Building Blocks: Community Health Worker Evaluation Case Studies

#### FORMS APPENDIX



# **Forms Appendix**

This Appendix provides the worksheet templates and checklists for exercises 1-5:

## **Logic Model Development Program Planning and Implementation**

Exercises 1 and 2 Template

Exercise 1 Checklist

Exercise 2 Checklist

### Theory of Change Logic Model Development Planning

Exercise 3 Template

Exercise 3 Checklist

### **Logic Model Development Evaluation and Indicators Development**

Exercise 4 Template

Exercise 4 Checklist

Exercise 5

Exercise 5 Checklist



## Logic Model Development Program Implementation Template – Exercise 1 & 2

| RESOURCES  | ACTIVITIES  | OUTPUTS  | SHORT &<br>LONG-TERM<br>OUTCOMES  | IMPACT  |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| In order to accomplish our set of activities we will need the following: | In order to address our problem or asset we will accomplish the following activities: | We expect that once accomplished these activities will produce the following evidence or service delivery: | We expect that if accomplished these activities will lead to the following changes in 1-3 then 4-6 years: | We expect that if accomplished these activities will lead to the following changes in 7-10 years: |
|  |   |  |   |   |

Evaluation: Start Here Please! Using Logic Models to Bring Together Planning, Evaluation and Action Framework, Instruments, Forms and Directory

Building Blocks: Community Health Worker Evaluation Case Studies Grant-Writing Tips to Help You Sustain Your CHW Program Bibliography, References and Glossary

#### FORMS APPENDIX

## **Exercise 1 Checklist**

| Progress Toward Results |   | Yes | Not | Comments  |
|-------------------------|---|-----|-----|-----------|
|                         | ality Criteria – 1  |     | Yet | Revisions |
| 1.                      | A variety of audiences have been considered when specifying believable outputs, outcomes, and impacts (i.e., clients, funders, staff).  |     |     |           |
| 2.                      | Target participants and/or partners are described and quantified as outputs (e.g. In Year One, 100 physicians from 10 specialties will volunteer for the clinic).   |     |     |           |
| 3.                      | The listed events, products, or services are described as outputs in terms of a treatment or dose (e.g. 5 doctors and 4 nurses will staff three clinics/week. Four medical supply companies will donate medical supplies in Year One. 2000 brochures will be distributed through 4 Emergency Rooms. 500 patients will be screened, qualified and enrolled in Year One). |     |     |           |
| 4.                      | The intensity of the intervention or treatment is appropriate for the type of participant targeted (e.g. higher risk participants warrant higher intensities).  |     |     |           |
| 5.                      | The duration of the intervention or treatment is appropriate for the type of participant targeted (e.g. higher risk participants warrant longer duration).  |     |     |           |
| 6.                      | Program outcomes reflect reasonable, progressive steps that participants can make toward longer-term results.   |     |     |           |
| 7.                      | Outcomes address the awareness, attitudes, perceptions, knowledge, skills, and/ or behavior of participants.  |     |     |           |
| 8.                      | Outcomes are within the scope of the program's control or reasonable sphere of influence.   |     |     |           |
| 9.                      | It seems fair or reasonable to hold the program accountable for the outcomes specified.   |     |     |           |
| 10.                     | The outcomes are SMARTSpecific, Measurable, Action-oriented, Realistic, and Timed.  |     |     |           |
| 11.                     | The outcomes are written as change statements (e.g. things increase, decrease, or stay the same).   |     |     |           |
| 12.                     | The outcomes are achievable within the funding and reporting periods specified.   |     |     |           |
| 13.                     | The impact, as specified, is not beyond the scope of the program to achieve.  |     |     |           |









## **Exercise 2 Checklist**

|    | Theory into Action Quality Criteria                               | Yes | Not<br>Yet | Comments/Revisions |
|----|---|-----|------------|--------------------|
| 1. | Major activities needed to implement the program are listed.      |     |            |                    |
| 2. | Activities are clearly connected to the specified program theory. |     |            |                    |
| 3. | Major resources needed to implement the program are listed.       |     |            |                    |
| 4. | Resources match the type of program.                              |     |            |                    |
| 5. | All activities have sufficient and appropriate resources.         |     |            |                    |









9 3 **Desired Results** outcomes, and (outputs, impact) **Assumptions** 2 **Community Needs/Assets Problem or Issue** 5 Strategies 4 Influential Factors





## **Exercise 3 Checklist**

| Exercise Three Checklist |  | Yes | Not<br>Yet | Comments/Revisions |
|--------------------------|--|-----|------------|--------------------|
| 1.                       | The problem(s) to be solved/or issue(s) to be addressed by the planned program is/are clearly stated.  |     |            |                    |
| 2.                       | There is a specific, clear connection between the identified community needs/assets and the problem(s) to be solved (or issue(s) to be addressed). |     |            |                    |
| 3.                       | The breadth of community needs/assets has been identified by expert/practitioner wisdom, a needs assessment and/or asset mapping process.          |     |            |                    |
| 4.                       | The desired results/changes in the community and/or vision for the future ultimately sought by program developers are specific.                    |     |            |                    |
| 5.                       | Influential factors have been identified and cited from expert/practitioner wisdom or a literature review.   |     |            |                    |
| 6.                       | Change strategies are identified and cited from expert/practitioner wisdom or literature review.   |     |            |                    |
| 7.                       | The connection among known influential factors and broad change strategies has been identified.  |     |            |                    |
| 8.                       | The assumptions held for how and why identified change strategies should work in the community are clear.  |     |            |                    |
| 9.                       | There is consensus among stakeholders that the model accurately describes the proposed program and its intended results.                           |     |            |                    |

## **Logic Model Development Evaluation Planning Template – Exercise 4**

| Evaluation<br>Focus Area | Audience | Question | Use |
|--------------------------|----------|----------|-----|
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |
|                          |          |          |     |

## **Exercise 4 Checklist**

|    | Posing Questions Quality Criteria  | Yes | Not<br>Yet | Comments<br>Revisions |
|----|--|-----|------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | A variety of audiences are taken into consideration when specifying questions.         |     |            |                       |
| 2. | Questions selected are those with the highest priority.                                |     |            |                       |
| 3. | Each question chosen gathers useful information.                                       |     |            |                       |
| 4. | Each question asks only one question (i.e. "extent of X, Y, and Z is not appropriate). |     |            |                       |
| 5. | It is clear how the question relates to the program's logic model.                     |     |            |                       |
| 6. | The questions are specific about what information is needed.                           |     |            |                       |
| 7. | Questions capture "lessons learned" about your work along the way.                     |     |            |                       |
| 8. | Questions capture "lessons learned" about your program theory along the way.           |     |            |                       |

## **Logic Model Development. Indicators Development Template – Exercise 5**

| Focus<br>Area | Question | Indicators | Technical<br>Assistance Needed |
|---------------|----------|------------|--------------------------------|
|               |          |            |                                |
|               |          |            |                                |
|               |          |            |                                |
|               |          |            |                                |
|               |          |            |                                |
|               |          |            |                                |

## **Exercise 5 Checklist**

|    | Establishing Indicators Quality Criteria   | Yes | Not<br>Yet | Comments<br>Revisions |
|----|--|-----|------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | The focus areas reflect the questions asked by a variety of audiences. Indicators respond to the identified focus areas and questions. |     |            |                       |
| 2. | Indicators are SMARTSpecific,<br>Measurable, Action-oriented, Realistic, and<br>Timed.   |     |            |                       |
| 3. | The cost of collecting data on the indicators is within the evaluation budget.   |     |            |                       |
| 4. | Source of data is known.   |     |            |                       |
| 5. | It is clear what data collection,<br>management, and analysis strategies will<br>be most appropriate for each indicator.               |     |            |                       |
| 6. | Strategies and required technical assistance have been identified and are within the evaluation budget for the program.                |     |            |                       |
| 7. | The technical assistance needed is available.  |     |            |                       |