because some of the crises that came up were very unique to a group of people within that population.

Now, retrospectively, it was found out that if they had worked with the people who were on the ground, the service level people who were working at the service level, some of this, some of the indicators would have been actually identified and engaged with. But because of the work that was being done was at more of the state level, things were missed, which is normal. And it happens all the time. But those are the lessons learned kind of thing. And when that was rectified, the ability to say the program is working, the ability to have good discrete information was enhanced greatly.

So one of the things you have to consider, when you're deciding on what to measure, you have to decide not only on what it is that you're going to keep, but what it is you're going to toss and why. So there should be a good, a really sound rationale to get this done. So, what we're also talking about is taking the time to think what is needed. And then what are you most likely to miss? Well, you're most likely to miss something important. You don't always know that. Which is the reason why I said, as we first started out, that this is not a solo process. If you decide that you're going to do monitoring evaluation as a solo process, you are limiting your ability to actually provide good assessment in a way, and meaningful assessment in a way to do this. You really need to engage those you work with. Yes ma'am?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I had a question.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Sure.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: How do you sell them?

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Sell?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: To your administration, that you actually (inaudible) buy them. You need to (inaudible). Because sometimes, I think, I’m in a situation where, anything data-related, oh, that’s your, that’s your task. Anything program evaluation, oh, that’s your task.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Right.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And they believe that you should be involved.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Mm-hmm.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But, what I try to express is, this is your program.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Mm-hmm.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Oh, you do know your program. I just assist you with identifying the goals and objectives, but this is your program. So how do you get that information related to them?

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Okay, well, well, of course we, we know that is critical for them. They're not going to engage, if they don’t think it really, they’re not going to engage if there's no ownership on their end.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: You know, if other words, if they do not believe that this is going to, they have a stake in it, they're going to get something out of it, they're not. So that's where you start, actually.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: You start at looking at them and saying, what is it about evaluation, or what do I think I provide as an evaluator, that will see that they have some gain here. And once you start looking at that, there's a number of different ways. And I'll give you a real good example. I'll give you an example, and again, I'll leave names out. The, when you're working, a lot of times staff on the front line are not always engaged. And even though the data collection have said, here, collect this information and give it back to us. Well, they are the ones that are responsible for asking the questions and making sure things are done and whatever. Well, the thing is, is that they don’t, they have no ownership. So, you may get errant information or whatever. The thing is, is that you have to design, essentially, your assessment process such that part of you, part of the actual work itself is required, that they participate in training, development, and is focusing on that. That's one thing to do. The other thing is that, what is it that you could, if you provide information to them, what will they get from this? You know, what will they gain? You know, if they provide data to you, will that help them in the grant process? Will that help them to better sell this to their clients? Will that help them to better sell this to people who are going to be giving them money? You know, those are all kinds of strategies you can use, and incentives you could use to also look at that way.

But the whole thing though is it all starts with you doing what I consider a pre-assessment, pre-evaluation, qualitative interview with them. And asking some pointed questions about what is important to them and what is not important to them, and then using your best judgment of how you can sort of make what you do important. And that's a process. But I recommend, we actually have, in something we put together, on doing community-based evaluation. It was a book by Sage. And we have in there, we call a friend of mine, a colleague of mine, and I wrote it, and we call it selling the evaluation process to the community. And I’m happy to send that to you. But, it was a thing that we had to, we had to do. And we talked about how, how this was done. It’s a very tough group of people. You know, it but it was great, because we learned a lot. But it is a selling process. But it's basically, you know, as you would convince, it’s part of negotiation. There's a whole element of negotiation called Principle of Negotiation that actually, instead of, you know, you being the person saying, what I'm going to gain from this, is actually sort of looking at what the other person has, and then what do you mutually gain from the process? But there's a whole way to do that here. So, I would say that. So look at mutual gain, and then look at those elements. But really get a sense, taking the time to really listen and finding out what is important to them, and how can you sort of make that work. I can't say it works all the time, but nine times out of 10, you know, it works. And it doesn't matter what level. We've done it at national level, we've done it internationally, we've done it locally. But it's something you have to have confidence in, but you got to do. I don't know if that answers your question.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Okay, and I’m happy to send you a copy of the chapter. My e-mail address is there. Other questions? Okay, so, to cover all the bases, in terms of this, which is deciding what it is what it is you missed important, then it's really important for you to start with the specifics. You know, what were your aims, what were your goals, what are your hypotheses? What are the kind of things you're trying to get at. And then, work your way backwards. And this is the way to do it. What are the things you're trying to get at, and then, how can you assess that? Now, what it means is that you have to decide, there will be things that you have sort of in your potential to get. Your indicators and measures that you could get. But there may be those that you have to decide you just can't get, because of who you're working with, what your program will allow, and that sort of thing. But you have to make a decision. And you should negotiate that decision with those that you're working with.

So, anyway, constructing the measure itself. Now there are three things you undertake. And I think this is really important. And this will actually help you in your decision making process of what to measure, what not to measure, what to keep, and what not to keep. So consider this. Consider identifying concepts to be measures. You know, as you're thinking, this is, what this means is think about what it is you're trying to measure. Think of the ideas. If you have, for example, a

Healthy Start Grant, and the Healthy Start, you're trying to measure maternal depression. Well, maternal depression is a construct, or a concept. What does that mean? What does maternal Depression mean? Well, clearly, in the guidance of Healthy Start Guidance, they define it. But when you're talking to persons at the ground level, what does it mean to them? You know, and you decide on what measures to use, what does it mean to them? So there has to be some congruence between the two, and then when you come up with that. So you have to really understand, mutually understand what it is we're talking about when we say maternal depression. Okay, and then operationalize that. In other words, make it measurable. Then, select these constructs you're going to measure. If it's maternal depression, then what elements of that you're going to look at that. You know, and what elements of that is it you’re trying to measure. Are you trying to just do initial screening in terms of depression indicators, or are you actually trying to do much more of those related to the clinical element of it. Are you going to screen, or are you actually going to do clinical? ‘Cause you remember now, whatever you decide to measure, you still have to do something about. All right? It’s going to be really hard for you to ignore something like that in that area.

And then locate and developing your data sources. Where are you going to get the information? These are the three things. If you consider these three things collectively, this will really help you to decide what it is you're going to measure. The tough thing is, is that if you decide that something is available to you, and,

and you, and you, you can't look at it because it's left off of this, you could actually do this. A lot of times what we have done is we've actually made a checklist, in terms of our criteria for inclusion of a measure, using these three areas. And if any one of those elements on the checklist is not there, we have to decide what we're going to do. And this is just another technique and a way to do that.

The other part here is that these are kinds of ideas. And these are things that are related to in the data we look at all the time. These are just sort of the number of things. We look at, for example, I use tuberculosis on this, because we are just looking at this in one of the rural areas, I would say we were looking at, where we had a outbreak. And one of the questions was, is that, what do you use as measures of this? And so, this is just used to (inaudible) that. You can look at, now these could be measures, could be things like numbers, like the number of deaths, the mortality rates, percentages, the percentage of days missed at work among persons with TB. You can also look at averages. You can also look at categories. And categories are more qualitatively oriented. But you can also look at that. The number of team meetings held. Those who are, come together to work on this issue, how many meetings are held. These are all examples of this. And this could be related to your intervention, or the goal that you have related to a TB abatement program that you have.

Now, the number of percentages and rates that are sort of most frequently used in Maternal and Child Health. These are the things you most use. What we don't use all that often of course is the qualitative indicators. You know, such as the things that I mention here. Now, many times, we do, this is what we do. When you're deciding, for example, you're putting together a coalition to address some, initial YTB, well, one of the first things you do is you don't start counting heads for the personal in the coalition. You bring people together, and you discuss and agree upon what it is you're going to do. Now, that's the, that’s the thing, that’s sort of like, but when you do that, you sort of skip that, in terms of giving yourself credit for whether or not data was actually effective. But we all know that if you don't get consensus or agreement among the group of people you're going to work with to address a problem, then you're not going to be able to address the problem, no matter what kind of data you use. Yes? So, so you need to include, was what I'm suggesting is, include that as part of your process, and ongoing.

So for example, you have agreement, or disagreement of statements. You have information that are used. And a lot of times when you're writing your Block Grants, and you’re looking at information, you're going back to notes and other things that are used, those become pretty critical, when you're trying to make the decisions, besides what is mandated, besides other additional things that you have. You know, so if you're going to go back to, for example, and try and negotiate with those you're working with, there are some kind of precedents. Because a lot of times, as we all know, history plays a big role in the willingness of those you’re working with, to work with you, work with your program, or what you have done. And if there's no documentation in any real way of how effective you were or how that works, then you're going to have some difficulty because you may run into these unexpected walls. You know, in other words, you go to work with a group, you know, who has a particular issue, like we did with the TB group, well, they had a long, they knew that TB was a critical problem. The problem is, is that they also had worked with people from the state, and people, other researchers before. And their level of willingness to work was very tepid. And that's because they history itself, which was documented somewhere else that we didn't find out till later was that they had a very, had a series, not a bad experience, but a series of bad experiences with people. And they had expressed their opinions in forums and focus groups and the whole shot. And none of that stuff was actually documented in this community as a whole. So when we went to do TB abatement, it became really difficult to just engage them in something that was obviously critically important. So this information is not to be, yes, ma’am?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, when it comes to the qualitative myth--

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Uh-huh.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The challenge, oh, the wrong page, (inaudible).

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And, as a program, we worked with them on their cooperative coalition (inaudible)--

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Them being?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The local, the local news, the county and office, and with the county--

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Okay, right. County and sec -- okay. Mm-hmm.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And we do the qualitative measures around the type of formal readings they have, or informal readings, the types of linkages with connections, communication mechanisms, things like that.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Right.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We’ve been really working effectively to get that done.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Right.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: However, when we go to report our performance measures, those ads mechanisms and valid (inaudible) measures are challenge in say, showing with our legislators that those are effective ways of measuring progress, because they want quantitative numbers instead of qualitative measures. So, are there ways we can present or make those type of qualitative performance measures seem more effective to the funders and legislators and things like that?

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Well, the issue actually is not seem more effective, to be honest with you. The issue is convincing them that these are valid ways to measure something. That's what your, that’s what your challenge is.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mm-hmm.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Okay, which means that you and your colleagues have to be convinced that they are. You know, and no offense to people, but I teach qualitative methods all the time, and one of the things that I get all the time is I have to spend the first hour and a half just showing the difference between quantitative and qualitative methods to convince people whose quantitative methods are that. It is critically important that you, that we, ‘cause this is how we’re taught. We've got to go back to how we’re taught. It means us looking at these as valid. And we know they're valid. I mean, you know, there's very few, having worked at MCH for 20 plus years, I know that qualitative information is very valid. And particularly in this day and time, when you have such a diverse constituency across, I mean, however you measure diversity. So, first of all, it's starting out with convincing you and your colleagues and yourself that these are valid measures. And second of all, then, looking at the best way to do this.

Now, one of the things is, is that if the only way you ever collected information, the only technique you used was focus groups, then that means that you've limited actually the range of qualitative measures, ability to get that information. There's many different ways. There's interviews, you know, there's records. There's other techniques that are used. We a lot of times in the health arena use focus groups because that's it. But we also do not do focus groups in a way that’s rigorous and it’s convincing. In other words, we do the quick and dirty sort of deal, which is actually not a really good way to do this. So, you have to sort of spend almost as, you have to spend the amount of time, requisite time, doing the work on qualitative measures, both in preparation, both in implementation, and both the writing it up as you would quantitatively. You will find though, that when you do that, you also construct ways. And there are ways of reporting qualitative ways. A lot of times, the best way to do it, as I said before, is triangulation. Show how they both work hand in hand. That is the best way to do that. Most legislators are pretty straightforward. You know, when they want you just to present something, the reason why they say, “Give us the numbers” is because they want something that's really simplistic. You know, and you can learn how to do that qualitatively by simply linking the two together.

Let me give you an example of something that people really do miss all the time. How many times have you all ever been to a hearing, where you have, the people are in roles. There is the expert, you know, us, you know, the researchers. And they present, and all they present is quantitative. Then there is the consumer who gets up and then tells a story. You know, so, and then you sit down and you listen, what is the legislator person talking about when they do, are they talking about the big numbers, or are they talking about the story? Nine times out of 10, they're talking about both. You know, they're talking about the impact that the story, that the consumer made on them, but at the same time, they are looking at the numbers. So, but they're getting the picture. So the idea here is that you learn how to prepare both methodologies together to create the picture of what it is you want people to understand, as opposed to saying, one is different than the other. You have to kind of, to me, I'm just saying. And this is, again, it's my perspective, and you-all do what's best in your shop. Because I know that it doesn't always work that way. But the idea is, is that you, you have to spend time looking at these as complementary methodologies, that allows you to better tell the story about the data that you have, as opposed to separate methodologies that, or one being weaker than the other. You know, and I know that that is, you know, difficult, but I think you, it takes, just like anything else, it takes time to do that. And then there's levels of validity there. Yes, ma'am?

CATHERINE: I just wanted to add in a comment here about the importance of minority voice.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Mm-hmm.

CATHERINE: That they make sort of a process (inaudible), ‘cause that’s something, I’m Catherine (inaudible), state of (inaudible)--

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Thank you.

CATHERINE: --MCH. But that’s something we’ve done in terms of setting our own processes, where we have not been (inaudible) in that, the minority voice, and eventually the minority voice, and we all know that, but it’s something (inaudible). And currently, another process (inaudible) which is primary concern. But once again, I think it's because we didn't acknowledge it and address it--

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Mm-hmm.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: --and crack it and capture it in a way that would have been very useful. .

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Right. Thank you. Okay. So, what I was saying is, often it helped to include numbers and qualitative indicators along with rates in percentages, which is what I just said to do this, for service. ‘Cause you're delivering a service. And depending on the service you're delivering, you do this. You have it. I mean, we do it all the time. You do interviews. You do intake interviews. You know, intake interviews are a combination of open-ended questions and closed-ended questions. You know, then you from that, you make an assessment of what services people have. You do this already. It's not like you're not. It’s just that you have to also remember that that is key data that you could use at the end of the day to make your case. You know, to what you have to do. And you sell this, just as much as you sell the other things.

But again, I'm glad you mentioned that. That the voice there, is that you do. But there is a training, I mean, you have, qualitative methodology is something that you do need extra training on. I would not say that, you do need extra time to work on, and I give it that. But there are opportunities, if you're willing to do that, that I think could be provided. But, one of the things that we have to do is be convincing on that. I would love to see actually, in the MCHB pyramid, a open space for qualitative indicators. I would love to see that. Because I think you would find there's a lot of stuff that you would learn. Also, developing high-quality performance measures, any, and candidate measures of those you assess according to criteria that’s rigor as well as practical. You know, and in essence. So it's both scientific rigor, but very practical rigor. You know, very practical things. The idea is that you, and to convincing, say your state health people, or your state board, they want sort of scientific rigor things. But, when you go to legislators and ask something, they want, but they also want just very practical means. They want a way, how can we, we've heard the stories, we've seen the data. How can we make this work in a way that we could sell that's very practical to us?

Okay, so remember, it's political, social, and technical. Okay, so what we’re saying is that responsive measures are able to detect any change. There are also measures that’s understandable by the audience with whom you will be presented. So there are groups of people, as we well know, that very much give that. And you have to, it’s tailor. We all know this. Tailor, you have to tailor your message to the audience in which you're speaking to. You know, and a lot of times, that's something we have to learn and practice a whole not. At the state (inaudible), we’re just state data persons, and generally, we don't really have many, many opportunities to talk to diverse groups of people. We’re pretty straightforward. We’re talking to just, you know, the administrators or just a group of some other people. But every once in awhile, we have to provide data to people who are going to be responsible to talking to diverse groups of people.

You know, if we have outbreaks, for example, in our state, of certain types of infectious diseases, particularly preventable infectious diseases, in populations that we know where there’s issues related to literacy, there's issues related to both spoken literacy as well as written literacy, you know, where there's issues related to access to services and that sort of thing, we know that whatever we say to them, it's going to have to be in a way that they understand it and see it as practical and usable. And a lot of times we just do not provide the kind of data in such a way that that. So that means that we have to challenge ourselves to be able to do that. Okay. And as we all know, this is an increasingly diverse group of population that we've always had, but we're now paying a little bit more attention to. So remember, regardless of how it's formulated, a measure itself needs to be precise in its wording, it needs to have a time frame in it. Smart, it needs to be smart. We all remember smart objectives, as part of your (inaudible)? Okay. So it needs to be smart, essentially what I'm saying. So, set of tasks or steps that you're going to do, all those things need to be a part of what it is we're talking about.

Now, the last thing here is that you also need to make sure that it's meaningful, valid, reliable, responsive. And let me just elaborate a little bit on what I'm talking about. First of all, what is a valid measure? Well, it is a validity, that like anything else, really, really means is that, are you getting at what it is that you're supposed to be measuring? You know, it is like, it's a quality of the measure. For example, list of things, you know, and the meaning of those things. Or the, is the meaning understood? Are you measuring change, are you measuring an event? Are you measuring depression, are you measuring anxiety, are you measuring service use, those sort of things, as it is supposed to be measured, or as the group leaders you're working with. So, is it valid? Is it getting at what it is you want?

That's kind of what you're what you're trying to talk about, when a measure is that.

Now, when you're talking about reliable performance measures, not only do you have to make sure you're asking what it is you're supposed to ask, but can you repeat this, you know, across different groups? You know, is it there? For example, assuming true results have not changed, are you doing that?

So like validity, reliability is a continuum. It is something that occurs over that. So, if you use it to measure today, does it hold up tomorrow? Does it hold up later on? And remember, I said a few minutes ago that there are going to be measures that are going to be those that absolutely do not change at any point, there are going to be those that change depending on the various definitions how they're used. You have to decide on what level of validity and level of reliability of your measures. But then you got to make a decision of do you keep and not keep, and do you need to make a list? Just like the overwhelming tidal wave of services. Some of this work you have to have.

So, data information sources, a couple of those are there. And these are actually listed in one of your handouts. If you look in your handout, there’s a whole table we give you. This is in the book chapter, by the way, of all the types of data sources that you might want to look at. So if you look at the book chapter, we have a whole section in there on that. And in the references section, we have a whole list of those as well. Also, if you want, I can send you a copy of something that we wrote that’s referenced there, called eight steps reference. And I can send you that as well, that list of these. But, the idea here is that the information sources need to be of high quality, they need to be accessible and usable. So if any of you all or the data persons in your state, you know this already. You know where your key data sources are, the ones that have changed.

Generally, the list that, if you are working on your Block Grant, the list of the mandated indicators, those things generally, you know where they are. Because you have worked on those over time. What you're going to have difficulties with of course are the data sources that are relied upon, programs and services that may change for a whole bunch of other reasons. So you have to be real clear about that, as you're putting your monitoring system together. So, also you have to make sure that there is acceptable levels of reliability and validity. And what I mean by acceptable is, you have to be comfortable with that. You know, you have to be able to talk and speak to whoever you're accountable to about of those levels. ‘Cause there are levels, there are certain indicators that they change. And if they do change, that means that there's going to be a change in how reliable they are and how valid they are.

And so for example Dan, you know, you want to make sure that information, particularly service information, is time frame. For example, is it going to be available for the next three years, or for the time, the next, until you have to do your next Block Grant. Is it going to be, the cost confirming to budgetary constraints, is it going to be there, something that, if it's sort of one of those very broad indicators that you have distally, you’re going to collect, say on mortality or morbidity, well, you know there's always going to be sources for that. But if it's for the specialized program, say preventing teenage drinking, well, those things come and go. You know. And if you're going to have that as part of what you do, you have to be able to say that that's going to be there.

Because right now, you know, some states are using their tobacco money to fund these type of programs, and some are using tobacco money for other things. But that is not going to be there forever. And there's going to be other sources that come on that as well. So, be efficient, and make sure that these are essential for whatever it is you're going to look at, look at both primary sources and secondary sources. But the key here is that, your new information, specifically for given performance measures, you're going to have to make sure that you are clear and acceptable of the reliability, the validity, and availability of that information.

Okay. So, let me tell you now, okay, so, so what I've done, essentially, is I’ve shown, told you all the roles in terms of why it is you have to do what you need to do. And then what you got to pay attention to, etcetera. So let me show you now, give you some ideas, and give you a bit of an idea of how you can take your system and sort of move it to track some of the stuff. So let me give you an idea. Let me just show you a way to do this. So let’s take Meticia’s model. Meticia is actually a person who is an MBA, who evaluates business programs. But, he had this really nice little model. I had a whole choice of different models to use, but, you know, if you're like me, and I understand, this is, I get accused of this all the time. I like drawings. So drawings and pictures, I understand those better sometimes than words. I realize that being academic, I shouldn't say that to you. But, but anyway, really, it is, if you can, to me, the belief is, if you can draw it, then you understand it. You know, if you can draw it, you can communicate it. You know, and if you can make a model for it, you can communicate it. If you can only use the words, then it’s really, and that's all you can go, then you have a hard time. And that's, as an evaluator, I try to be very practical. You know, and this is required. So to me, if you have a model, you can do this.

This model actually is a pretty straightforward thing. What it tells you is that you have this whole process of monitoring and assessment. And you know that. So encompass within monitoring and assessment, you have things that you do, which is the service delivery assessment process. Okay? And the service delivery assessment process can start at any point, depending on when you come onboard. Now, the reason why I have this is because I know some of you came onboard, you’re brand-new, you come onboard, stuff is already up and running. And your job is sort of, basically catch up. You know, and to try to figure out what is. And some of you have the luxury, and I call it luxury, luxury as in sort of major diamond luxury, of starting stuff from scratch. And that's a rare thing in our neck of the woods. But, most of us come onboard once things are already up and running. So we have to figure out what's going on when we come in, and we usually only have a month, or maybe less. Some of you are laughing, but I know it's the truth. Okay. So that means we have to do this. So what this model does is it tells you what you need to start paying attention to right off the bat. So what it says is that in the process itself, consider the kinds of things you're going to look at. Consider what already exists in terms of data, what are some of the things that were done in terms of previous evaluation, and then, what is the practice wisdom? In other words, when you come onboard, look at, yes, do your data assessment thing. Do pull that together, but take the time to talk to those who've been there a bit, or who have been working there a bit. And ask them what is going on, how this stuff has worked. Because what that will allow you to do is instead of having to guess, it also gives you at least some idea of what has gone on well or not well. You know, you don’t want to gossip. Okay? You just want to sort of ask pointed questions. Okay. And there is a difference. And you want to get at that. So then you have that. So then you would look at this, and you want to ask some of those questions, but you also know that there are other things that have influenced, you know, the decisions that have been made. And he’s, just give us a few, donor intent, which in business, I guess that’s a term. We just mean, in our neck of the woods, we’re talking about stakeholders. You know, what is going on with them. He also says that, you know, what are some of the people that have worked in the job before, staff, that sort of thing. But, the other piece, and this is, all the, the political environment. What are you walking into? You know, you may be brilliant, but I can tell you that brilliance is not enough to survive in some of the environments in which we work. Okay? Do you understand? Okay.

Because, because it doesn't, yeah, I mean, because, if someone above you or those around you make decisions, it's just that some of the stuff is just, I can’t even speak, they're so baffling, (laughter) of how do they even come up with that in the first place. (laughter) But you know what I mean. I mean, it becomes important. So you have to assess, because of the work you do, these things. So, consider, what was done before, what was the findings, what was working, what has been the stakeholder influence? What has been the background of people you work with, and what has been the staff. You do all that stuff. Then you go to start doing what it is you know how to do, which is program design, assessing of change, and then making your modifications. All right? So first of all, what we're saying is, get a good handle on what’s there. Then move to the things you know is going to do it to make it your own, or to do what it is that the job description says you need to do. Because, if you don't do that, you are going to be playing catch-up for a very long time. You know, in the state that I worked in, in Alabama, the person who took over for the state, the SCHIP Program, used to come to meetings with a ketchup bottle. And this was her, symbolically, her job was, until that bottle was removed, that's what she was doing. So for two and a half years, there was a ketchup bottle sitting at every meeting that we had. And the day that it was removed, no one knew what to say. They couldn't believe that people were caught up. But that was symbolically her way of saying that it's doing this. It's a symbolic way, but it made a big difference in terms of us paying attention. Which means that then we can actually, and literally, we spent a lot of times on this process that long, and we finally moved in very recent times on this stuff. And I kid you not. Yes?

ANGELA MORA: Can we, I’m Angela Mora, I’m from the (inaudible) District. Can we go back to the beginning, well, this model, but looking at the research findings and program evaluation findings?

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Is it a slide that I have?

ANGELA MORA: No, yes, this one.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Okay. Oh, you mean, here? This part here?

ANGELA MORA: Yes. That part there. What if you are, the program hasn't been, but there hasn't been any program evaluation findings done.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Right.

ANGELA MORA: And so, you're trying to learn about the program, and you're trying to play catch-up, but there aren't those items there to inform you about how to go forward.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Okay. Well, then you have the other piece there. You have practice wisdom. Okay? Now, the thing about it is that there is a lot of times, there's a lot of times where we have been asked to evaluate a program that's been up and running for a year, two years, three years, five years. You know, and the evaluator’s just not called in because the money became available, or someone came in and said, oh, by the way, we probably need to evaluate this. Or, somebody with big voice, if you know what I mean, has said, "Why aren't you showing results with this program?" So, you know, and that happens, that’s not unusual. So that means that you have to come in, and wherever that program is at that point in time, you have to then start looking at what’s there. And you do your retrospective discussion, but the retro discussion should have a particular focus, which is on what is doable at this point in time, as opposed to what was done.

Okay? So you have to modify it. Because a lot of times, if it's been going around and there's no data previously, then you have to create your own baseline, essentially. So, then you have to do it, and then basically you’re developing what's doable and what's not. Because you have, your wisdom, you know, based on what you know how to do, based on your skills, knowledge, and information. But, the last thing in the world, you want to start moving in a direction, and then have the little dog come up and, if you know what I mean. Okay? So, that is what to do. So, what is a really good practice to do is to start, we have a model actually, and I'm happy to send it to you, that shows you how to, that talks about that. We call it the pre-evaluation assessment, you know, or the pre-existing, and it walks you through the steps you take to look at what it is you do if you just step into a program that's really already running, which in our case, a lot of times, is already there. But one of the things to do, if there's no existing information, you have to learn how to create your own, but create it in a very targeted way. Okay?

So then, once you do that, you move forward, because one of the things you run into, and correct me if I'm wrong on this, is that you also have people who told, who hired you for a reason, but, all they know is, broadly, we want you (inaudible) with this program. But the people you're working with are very specific about what has and hasn't happened. And so you really need to understand what hasn't happened so that you can then now go somewhere. You know, where you do it. So you create your own baseline about what you can and cannot do. But you have to also spend some time with that. That means you have to ask for that time or negotiate that time or whatever. Otherwise, you're going to be catching up for a real long time. You know, or you're going to do something and then the rug gets pulled out. Because the whole idea here, if I can just use an analogy is, is that you're building a foundation. You know, and then, and, you know, of a house. Think of building the foundation of the house. You build the foundation first before you build the structure of the House. You know, but you don't build a foundation on shaky ground. If you can help it. You want to build it on solid ground. Cause then, whatever you build from that point out is going to be, you know, yours, and it's going to be there. It's not going to be pulled out from under you, if you can help it. Of course there are natural disasters, like earthquakes and things like that, but, those are the political wins. Do you understand? Make sense? Somebody else got a question?

Okay, so, anyway, the model itself, the rest of the model, you understand, ‘cause this is how things work. But the key that I want to point out to you is, even though we're starting here, you'll always come back to this as well. Okay, because that will also inform the process. This is an iterative process, you got to keep it in mind, ‘cause you will come back to this later on. Okay, so that's practical speaking. So let's talk about developing a monitoring system. Now some of you have already had this in place. And if it is, then, I'm just going to be reiterating what you already know. And some of you it’s new. But anyway, developing a monitoring system, what do you need to pay attention to? Well, first of all, you need to make sure that the basics are there. That means the program objectives are there, and then how you're going to sort of address the program objectives. What are going to be the set of activities you're going to do? And what are they, you know, are the tasks related to those activities, that you're going to carry out? Okay, so you have to look at that. And then, whatever the measure it is you're going to do, you have to start with those. So, the relative strength and emphasis of these measures, you know, you assign them as you would. Whatever it is, they're going to look at what are the, or how what you’re going to measure that information, the relative reliability and validity you have to make a decision about.

So the strength of those is going to be there. What is your data collection plan, you know, in terms of how you're going to do it, what techniques you're going to use, and how it's there. If it's information that you are mandated to collect, then clearly you should already have in place some means by which that has been done. You know, or, you have to create that yourself. But clearly, the thing is a data collection plan. And the data collection includes also the whole thing. It's not only just what’s going to be collect, how you’re going to collect it, but who is going to collect it, when it's going to be collected, and then, how is that information going to be disseminated to whoever is going to do whatever assessment it is you're going to do. So it’s a plan, you know, that works. And those are the pieces and components of that.

Also, I'm going to show you how to assess, and they'll call it achievement scores, how to assess whether or not, what it is you have as a target is actually being achieved. Which means it's a metric. It allows you to determine, as you move along, whether it's at the end of a three-month period, six-month period, 10-month period, whether or not, you know, that thing, that you're working as it should be. So, I’ll go over achievement in a second, I'll actually show you a working example. The other parts of this is that just as in a logic model, you have these elements to it. But we’ve already talked about what a specific aim is, what a measure is, and targets. And targets, as you well know, are actually the things you hope to achieve. How much of what, you know, do you hope to achieve. Or, you know, what level at which you achieve it too. If so, how many of this do you hope to achieve at a certain point in time, or how often you want to do something, at a certain point in time, or whatever. And I'll give you examples both qualitative and quantitatively, and show you how to do that. So, the idea though, is to develop measures and objectives that correspond to the service and program you have. So, you have to be sure. And this is actually a very, it's a given. Whatever it is that you're supposed to be doing, you have to make sure that it corresponds with what service you’re doing. But again, it's a decision-making. You have to decide what elements of the service process you want to measure and what do you want to monitor. You know, what do you want to monitor, what do you want to evaluate? Or, what do you think you just want to leave alone. You have to decide. But that's what we're talking about here. So they must be developed. Performance measures must be developed as the program is being planned.

I know this is ideal, because that's just not the case, as your colleague here just pointed out. You may have, the program may be already up and running, which means that now you have to go back and develop baselines. But still, the critical piece, if you can work it out, because things do change, you should try to develop measures from the beginning. Now, the suggestion that I have is that what you have to do is do a reassessment, if that's not the case. And I'll talk about that in a second.

Okay, so, let me just show you the next slide, because the next slide is an example, actually. In your hand out, hopefully this is clear. Okay, here is one where we have more of a quantitative measure. So the performance measure itself is a percentage adult, and this is, I'm using this, you know, as an international example, or, where I come from, where we do have villages, and look at that. So, for example, if your performance measure is that the number of adults in the second village, by either gender and race, within normal range. And this is related to the TB. If you think of TB, we're talking about TB. So, in terms of that. And then so you would have the target which you're trying to reach is that you're trying to reach those that at baseline, when you're assessing, you know, TB in that area, you want to be able to for one, do whatever you've done, whatever intervention you've done, medication-wise, treatment wise, service, intervention wise, whatever it's going to be, you want to make sure your target is that, by the end of a six-month period, three-month period, whatever, 7% of those, you know, you will have a 7% increase over whatever the baseline was. Whatever when you came in, that's the measure, that's what you're trying to get.

You're going to work, the next one, another example is that the amount of time spent collecting comments from the staff that are working there, from any kind of program assistance you have, you're going to look at that, how much time you spent. Well, you want to spend at least four hours interviewing the staff on average. Now, the other example is that if in that village, you want to get people back and forth to the main area in which care is provided. So there's transportation, such that it can participate in treatment. You want to be able to have in the city, for them to gather information for you. So your goal is that you want to have 30 adults, you know, who are sampled, sort of a part of your study, and that they are part of the work that you're trying to do in terms of that. So you want to have about 30 adults of that population to participate in your project per month.

Okay, so that's your target. Those are what you're shooting for. Now, the other piece to this is that the information that you get here is derived from your objective. So if your objective in the TB program is to reduce the, to eradicate TB in this particular area, it requires a set of things that you got to do. And I listed a couple of them. First of all, making sure that people are getting the treatment they need, making sure that the staff who’s working with them are informed and what is it they’re trying to do, and then also making sure that people are coming in to care, or have access to care, and you're collecting information from them. So those are the kind of three things that we have in a performance measure chart. Any questions?

Okay, so these are related to your service delivery. Now, you know, if the process has fallen short on any one of these objectives, that really should give you some idea of what it is you need to be paying attention to. And let me show you. I think, on my next one, let me show you how to look at that. Okay. Now this is the model, that is slightly modified again, you know, from that. So let's take the first one, which is, you know, the number of people by either, by gender and age, that's your target population, that you try to make sure that the treatments you're providing with them is in effect. Is in effect is the question. So, based on the baseline level that you had, and the baseline is 80% of those that were within normal range. So those that are individuals, 80% were within normal range. But you want to increase it such that at some point in time, you have more than that. So, within, say a year, which is our target here, you have the, you want to increase to 7% over baseline, which is roughly 87%, which is what you're shooting for, at the end of the year, you know, of the persons who are within normal range, okay, of that. So, and we are using this. So the percentage of those that are over baseline within normal range, you know, we have. So you have here, results after the end of the year is, you only have a 1.7% of those. And so what your achievement score will be will be only 25%. So only 25% of the people that you actually targeted are actually, you know, in the range that you're trying to get at. The other example here is that you look at the number of, you want 30 adults, in the population. And you actually have, you know, the number of adults who are participating in the project for 80% of the study days, which is roughly seven or eight days. But you have your results here. Only 24 adults participated. So 24 over 30 gives you roughly 80%. So, the whole idea here is that you rely on yourself to monitor over time, is how well, you know, those that are participating in the project you're doing are doing, but you're getting some indicator of this, that you're able to follow and to use.

So, how do you really develop the formula? So that’s just, those are examples of the formulas you applied. Well, there's a couple ways to do it. The first thing is, is that you construct a formula to reflect progress. In other words, progress along the way you have. That's your first step. Then, the formula should be based on some percentage score. And this is just a quantitative one. And I'll show you the qualitative one in a second, of one, where one means you've reached 100% of what your target is. So if your target itself as 30 people, then if you reach at the end of the year 30 people, it’s 100%. These are clear indicators that allows you or whoever you're talking too to see how well you're doing. The whole idea is to show progress, how you're achieving process. These are the things, this is what you communicate. It's very easy to do. This is a very easy formula to show people who are asking you, particularly constituents, particularly people who don't understand massive, you know, ways that you do data assessment or whatever. So, and these are pretty straightforward. Now, the other part of this is that you also have to make a decision, based on your own judgment, of what some of the numbers, or what your targets represent.

Okay, so what you have is that you have the, you have, for example here, 99% of (inaudible) signifies performance measure fell short. But a score of one indicates that it's either greater, that it's at or greater than expected. So you're also able to see this. So, these are numbers you can use. And you'll be able to follow these over time, depending on what your system is. But any, any, essentially any objective and any set of tasks you have, if you set a target to it, it allows you to understand kind of where you're going and what progress you've made. That's the whole idea. So, but if you've done everything we've said up to this point, which is making very good decisions about what the measures are, how to measure, how to put them together, you should be able to, this is into the process and how you construct this.

So, how it really looks here is that you have the actual value, and then what your targeted value is. You know. But all of the, all of that value, all the other pieces is related to the objective or the task you've set. And we've talked about that. And it shows you that in the formula itself. And this is just a little bit more information on that.

So the first three columns, you know, in the table, were completed as part of your initial plan. So you should have information related to what is it you’re trying to achieve? How much is it that you're trying to achieve, and when. You all already have that. So even if you walk into a project that's already in running, this information should be readily available to you. Your job now is to figure out what's realistic and what's not. Okay, and then you can adjust the targets. You can adjust where it needs to go. And this happens all the time. People will write an objective where they're going to make a change that's 80% of the population change. Well, a lot of times that's unrealistic. And so you have to go back and really look at what is doable. The idea here is to set up in such a way you can monitor to see what's doable. So that may require then, going back and looking at what your data sources are, and then how you're going to perform that. Because you may have a plan to do 80%. But your data system, or your data source, whatever it may be, may go away. Or it may change. But you still have to make a decision of how and how you’re going to use that information.

Okay, and my point here is that you should not do this. You should not miss this step. So you and those you're working with will have that. Now, the other point of it here is interpretation of results. The idea is that when you pull the information together, and again, it's not a solo process. It is pulling together those who help you to make sense of that information. Now, the whole here is paying attention to subsequent years if you have them. If not, what is it you collected at baseline. And then adjust, based on the information that you have. The idea is that if you come up with formulas to see how you're progressing or how your program is progressing, then those that are working with you should understand what that really means. So if 99, if one or a percent means that you’ve achieved or accomplished what it is you're supposed to accomplish, everyone should understand what that really means. Also, you should be able to follow that information over time to be consistent. ‘Cause sometimes, the information as I said before, the data sources are not there. Mandated information, I'm not talking about. Because that's always going to be available to you. It is the things that we do deal with the toughest, which are new programs, programs that change, or programs that come and go. You know, or programs that may be new.

Okay, I’ve covered that already. So let me just, let me just say a few things, and in conclusion here. Okay, so service programs may not reach their targets for a number of reasons. And I really want to emphasize this to you. You may do all the right things. You may set up the program and set up the system, but there may be times when things just do not work out the way they should. So, the reasons may be, they may take insufficient funds, you know, there may be political or social change or whatever. Misallocation, and (inaudible). So it's possible to, you know, too, you have to pay attention to what's going on. So it may be possible to take, you know, misallocation of some targets that are over achieved, and where those fall short. This system will allow you to do just that. Even if stuff is not achieved the way it should, at least you have an idea of how stuff did or did not work. At least you have an idea of that and you can answer the question of why things did or did not work, instead of, what we normally do, we just kind of throw up our hands and say, “We don’t know why.” Okay? The other part of it is, is that there are many reasons why they fall short. There is lack of knowledge, there's external factors. Particularly if you're doing qualitative information. There may be a number of difficulties in just gathering the information that you need and making sense of it. Also, there may be inaccurate measures, or when you are defining something like depression, it may be just conceptually defined the wrong way, which is why it's critically important in the very beginning to really make sense of that. Okay?

Now, the other piece of it is, is that, how do you really strengthen this? Well, it's important then that you first, that you're monitoring has three important shortcomings. And so you can recognize this. It needs to, first of all, it needs to produce evidence that where you could say, give a good reason why it does. Monitoring is limited in the sense that it doesn’t always have cause and effect. Evaluation can't really do that. So, you know, the other part of it is, is that monitoring limits many times to just a single program. While, if you sort of decide to do a multi-sided evaluation or a cross-sided evaluation, you could do that. So, monitoring, you have to be aware, will only give you information about a single program, as opposed to having a system in place. So what we're suggesting is that you take this program monitoring and you look at your single program. But you can always go back and see how one program is doing compared to another, if you use the achievement scores. Okay, that you have. That allows you to look at multiple programs. But remember.

And the other part here is that there are some shortcomings on that. So, the other thing is that coming to a consensus, a lot of times, coming to a consensus of what a score means. What is the difference between a 70% achievement and a 90% achievement is something that you as a group kind of needs to have, make a decision on. So, just remember monitoring limits issue there. I would just say that it’s a valuable tool for managing on this, and it's something that not, you know, is not real expensive, and that you could easily apply this to pretty much any program you have at state and a local level. What it really requires though, it does require you have some degree of training. But most people who you work with, even at the entry level, can learn how to do this. You know, it is not as complicated in the sense that when you get to the data assessment stage of it, but the initial piece of this, it's very straightforward. And it's something that you can present to any group you have, like we have done as well.

The last thing that I want to mention on this is, before I close out is that monitoring staffs really develop objectives that serve as the basis of service delivery. So whatever service delivery issues you have, whatever, keep in mind that monitoring helps you do this because it creates the capacity to really track the progress. But in a very systematic and rigorous way, as opposed to just the guessing.

Another important advantage though, is that it does encourage you to create information. And it does allow for you many times to have information available to you, and encourages people to use it that they may not have done before. So, it is compatible with pretty much any government program that you have, or any kind of program you have at that level.

Okay, so, what I want to do is leave you with two sayings. Because these are not in your hand out, by the way, but we’ll do this. One saying is this. Just because you could quantify something, doesn't mean you understand it. Okay? We do that all the time. We think that numbers can tell us everything. Well, reality, that's not always the case.

The other thing is, and to do this, this is, I know, words. Not everything that counts can be counted and not everything that can be counted counts.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That’s the truth.

JOSEPH TELFAIR: Okay? Anyway, If you don't have any questions, that's it. Thank you.