



# Qualitative Methods in Evaluation of Public Health Programs

A Curriculum on Intermediate Concepts and Practices: Syllabus

March 2020





# Qualitative Methods in Evaluation of Public Health Programs

## A Curriculum on Intermediate Concepts and Practices: Syllabus

Jessica A. Fehringer  
Pilar Torres-Pereda  
Phyllis Dako-Gyeke  
Elizabeth Archer  
Carolina Mejia  
Liz Millar  
Brittany Schriver Iskarpatyoti  
Emily A. Bobrow

March 2020

**MEASURE** Evaluation  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
123 West Franklin Street, Suite 330  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA 27516  
Phone: +1 919-445-9350  
measure@unc.edu  
[www.measureevaluation.org](http://www.measureevaluation.org)

This publication was produced with the support of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) under the terms of MEASURE Evaluation cooperative agreement AID-OAA-L-14-00004. MEASURE Evaluation is implemented by the Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partnership with ICF International; John Snow, Inc.; Management Sciences for Health; Palladium; and Tulane University. Views expressed are not necessarily those of USAID or the United States government. MS-17-121A  
ISBN: 978-1-64232-082-4 | © 2018 by MEASURE Evaluation



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The short course, “Qualitative Methods in Evaluation of Public Health Programs,” was developed jointly by MEASURE Evaluation (funded by the United States Agency for International Development [USAID] and based at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) and Global Evaluation and Monitoring Network for Health, in collaboration with experts from the Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública (INSP), in Mexico City; the University of Ghana in Accra; the Public Health Foundation of India (PHFI), in New Delhi; and the University of Pretoria, in South Africa.

We thank our Curriculum Advisory Committee (CAC) members Elizabeth Archer, Phyllis Dako-Gyeke, Sunil George, and Pilar Torres. They guided the conceptualization of the curriculum. Elizabeth Archer, Phyllis Dako-Gyeke, and Pilar Torres also wrote components, and carried out review, of the current course. We also thank CAC members Hemali Kulatilaka, Emily Bobrow, and Jen Curran (all of MEASURE Evaluation) for their contribution to curriculum conceptualization, evaluation, and logistics. Jessica Fehringer (MEASURE Evaluation) led the CAC activities and overall course development, with the assistance of Carolina Mejia (formerly of MEASURE Evaluation). Jessica Fehringer, Carolina Mejia, and Liz Millar (MEASURE Evaluation) also contributed content to and edited the curriculum. Heather Biehl assisted with editing as well. Brittany Iskarpatyoti (MEASURE Evaluation) also contributed content and Susan Pietrzyk and Eva Silvestre (both of MEASURE Evaluation) gave feedback on the course outline and selected sessions.

We also thank the Knowledge Management team of MEASURE Evaluation for editorial and production services.

We thank Global Evaluation and Monitoring Network for Health members who participated in the March 2017 curriculum review meeting in Mexico and the October 2017 Ghana pilot workshop participants. Their invaluable feedback was used to improve the course to its current version.

We particularly thank USAID for supporting this strategic activity on strengthening qualitative methods in evaluation and Amani Selim (USAID) for her feedback during the curriculum review meeting.

# CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....2

Introduction.....4

Course Description.....5

Appendix 1. Core Competencies and Learning Objectives .....8

Appendix 2. Session Overviews .....10

Appendix 3. Qualitative Methods in Public Health Evaluation Short Course: Agenda .....19

Appendix 4. Advisory Committee.....20

Appendix 5. Curriculum Contributors .....21

References .....22

## INTRODUCTION

Health organizations around the globe regularly make evidence-based decisions for effective health programming. Qualitative evaluation fulfills an important role in rigorous evaluation of programs. The strength of qualitative evaluation is its ability to provide valuable insight into complex issues, which quantitative methods may not provide. Qualitative data sources can answer the “why” behind program successes or challenges. Additionally, qualitative data illuminate the uniquely human side of health programming and bring to light important contextual factors, such as culture, gender, or societal norms. Qualitative evaluation may be used to complement quantitative data, answer a question not accessible quantitatively, or provide a cost-effective data source when one would not otherwise be available.

This syllabus covers a training that is meant to assist health professionals in using qualitative evaluation skills in sound and rigorous evaluation of their program. The sessions go beyond basic concepts to explore important considerations of qualitative methods in the context of rigorous evaluation. Through session content and participatory exercises, participants will gain basic skills in rigorous qualitative data collection, analysis, and use.

This syllabus provides an overview of the ten-day (8.5 working days) training workshop, including presentations, facilitator guides, practical sessions, case studies, and sample agendas. The training length and content can be adapted to meet the needs of attendees.

# COURSE DESCRIPTION

## Objectives

The purpose of this course is to build participants' knowledge about the core competencies of the course in order to enhance their capacity to conceptualize, design, develop, govern, and manage qualitative methods in evaluation and use the information generated for improved public health practice and service delivery. This course contextualizes qualitative methods within rigorous evaluation, rather than offering the basics of a qualitative approach.

This course includes a practical component. Over the course of the workshop, participants will develop a protocol for a program evaluation. The programs under evaluation will either be based on samples provided in the curriculum or program concepts submitted by participants. Small groups will be formed on Day 1, and each group will select a qualitative evaluation for which they will develop a protocol. Throughout the course, time will be allotted to develop the various protocol components, based on sessions covered that day. On the final day of the course, groups will present their draft protocols to the rest of the participants for feedback.

## Definition of Rigorous Evaluation

MEASURE Evaluation defines “rigorous evaluation” as an evaluation that follows a clearly specified protocol that is appropriate to address the evaluation question(s) of interest in the context in which the evaluation is being conducted. The protocol should use scientifically-recognized methods to address the question(s) of interest objectively. The protocol should be comprehensive and should discuss threats to the evaluation findings, the extent to which these threats are addressed by the design, and design limitations and their implications for the interpretation of results. Implementation of the evaluation should also be “rigorous.” This means the evaluation should follow recognized scientific standards to ensure that the data quality is good, procedures are ethical, analysis is correctly implemented, results are interpreted appropriately, and information products are well written. Rigorous evaluations should be designed and implemented to ensure that they yield information that is relevant and can inform program decisions. This can be accomplished by engaging stakeholders from the outset and sharing results in appropriate formats for different audiences. Rigorous evaluation can include formative evaluations, process evaluations, outcome evaluations, and impact evaluations.

## Core Competencies

At the end of this course, participants will have acquired the qualitative program evaluation competencies listed below.

### Competency Categories

- Concepts, approaches, and purposes of qualitative methods in evaluation
- Creating and conceptualizing evaluation questions
- Troubleshooting selected qualitative methods for evaluation
- Discussing the nature of sampling participants in qualitative evaluations
- Developing data collection tools
- Qualitative data analysis techniques
- Fieldwork considerations
- Presentation and dissemination of data
- Quality standards for qualitative inquiry
- Ethical principles for qualitative evaluation, including gender integration

## **Audience**

The course curriculum is designed for participants who have a basic knowledge of program evaluation and qualitative methods. The intended audience is professionals from the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and health and development fields.

## **Course Prerequisites**

Prior experience (academic or professional) with qualitative methods and public health program evaluation is required. For example, it would be beneficial for participants to have already taken a basic course in qualitative methods and have conducted evaluations.

A short list of required reading is included with the course, which should be completed beforehand. Additional references are included for participants wishing to learn more about each session topic. In addition, participants ideally should come with information and resources on the program for which they will design an evaluation for the groupwork component of the course.

## **Curriculum Summary**

The course consists of 12 sessions covering the key aspects of rigorous qualitative evaluation. The total duration of the course is 65 hours, to be covered over 10 days of in-person instruction, including time for practical application. Course organizers can adapt the length and content as needed for their participants and context. Detailed competencies and learning objectives are included in the appendices, along with the agenda.

## **Sessions**

1. Introduction to Paradigms and Qualitative Evaluation
2. Creating and Conceptualizing Qualitative Evaluation Questions
3. Troubleshooting in Selected Qualitative Methods for Evaluation
4. Developing Data Collection Tools
5. Sampling Strategies and Saturation
6. Qualitative Data Analysis Techniques for Drawing Themes
7. Qualitative Data Analysis: Hands-On
8. Quality Research Standards for Qualitative Inquiry: Trustworthiness
9. Developing a Fieldwork Plan for Qualitative Evaluation
10. Data Presentation and Dissemination
11. Key Ethical Principles in Qualitative Evaluation
12. Integrating Gender into Your Evaluation

## **Teaching Methods**

Course delivery is based on adult learning principles. A range of teaching methods, such as lectures, discussions, case studies, exercises, and group work, will address participants' varying learning styles. Each module includes varied teaching approaches for its activities.

## Course Materials

The course materials include digital copies of the following:

- Course syllabus
- Facilitators' guide
- PowerPoint presentations
- Case study
- Group exercises
- Examples of relevant tools/guides
- Additional reference materials

## Course Evaluation

The following are the recommended course evaluation methods:

- Pretests and post-tests covering all 12 sessions
- Simple daily participants' evaluation form for facilitators to review covering the following:
  - Was content clear?
    - Were the facilitators prepared and organized in conducting the session?
    - Overall impression of the day (use a scale)
- Final evaluation, stressing the following:
  - Overall impressions
  - Comments on specific module presentations
  - Group comments and ranking
  - What worked best; what did not work
  - Suggestions for improvement (general and specific suggestions)
- Assessment of facilitators

## APPENDIX 1. CORE COMPETENCIES AND LEARNING OBJECTIVES

<b>Characterization of qualitative evaluation</b>
Discuss major concepts, approaches, and types of qualitative methods in evaluation, including the purpose of using qualitative methods in evaluation as well as discussing the use of mixed-methods.
LO1: Understand and compare the four major paradigms of evaluation.
LO2: Compare and contrast the use of qualitative methods for evaluation with other approaches.
LO3: Establish the appropriateness of the use of mixed-methods of evaluation.
<b>Evaluation questions and theory of change</b>
Identify evaluation questions that are appropriate for qualitative methods. Analyze the theory of change of the program in order to identify relevant evaluation question(s) for qualitative assessment.
LO1: Use the program's theory of change to identify key questions that can be answered using different types of qualitative evaluation.
LO2: Conceptualize key components of evaluation questions.
<b>Methods</b>
Assess and select appropriate methods for qualitative evaluations.
LO1: Explain the pros and cons of selected qualitative methods for rigorous evaluation.
LO2: Describe methods to mitigate common problems in qualitative evaluation.
<b>Data collection tools: Develop data collection tools that reflect the evaluation question</b>
Design various data collection tools appropriate for addressing specific evaluation questions: in-depth interviews, focus group discussions, and observation guides.
LO1: Identify specific tools used for various qualitative data collection approaches.
LO2: Describe the structure and components of qualitative data collection tools.
LO3: Demonstrate the use of probes to elicit in-depth responses.
Utilize appropriate data collection tools to address an evaluation question.
LO4: Outline sets of questions that can address specific study objectives in data collection instruments.
LO5: Demonstrate the logical flow of questioning in a data collection tool.
<b>Methods/design: Sampling considerations</b>
Discuss the nature of sampling participants in qualitative evaluations.
LO1: Discuss types of sampling strategies employed in qualitative evaluations.
LO2: Explain the concept of data saturation and how to identify it.
LO3: Discuss factors that have an impact on the sampling strategy, including the emergent nature of qualitative evaluation.
LO4: Discuss strategies to reduce bias in sampling.
<b>Analysis: Appropriately select qualitative data analysis techniques to develop evaluation question–relevant themes drawing on the evidence</b>
Demonstrate the relevance of various qualitative data analysis techniques for evaluation; validate and utilize themes that can address the evaluation questions.
LO1: Explain qualitative data analysis and its approaches.
LO2: Describe stages in conducting qualitative analysis.
LO3: Develop a coding structure for categorizing data.
LO4: Apply an analytic method for drawing themes.

Develop a data analysis plan for a qualitative evaluation.
LO5: Design an analysis plan using a selected analytical technique.
LO6: Understand main practicalities of analysis for evaluation.
LO7: Demonstrate use of different qualitative analysis software and their applicability to specific analytical steps.
<b>Applying qualitative norms in research: Understand and apply approaches to strengthen trustworthiness of the findings from qualitative evaluation</b>
Debate the philosophical underpinnings of trustworthiness (quality research standards for qualitative inquiry).
LO1: Describe the various approaches and principles of establishing quality in qualitative evaluation.
Illustrate the practical application of trustworthiness in qualitative evaluation.
LO2: Justify the choice of approach to qualitative norms to be applied for a particular study.
LO3: Develop a plan for establishing trustworthiness in a qualitative component of an evaluation.
<b>Fieldwork considerations</b>
Discuss practical constraints and requirements in qualitative evaluation, and develop a fieldwork plan that takes this into consideration.
LO1: Understand what qualitative data collection in evaluation requires.
LO2: Outline field data collection, identify timeline components, and find potential solutions to timing constraints.
LO3: Describe key components of a field data collection budget and potential solutions to budget-related constraints.
LO4: Describe the interviewer field team: hiring, training, and field supervising needs.
LO5: Understand considerations related to the funding agency or government regulatory body requirements.
LO6: Recognize the special considerations, including gender issues, required for qualitative methods and the management of crisis during fieldwork.
<b>Data presentation and dissemination</b>
Evaluate the appropriateness of various types of data presentation for particular audiences.
LO1: Organize evaluation findings in a coherent and clear story line.
LO2: Propose and negotiate the report format and dissemination plan with stakeholders.
LO3: Demonstrate how dissemination will be appropriate for various stakeholders, including potentially vulnerable or special populations.
LO4: Formulate a dissemination plan that provides actionable recommendations based on qualitative data.
<b>Illustrate ethical principles for qualitative evaluation and how those apply to evaluation</b>
Identify and address ethical, gender-related, and political implications of, and considerations in, evaluation work.
LO1: Specify the basic tenets of ethical protocols for field data collection.
LO2: Identify special ethical considerations in qualitative evaluation when using methods such as case studies, focus group discussions, interviews, or observations.
LO3: Describe ethical and gender-related issues in evaluation design, data collection, analysis, and dissemination/use.
LO4: Understand the potential influence of political and cultural contexts in evaluation.
Design an ethically acceptable qualitative component of an evaluation.
LO5: Given a specific evaluation context or area/location, identify potentially vulnerable or special populations.
LO6: Describe types of consent for data collection and basic components of a consent form.
LO7: Explain data security considerations and steps to ensure data security.

## APPENDIX 2. SESSION OVERVIEWS

### Session 1. Introduction to Paradigms and Qualitative Evaluation

#### Session Objectives

By the end of this session, participants will be able to do the following:

- Understand and compare the four major paradigms of evaluation
- Compare and contrast the use of qualitative methods for evaluation with other approaches
- Establish the appropriateness of the use of mixed-methods of evaluation

#### Topics Covered

- Four major paradigms with respect to evaluation in health systems
- Strengths and weaknesses of various philosophical approaches to evaluation
- Introduction to qualitative evaluation
- Introduction to mixed-methods evaluation
- Types of qualitative assessment

#### Required Reading

Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2002). Why can't we all get along? Towards a framework for unifying research paradigms. *Education*, 122(3):518–531. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED452110.pdf>

#### Further Reading

None

### Session 2. Creating and Conceptualizing Qualitative Evaluation Questions

#### Session Objectives

By the end of this session, participants will be able to do the following:

- Use the program theory of change to identify key questions that can be answered using different types of qualitative evaluation
- Conceptualize key components of evaluation questions

#### Topics Covered

- Creating questions appropriate to the type of evaluation planned
- Aligning evaluation questions with program theory of change
- Conceptualizing evaluation questions

#### Required Reading

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for HIV/AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, STD, and TB Prevention. (2018). *Types of Evaluation*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/std/Program/pupestd/Types%20of%20Evaluation.pdf>

## Further Reading

Agee, J. (2009). Developing qualitative research questions: a reflective process. *International journal of qualitative studies in education*; 22(4):431–447. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09518390902736512>

## Session 3. Troubleshooting in Selected Qualitative Methods for Evaluation

### Session Objectives

By the end of this session, participants will be able to do the following:

- Explain the pros and cons of selected qualitative methods for rigorous evaluation
- Describe methods to mitigate common problems in qualitative evaluation

### Topics Covered

- Strengths, challenges, and considerations in using selected qualitative methods of data collection, such as participant observation, focus group discussions, and interviews
- Techniques for mitigating or managing challenges in qualitative data collection

### Required Reading

None

## Further Reading

Rimando, M., Brace, A., Namageyo-Funa, A., Parr, T.L., Sealy, D.A., Davis, T.L., & Christiana, R.W. (2015). Data collection challenges and recommendations for early career researchers. *The Qualitative Report*; 20(12):2025. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol20/iss12/8>

## Session 4. Developing Data Collection Tools

### Session Objectives

By the end of this session, participants will be able to do the following:

- Identify specific tools for qualitative data collection
- Describe the structure and components of qualitative data collection tools
- Outline sets of questions that can address specific evaluation components in data collection instruments
- Demonstrate the use of probes to elicit in-depth responses
- Design tool with logical flow of questions

### Topics Covered

- Structure of qualitative data collection tools
- Techniques for achieving flexibility
- Using enabling techniques
- Preparing data collection tools

## Required Reading

Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C.M., & Ormston, R. (Eds.). (2013). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. Sage. Retrieved from [https://mthoyibi.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/qualitative-research-practice\\_a-guide-for-social-science-students-and-researchers\\_jane-ritchie-and-jane-lewis-eds\\_20031.pdf](https://mthoyibi.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/qualitative-research-practice_a-guide-for-social-science-students-and-researchers_jane-ritchie-and-jane-lewis-eds_20031.pdf)

## Further Reading

DiCicco-Bloom, B., & Crabtree, B.F. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical education*; 40(4):314–321. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02418.x>

## Session 5. Sampling Strategies and Saturation

### Session Objectives

By the end of this session, participants will be able to do the following:

- Discuss types of sampling strategies employed in qualitative evaluation
- Explain the concept of data saturation and how to identify this
- Discuss factors that have an impact on the sampling strategy, including the emergent nature of qualitative evaluation
- Discuss strategies to reduce bias in sampling

### Topics Covered

- Types of qualitative sampling approaches
- The concept of data saturation
- Factors to consider when sampling
- Reducing biases in sampling

## Required Reading

Patton, M. (1990). Purposeful Sampling. In *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (pp. 169–186). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. Retrieved from <https://legacy.oise.utoronto.ca/research/field-centres/ross/ctl1014/Patton1990.pdf>

## Further Reading

Guest, G., Namey, E., & McKenna, K. (2017). How many focus groups are enough? Building an evidence base for nonprobability sample sizes. *Field methods*; 29(1):3–22.

Devers, K.J., & Frankel, R.M. (2000). Study design in qualitative research—2: Sampling and data collection strategies. *Education for health*; 13(2):263.

Teddlie, C., & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of mixed methods research*; 1(1):77–100.

## Session 6. Qualitative Data Analysis Techniques for Drawing Themes

### Session Objectives

By the end of this session, participants will be able to do the following:

- Explain qualitative data analysis and its approaches
- Describe stages in conducting qualitative analysis
- Develop a coding structure for categorizing data
- Apply analytical method for drawing themes

### Topics Covered

- Overview of qualitative analysis
- Techniques for drawing themes
- Coding qualitative data
- Identifying and reviewing themes

### Required Reading

Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Terry, G. (2012). Thematic analysis. *APA handbook of research methods in psychology*; 2:57–71. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Victoria\\_Clarke2/publication/269930410\\_Thematic\\_analysis/links/5499ad060cf22a83139626ed/Thematic-analysis](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Victoria_Clarke2/publication/269930410_Thematic_analysis/links/5499ad060cf22a83139626ed/Thematic-analysis)

### Further Reading

Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International journal of qualitative methods*; 5(1):80–92.

MacQueen, K.M., McLellan, E., Kay, K., & Milstein, B. (1998). Codebook development for team-based qualitative analysis. *CAM Journal*; 10(2):31–36.

Starks, H., & Trinidad, S.B. (2007). Choose your method; A comparison of phenomenology, discourse analysis, and grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research*; 17(10). Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1049732307307031>

## Session 7. Qualitative Data Analysis: Hands-On

### Session Objectives

By the end of this session, participants will be able to do the following:

- Design an analysis plan using a selected analytical technique
- Understand main practicalities of analysis for evaluation
- Demonstrate use of different qualitative analysis software and their applicability to specific analytical steps

## Topics Covered

- Review of analysis process and main analytical techniques
- Designing the steps of an analysis plan using selected analytical techniques and strategies including content analysis, thematic analysis, and discourse analysis
- Deciding on an analysis plan: creating an analysis chart
- Finding gaps and emerging data
- Using qualitative software to help with analysis (demonstration using qualitative software)
- Creating and applying codes
- Generating outputs

## Required Reading

Patton, M.Q. (2002). Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods. In *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*; 3rd Ed;440–447;462–481. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Masoumeh\\_Bahman/post/What\\_Is\\_Qualitative\\_Research/attachment/59d6277279197b8077985b9d/AS%3A325803062644739%401454688912157/download/qualitative-research-evaluation-methods-by-michael-patton.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Masoumeh_Bahman/post/What_Is_Qualitative_Research/attachment/59d6277279197b8077985b9d/AS%3A325803062644739%401454688912157/download/qualitative-research-evaluation-methods-by-michael-patton.pdf)

## Further Reading

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*, 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kozinets, R.V. (2015). Netnography. In *The International Encyclopedia of Digital Communication and Society* (eds P. H. Ang and R. Mansell). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Salmons, J. (2014). *Qualitative online interviews: Strategies, design, and skills*. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA:: SAGE Publications, Inc.

## Session 8. Quality Research Standards for Qualitative Inquiry (Trustworthiness)

### Session Objectives

By the end of this session, participants will be able to do the following:

- Discuss the relevance of trustworthiness in qualitative evaluations
- Justify the choice of qualitative approach to be applied to a particular evaluation
- Develop a plan for establishing trustworthiness in a qualitative component of an evaluation

## Topics Covered

- Trustworthiness with respect to evaluation in health systems
- Practical application of trustworthiness and programs

## Required Reading

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. (2008). Lincoln and Guba's Evaluative Criteria. Retrieved from <http://www.qualres.org/HomeLinc-3684.html>

Coryn, C.L. (2007). The Holy Trinity of Methodological Rigor: A Skeptical View. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*; 4(7):26–31. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.899.2553&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

## Further Reading

Rolfe, G. (2006). Validity, trustworthiness and rigour: quality and the idea of qualitative research. *Journal of advanced nursing*; 53(3):304–310.

Tracy, S.J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative inquiry*; 16(10):837–851. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1077800410383121>

## Session 9. Developing a Fieldwork Plan for Qualitative Evaluation

### Session Objectives

By the end of this session, participants will be able to do the following:

- Understand what qualitative data collection in evaluation requires
- Outline field data collection, identify timeline components, and find potential solutions to timing constraints
- Describe key components of a field data collection budget and potential solutions to budget-related constraints
- Describe the interviewer field team—hiring, training, and field supervising needs
- Understand considerations related to the funding agency or government regulatory body requirements
- Recognize the special considerations required for qualitative methods and the management of crisis during fieldwork

### Topics Covered

- From A to Z in qualitative evaluation fieldwork
- Fieldwork: time and budget
- Fieldwork team: aspects of quality and care
- Agencies and government regulatory aspects
- Special considerations in qualitative evaluation
- Management of crisis during fieldwork

### Required Reading

Bamberger, M., Rugh, J., & Mabry, L. (2012). *RealWorld Evaluation: Working Under Budget, Time, Data, and Political Constraints, 2nd edition: A Condensed Overview*. SAGE Publications, Inc. Retrieved from [https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/Condensed\\_Summary\\_Overview\\_of\\_RealWorld\\_Evaluation\\_2nd\\_edition.pdf](https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/Condensed_Summary_Overview_of_RealWorld_Evaluation_2nd_edition.pdf)

### Further Reading

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Patton, M.Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice* (4th Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

## Session 10. Data Presentation and Dissemination

### Session Objectives

By the end of this session, participants will be able to do the following:

- Organize evaluation findings in a coherent and clear storyline
- Propose and negotiate the report format and dissemination plan with stakeholders
- Demonstrate how dissemination will be appropriate for various stakeholders, including potentially vulnerable or special populations
- Formulate a dissemination plan that provides actionable recommendations based on qualitative data

### Topics Covered

- Writing a report for the funding agency; writing a report for government program
- Report review: clarifications and changes after external reviewers' comments
- Presenting results with funders and mandatory evaluations: using evaluation results for recommended changes and program modification
- How to disseminate results (report, sharing results with community, scientific paper)
- Presenting results to different audiences (presenting sensible results)
- What to show, how to show, and where to show in order to ensure the use of results

### Required Reading

Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International journal for quality in health care*; 19(6):349–357. Retrieved from <https://academic.oup.com/intqhc/article/19/6/349/1791966>

### Further Reading

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity and Obesity. (2013). Developing an effective evaluation report: Setting the course for effective program evaluation. Atlanta, Georgia: CDC. Retrieved from [https://www.cdc.gov/eval/materials/developing-an-effective-evaluation-report\\_tag508.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/eval/materials/developing-an-effective-evaluation-report_tag508.pdf)

Reid, A., & Gough, S. (2000). Guidelines for reporting and evaluating qualitative research: what are the alternatives? *Environmental Education Research*; 6(1):59–91.

Spencer, L., Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., & Dillon, L. (2003). Quality in qualitative evaluation: a framework for assessing research evidence. Government Chief Social Researcher's Office, London: Cabinet Office. Retrieved from [https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/166\\_policy\\_hub\\_a\\_quality\\_framework.pdf](https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/166_policy_hub_a_quality_framework.pdf)

## Session 11. Key Ethical Principles in Qualitative Evaluation

### Session Objectives

By the end of this session, participants will be able to do the following:

- Specify the basic tenets of ethical protocols for field data collection
- Given a specific evaluation context or area/location, identify potential vulnerable or special populations
- Describe types of consent for data collection and basic components of a consent form

- Identify special ethical considerations in qualitative evaluation when using methods such as case studies, focus group discussions, interviews, or observations
- Explain data security considerations and steps to ensure data security
- Describe ethical issues in evaluation design, data collection, analysis, and dissemination/use
- Understand potential influence of political and cultural context in evaluation

## Topics Covered

- What a protocol/evaluation plan must have in respect to the basics of ethics in evaluation (informed consent, freedom/leaving the evaluation, equal opportunities, anonymity, confidentiality, no harm/harm reduction)
- Cultural aspects of evaluation topics, how evaluation and qualitative techniques can lead to subject vulnerability
- Ethical aspects of qualitative inquiry
- Institutional review and informed consent
- Reporting sound data, reviewing with funding agency and government
- Confidentiality and anonymity in reporting

## Required Reading

Hewitt, J. (2007). Ethical components of researcher-researched relationships in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative health research*; 17(8):1149–1159. Retrieved from [http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1049732307308305?url\\_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr\\_id=ori:rid:crossref.org&rfr\\_dat=cr\\_pub%3dpubmed](http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1049732307308305?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori:rid:crossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub%3dpubmed)

## Further Reading

General Assembly of the World Medical Association. (2014). World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *The Journal of the American College of Dentists*; 81(3):14. Retrieved from <http://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/1760318>

## Session 12. Integrating Gender into Your Evaluation

### Session Objectives

By the end of this session, participants will be able to do the following:

- Define gender and related terms
- Identify why gender is important to qualitative evaluation of public health programs
- Describe gender issues in qualitative evaluation design, data collection, analysis, and dissemination/use

### Topics Covered

- Key gender-related definitions
- Importance of gender to health outcomes
- Sex-disaggregation in qualitative data
- Gender-sensitive measures in qualitative data
- How gender matters in the qualitative evaluation design
- Impact of gender-related norms on data collection logistics
- Gender integration in analysis and use of qualitative data
- Gender biases in data collection and analysis

## Required Reading

Day, S., Mason, R., Lagosky, S., & Rochon, P.A. (2016). Integrating and evaluating sex and gender in health research. *Health Research Policy and Systems*; 14:75. Retrieved from <http://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-016-0147-7>

## Further Reading

MEASURE Evaluation. (2018). Standard Operating Procedure for Integrating Gender in Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research. Chapel Hill, NC, USA: MEASURE Evaluation. Retrieved from <https://www.measureevaluation.org/resources/publications/fs-17-247b>

MEASURE Evaluation. (2017). Gender in Series. Chapel Hill, NC, USA: MEASURE Evaluation. Retrieved from <https://www.measureevaluation.org/our-work/gender/gender-in-series>

Morgan, R. et al. (2016). How to do (or not to do)... gender analysis in health systems research. *Health Policy and Planning*; 31(8)1069–1078. Retrieved from <https://academic.oup.com/heapol/article/31/8/1069/2198200>

World Bank. (2005). Module 16. Gender issues in monitoring and evaluation overview. In *Gender, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Key Resources*. Washington, DC: World Bank. Retrieved from <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTGENAGRLIVSOUBOOK/Resources/Module16.pdf>

# APPENDIX 3. QUALITATIVE METHODS IN PUBLIC HEALTH EVALUATION SHORT COURSE: SAMPLE AGENDA

Day 1: Thursday	Day 2: Friday	Day 3: Saturday	Day 4: Sunday	Day 5: Monday	Day 6: Tuesday	Day 7: Wednesday	Day 8: Thursday	Day 9: Friday	Day 10: Saturday
8:30-9:00a Registration 9:00-10:30a Opening/workshop objectives/ agenda/ logistics and introductions	9:00-10:30a Session 1 continued	9:00-10:30a Session 3: Troubleshooting in Selected Qualitative Methods for Evaluation	9:00-10:30a Off	9:00-10:30a Session 5: Sampling Strategies and Saturation	9:00-10:00a Session 6 continued 10:00-10:30a Session 7: Qualitative Data Analysis: Hands-On	9:00-10:30a Session 6/7: time for data analysis recap, questions, facilitator-led discussion	9:00-10:30a 9-9:30a recap of session 8, questions 9:30-10:30a: Session 9: Developing a Fieldwork Plan for Qualitative Evaluation	9:00-10:30a Session 11: Key Ethical Principles in Qualitative Evaluation	9:00-10:30a Group presentations (3)
10:30-10:45a Tea break									
10:45a-12:30p Session 1: Introduction to Paradigms and Qualitative Evaluation	10:45a-12:30p Session 2: Creating and Conceptualizing Qualitative Evaluation Questions	10:45a-12:30p Session 3 continued	10:45a-12:30p Off	10:45a-12:30p 10:45-11:45 Session 5: Sampling Strategies and Saturation 11:45-12:30 Session 6: Qualitative Data Analysis Techniques for Drawing Themes	10:45a-12:30p Session 7 continued	10:45a-12:30p Session 8: Quality Research Standards for Qualitative Inquiry: Trustworthiness	10:45a-12:30p Session 9 continued	10:45a-12:30p Session 11 continued	10:45-12:30p Group presentations (2) 12:30-1:00p Closing/evaluation
12:30-1:30p Lunch									
1:30-2:45 Session 1 continued	1:30-2:45pm Session 2 continued	1:30-2:45p Session 4: Developing Data Collection Tools	Off	1:30-2:45p Session 6 continued	1:30-2:45p Session 7 continued	1:30-2:45p Session 8 continued	1:30-2:45p Session 10: Data Presentation and Dissemination	1:30-2:45p Session 12: Integrating Gender into Your Evaluation	
2:45-3:00p Tea break									

3:00–4:30p Group work organization	3:00–5:00p Group work	3:00–4:30p Session 4 continued	3:00–5:00p Off	3:00–5:00p Group work	3:00–5:00p Group work	3:00–5:00p Group work	3:00–4:30p Session 10 continued	3:00–5:00p Group work	
		5:30pm Group dinner offsite— location TBD							

## APPENDIX 4. ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Name	Position	Organization
Jessica Fehringer	Chair	MEASURE Evaluation
Carolina Mejia	Assistant Chair	MEASURE Evaluation
Elizabeth Archer	Member	University of Pretoria, South Africa
Emily Bobrow	Member	MEASURE Evaluation
Jen Curran	Member	MEASURE Evaluation (formerly)
Phyllis Dako-Gyeke	Member	University of Ghana
Sunil George	Member	Public Health Foundation of India (PHFI), India
Hemali Kulatilaka	Member	MEASURE Evaluation
Liz Millar	Member	MEASURE Evaluation
Pilar Torres	Member	National Institute of Public Health (INSP), Mexico

## APPENDIX 5. CURRICULUM CONTRIBUTORS

Session	Name	Organization
Session 1	Elizabeth Archer	University of Pretoria
Session 1	Emily Bobrow	MEASURE Evaluation
Session 1	Carolina Mejia	MEASURE Evaluation (formerly)
Session 2	Jessica Fehringer	MEASURE Evaluation
Session 2	Carolina Mejia	MEASURE Evaluation (formerly)
Session 2	Liz Millar	MEASURE Evaluation
Session 3	Jessica Fehringer	MEASURE Evaluation
Session 3	Carolina Mejia	MEASURE Evaluation (formerly)
Session 3	Liz Millar	MEASURE Evaluation
Session 4	Phyllis Dako-Gyeke	University of Ghana
Session 4	Jessica Fehringer	MEASURE Evaluation
Session 5	Phyllis Dako-Gyeke	University of Ghana
Session 5	Jessica Fehringer	MEASURE Evaluation
Session 5	Liz Millar	MEASURE Evaluation
Session 6	Phyllis Dako-Gyeke	University of Ghana
Session 6	Pilar Torres	National Institute of Public Health (INSP), Mexico
Session 7	Elizabeth Archer	University of Pretoria
Session 7	Phyllis Dako-Gyeke	University of Ghana
Session 7	Pilar Torres	National Institute of Public Health (INSP), Mexico
Session 8	Elizabeth Archer	University of Pretoria
Session 8	Carolina Mejia	MEASURE Evaluation (formerly)
Session 9	Jessica Fehringer	MEASURE Evaluation
Session 9	Pilar Torres	National Institute of Public Health (INSP), Mexico
Session 10	Elizabeth Archer	University of Pretoria
Session 10	Carolina Mejia	MEASURE Evaluation (formerly)
Session 10	Pilar Torres	National Institute of Public Health (INSP), Mexico
Session 11	Jessica Fehringer	MEASURE Evaluation
Session 11	Pilar Torres	National Institute of Public Health (INSP), Mexico
Session 12	Jessica Fehringer	MEASURE Evaluation
Session 12	Brittany Iskarpatyoti	MEASURE Evaluation

## REFERENCES

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper, Ed. *APA Handbook of Research Methods in Psychology, Vol. 2*. American Psychological Association. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Victoria-Clarke2/publication/269930410\\_Thematic\\_analysis/links/5499ad060cf22a83139626ed/Thematic-analysis](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Victoria-Clarke2/publication/269930410_Thematic_analysis/links/5499ad060cf22a83139626ed/Thematic-analysis)
- Coryn, L.S. (2007). The holy trinity of methodological rigor: A Skeptical view. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation: 4*(7). Retrieved from <http://evaluation.wmich.edu/jmde/>
- Devers, K.J., & Frankel, R. (2000). Study design in qualitative research—2: Sampling and data collection strategies. *Education for Health; 13*(2):263–271. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14742088>
- Escobar, A. González de la Rocha, M. (2002). Seguimiento de impacto 2001–2002; Comunidades de 2,500 a 50,000 habitantes. Retrieved from <http://lanic.utexas.edu/project/etext/oportunidades/2002/escobar2.pdf>
- Fereday, J., & Miur-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 5*(1). Alberta, Canada: International Institute for Qualitative Methodology. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/160940690600500107>
- González de la Rocha, M. (2008). La vida después de Oportunidades: Impacto del programa a diez años de su creación. In *Evaluación Externa del Programa Oportunidades, Volumen 1*, (pp.121–199). México DF: SEDESOL. Retrieved from <http://lanic.utexas.edu/project/etext/oportunidades/>
- Guest, G., Namey, E., & McKenna, K. (2016). How many focus groups are enough? Building an evidence base for non probability sample sizes. *Field Methods; 1–20*. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301719869\\_How\\_Many\\_Focus\\_Groups\\_Are\\_Enough\\_Building\\_an\\_Evidence\\_Base\\_for\\_Nonprobability\\_Sample\\_Sizes](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301719869_How_Many_Focus_Groups_Are_Enough_Building_an_Evidence_Base_for_Nonprobability_Sample_Sizes)
- Guzmán, J.M. (2002). Envejecimiento y desarrollo en América Latina y el Caribe, Serie Población y Desarrollo No. 28. Santiago, Chile: United Nations, CELADE-División de Población. Retrieved from [http://gerontologia.org/portal/archivosUpload/uploadManual/10\\_envejecimiento\\_y\\_desarrollo.pdf](http://gerontologia.org/portal/archivosUpload/uploadManual/10_envejecimiento_y_desarrollo.pdf)
- Guzmán, J.M., Huenchuan, S., & Montes de Oca, V. (2003). Redes de apoyo social de las personas mayores: Marco conceptual, en revista notas de población de la Economic Commission for Latin America No. 77. CELADE División de Población de la CEPAL. Retrieved from <http://repositorio.cepal.org/handle/11362/12750>
- Harries, E., Hodgson, L., & Noble, J. (2014). Creating your theory of change: NPC's practical guide. London, England: New Philanthropy Capital (NPC). Retrieved from <http://www.thinknpc.org/publications/creating-your-theory-of-change/>
- Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E.G. (1985). Chapter 11. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE
- MacQueen, K.M., McLellan, E., Kay, K., & Milstein, B. (1998). Codebook development for team-based qualitative analysis. *Cultural Anthropology Methods; 10*(2):31–36. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/215666089\\_Codebook\\_Development\\_for\\_Team-Based\\_Qualitative\\_Analysis](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/215666089_Codebook_Development_for_Team-Based_Qualitative_Analysis)
- Martínez, I. (2003). Recomendaciones sobre métodos e instrumentos para el estudio de redes de apoyo social de personas mayores. In *Redes de Apoyo Social de las Personas Mayores en América Latina y el Caribe* (pp.67–75). Santiago Chile. Retrieved from [https://www.cepal.org/publicaciones/xml/2/14182/lcl1995\\_2.pdf](https://www.cepal.org/publicaciones/xml/2/14182/lcl1995_2.pdf)

- Mpembeni, R.N.M., Bhatnagar, A., LeFevre A., Chitama, D., Urassa, D.P., Kilewo, C., George, A. (2015). Motivation and satisfaction among community health workers in Morogoro Region, Tanzania: Nuanced needs and varied ambitions. *Human Resources for Health*, 13(1):44. Retrieved from <https://human-resources-health.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12960-015-0035-1>
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2002). Why can't we all get along? Towards a framework for unifying research paradigms. *Education*; 122(3):518. Retrieved from <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=814bda50-24b9-41b1-9c34-ebebfd49bbda%40sessionmgr4008&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#AN=6763557&db=aph>
- Palomba, R. (2003). Recomendaciones para investigaciones sobre redes de apoyo y calidad de vida: Agenda de investigación, métodos e instrumentos para estudios cualitativos y cuantitativos. In *Redes de Apoyo Social de las Personas Mayores en América Latina y el Caribe* (pp.77–83). Santiago, Chile: United Nations. Retrieved from <http://repositorio.cepal.org/handle/11362/12757>
- Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (pp.169–186). Beverly Hills, CA, USA: Sage.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). Chapter 2. Qualitative Design and Data Collection. In *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (pp.207–339). Sage, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi, 3rd Edition.
- Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (2003). *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Rogers, P. (2014). Theory of Change, Methodological Briefs: Impact Evaluation 2. Florence, Italy: United Nations Children's Fund, Office of Research. Retrieved from [http://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Dokumente/Evaluierung/Theory\\_of\\_Change/UNICEF\\_Theory\\_of\\_change.pdf](http://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Evaluierung/Theory_of_Change/UNICEF_Theory_of_change.pdf)
- Starks, H., & Trinidad, S.B. (2007). Choose your method; A comparison of phenomenology, discourse analysis, and grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research*; 17(10):1372–1380. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18000076>
- Teddle C., & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*; 1(77). Retrieved from <http://mmr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/1/1/77>
- Vera, M. (2007). Significado de la calidad de vida del adulto mayor para sí mismo y para su familia. *Anales de la Facultad de Medicina*; 68(3):284–290. Lima, Peru: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos. Retrieved from <http://revistasinvestigacion.unmsm.edu.pe/index.php/anales/article/view/1218>

**MEASURE** Evaluation

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

123 West Franklin Street, Suite 330

Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA 27516

Phone: +1 919-445-9350

measure@unc.edu

[www.measureevaluation.org](http://www.measureevaluation.org)

This publication was produced with the support of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) under the terms of MEASURE Evaluation cooperative agreement AID-OAA-L-14-00004. MEASURE Evaluation is implemented by the Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partnership with ICF International; John Snow, Inc.; Management Sciences for Health; Palladium; and Tulane University. Views expressed are not necessarily those of USAID or the United States government. MS-17-121A  
ISBN: 978-1-64232-082-4 | © 2018 by MEASURE Evaluation

