Qualitative Methods in Evaluation of Public Health Programs

A Curriculum on Intermediate Concepts and Practices: Facilitators' Guide

December 2018

USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE
GEMNet Health
Global Evaluation & Monitor
NetworkforHeal
MEASURE Evaluation

Qualitative Methods in Evaluation of Public Health Programs

A Curriculum on Intermediate Concepts and Practices: Facilitators' Guide

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

December 2018

MEASURE Evaluation
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
123 West Franklin Street Building C, Suite 330
Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA 27516
Phone: +1 919-445-9350
measure@unc.edu
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-17-121B
ISBN: 978-1-64232-073-2 |

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The draft 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; and 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

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 course is meant to assist health professionals in using qualitative evaluation skills in sound and rigorous evaluation of their programs. 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.

Purpose, Audience, and Content of This Course

To improve the quality of qualitative methods in evaluation of public health programs, a global group of experts developed this intermediate course on "Qualitative Methods in Evaluation of Public Health Programs" in 2015–2017 pilot-tested it in Mexico and Ghana in 2017, and then revised it based on feedback in 2018. The course responds to an important need to build the qualitative methods capacity of health professionals involved in implementing and/or managing evaluations of public health programs in lower- and middle-income countries. Despite widespread interest in the effectiveness of health programs and common use of qualitative data in program evaluation, the quality of qualitative evaluation methods is often overlooked in practice and in existing qualitative methods short courses. Are qualitative methods really appropriate to answer the evaluation question? How do we analyze our data beyond basic summarization? How do we ensure our results are trustworthy—credible, transferable, dependable, and confirmable? And how do we communicate this trustworthiness to others who are unfamiliar with qualitative methods? Are we appropriately addressing the unique ethical concerns raised in evaluations using qualitative methods? This intermediate level workshop is meant to address these questions and to assist health professionals in using qualitative skills in sound and rigorous evaluation of their program. Through session content and participatory exercises, the course will build participants' knowledge around qualitative evaluation core competencies 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.

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 and health and development fields.

This facilitators' guide is part of a package of training materials for the qualitative evaluation course. It explains how to present the sessions outlined in the syllabus: a separate, shorter document that provides an overview of the course. It is accompanied by a participants' guide as well, that has handouts and information the participants will need throughout the course. The course consists of 12 sessions covering intermediate level skills and knowledge in qualitative evaluation (see session list on the next page). The total duration of the course is 8.5 working days (the sample agenda spreads this over 10 days total). Sessions range in length, but typically take about three hours to complete. (For each three hours of class time, a 15-minute break should be scheduled.) At the start of each module, the facilitator will present that session's learning objectives. Students should read as many of the reference documents listed on the syllabus as possible before they attend a given session.

This course includes a practical component. Participants are asked to contribute a specific program evaluation need that they are aware of before the course. Course organizers choose five program evaluation concepts that are best suited to the course and send them to participants before the course begins. Participants give their top three program choices and facilitators assign participants to small groups based on these rankings, along with participant level of expertise (a mix of levels within a group is desired). Each group will develop a protocol for an evaluation of their assigned program. 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.

Course Overview

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. The course is designed for in-person delivery and is not intended to be a self-guided course. It requires facilitators who are skilled in qualitative methods in evaluation.

Course Materials

The course materials include digital copies of the following:

- Course syllabus
- Facilitators' guide
- Participants' guide
- PowerPoint presentations

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION PROPOSAL GROUP WORK AND PRESENTATIONS

The evaluation proposal groupwork is an important hands-on component of the curriculum. The objective is to prepare an evaluation proposal using the concepts and methods learned at the workshop. The steps for the group work are as follows:

1. The work will be performed in groups of 4–6 persons.
2. Ideally, groups should be defined before the first day of the course. It is recommended that groups are formed according to shared themes, interests, and mixed thematic and research experience. Each group will work on a specific program.
3. Prior to the course, participants should submit actual programs which will be presented as candidates for the group work. Course facilitators will discuss the evaluability of the proposed programs and select 5–6 programs for this task. The selected programs will be shared with participants, again before the course starts. Participants will indicate their preferences for the program they would like to work on. Instructors will make the final determination on the conformation of groups based on preferences as well as skill levels of participants. Skill levels can be determined from applications or based on other participant survey methods.
4. Groups will work on developing a proposal for evaluating the program. The group should convincingly justify the proposed evaluation design in terms of methodological rigor and practical feasibility.
5. Groups will work during the last sessions in the afternoons and will receive advice from instructors. One way to organize the work is for participants to work on the parts of the proposal that relate to the topics covered that day in class.

Presentation:

Groups will present the results of their work on the last day of the workshop. Each group will have a maximum of 20 minutes for the presentation followed by a maximum of 10 minutes for questions and discussion. **All members of the group must present**. Groups will prepare their presentations using PowerPoint.

The presentation should include the following elements of an evaluation proposal:

1. Title
2. Brief general background: about the country and the main health problem(s) that the program will address
3. Description of the program: name, key objectives, components and interventions, target areas and target groups, key outcomes and target, placement, targeting rules or participant selection criteria, start date, duration, implementing plan/timeline, implementing agency, funding
4. Conceptual framework or program theory (the groups will not be developing this—it should be taken from the actual program)
5. Main evaluation questions and subquestions, and why those questions are important for the program or policymakers
6. Evaluation design
    a. Evaluation concepts: Describe the main concepts that lead the evaluation and how these will be operationalized in the evaluation (example: "the program seeks to improve the quality of life of beneficiaries," but what does it mean? Then, "quality of life" is a concept that must be operationalized).

b. Methods: Describe the methods; for example, participant observation, focus group discussions, photovoice, etc., and timeline for implementation (baseline, midterm, ongoing, endline, etc.). Include quantitative methods as well if mixed methods design.
c. Sampling design: How will participants be selected, which kind of sampling they will use, how many times and with whom the instruments will applied? Also, include methodological logic for deciding when to stop collecting more data.
d. Data collection: Describe how you will capture the data and how often you will reflect on it. For example, you may capture data through: audio or videotaping, writing field notes, memo writing, asking respondents to draw diagrams and/or pictures for you, questionnaires, or in other ways.
e. Analysis plan: The team must explain which kind of analysis they will carry out and why.
f. Plan for establishing trustworthiness and triangulation.
g. Ethical considerations and how these will be addressed—including special protections for vulnerable groups.
h. Strengths and limitations of the design; also, challenges previewed for fieldwork of the evaluation design and plan "B" in case challenges in the field become true.

7. Deliverables (reports or other kinds of dissemination to be prepared)
8. Fieldwork plan: Include estimated timeline, as well as notes of any special fieldwork considerations required, such as steps to gaining community entry, staff training, fieldwork quality checking plans, staff and respondent security, etc
9. Dissemination and communication plan
10. Gender integration: How your research will address any relevant gender issues in data collection, ethics, analysis, and dissemination

Evaluation proposals typically also include the following sections:

- Organization
- Budget

A group may consider including brief and general information on these aspects, but they are optional for this presentation.

THE CASE STUDY: THE COMMUNITIES UNITED AGAINST GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE IN TANZANIA[1]

Background for Facilitators

Participants will use this case study throughout the activities in the sessions. It is based on real programs but has been fictionalized. Most of the group activities within sessions specifically reference parts of this case study and the sample transcripts and codebook, etc., are also based on this. If you host a workshop outside of sub-Saharan Africa, you should adapt this case study to make it applicable to your region or select another case study of a program from your region that can be evaluated with qualitative methods. If you choose to adapt or change the case study, you will need to adapt the session activities and the related materials (codebook, transcript, etc.) accordingly.

Case Study Program Context

Violence Against Women (VAW) is a major public health problem and violation of women's human rights. VAW is defined as any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual, psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life.[2] According to the World Health Organization, almost one-third (30%) of all women have experienced physical and/or sexual violence by an intimate partner, although this varies widely by county.[3] Such violence can have fatal outcomes like homicide or suicide, and can lead to injuries, unintended pregnancies and abortions, and sexually transmitted infections, including HIV.

According to Tanzania's 2015-2016 DHS Survey, 39.5% of all women aged 15-49 have experienced violence after the age of 15, while 41.7% of ever-married women had experienced violence committed by a husband or partner. Violence against married women is legally prohibited in Tanzania by the Law of Marriage Act. The Sexual Offenses Special Provision Act criminalizes various forms of VAW, including rape, sexual assault, and harassment. Tanzania police offices operate gender and children's desks, where women can report acts of violence. These desks are meant to be staffed by specially trained officers and feature a private space for reporting. Despite these resources, very few women ever report violence perpetrated against them.[4] This is both due to fear of more violence and/or social stigma, as well as lack of knowledge about available resources for victims of VAW.[5] In addition, such violence, especially within a marriage, is commonly accepted at a cultural level and many Tanzanians hold the belief that violence against women is an acceptable practice.[6]

The Program

Communities United (CU) is a community mobilization intervention created by a non-governmental organization (NGO) based in Tanzania. CU has been designed to prevent violence by addressing the risk factors associated with violence in relationships and communities in the Sengerema district in the Mwanza region. Formative research for CU identified that knowledge of laws related to VAW and knowledge of available resources for victims is low, community members commonly see VAW as acceptable, and there are many myths regarding the causes of VAW. The CU program acknowledges that VAW is complex in nature, and thus has designed a community-based intervention to target knowledge, attitudes, and skills related to VAW.

---

[1] The information in this case study, while based in part on existing intervention programs, is fictional and not based on an actual program.

[2] Source: United Nations.

[3] http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs239/en/

[4] Legal and Human Rights Centre (LHRC) and Zanzibar Legal Services Centre (ZLSC). March 2014. Tanzania Human Rights Report 2013.

[5] Source: WHO multi-country report.

[6] McCleary-Sills, et al., Mar. 2013.

The CU program has three primary objectives for three-year life of the program:

- To increase knowledge of community members on the existence of both VAW and the imbalance of power between women and men;
- To increase awareness among community members (both men and women) of laws and local legal resources related to VAW
- To decrease acceptability of VAW among community members
- To increase community support for VAW survivors

Program Implementation Process

The program uses a combination of three strategies. The first is local activism, through which CU staff recruit and support male and female community leaders, called community activists, to mobilize and engage with their fellow community members around issues of power and violence.

The second strategy is the use of communication materials, which are designed to be locally and contextually relevant and provide activists with a tool for guiding discussions around various themes and topics related to VAW, local laws, and resources. To support this strategy, CU staff were present in the communities on a regular basis to assist in the implementation of these tools.

The third strategy is training, by which both CU staff and community leaders are supported to strengthen their knowledge and skills continually, which in turn supports community members in the prevention and response to VAW. Over the duration of the three-year implementation, CU staff supported over 150 community activists to implement CU in their communities. These included women and men who were involved in men's, women's, and youth groups. Each community activist committed to conducting four activities a month, which they documented during their monthly meetings with CU program staff. Over the intervention period, community leaders led more than an estimated 5,000 activities, which included community conversations, door-to-door discussions, quick chats, trainings, public events, poster discussions, community meetings and prayer group meetings, and engaged a variety of community members through different channels.

Participant Demographics

The population of the study communities were relatively young (42% were 25 years of age or younger) and dominated by one tribal ethnic group. The community was culturally diverse, representing four different tribal groups and at least as many languages. Approximately 30% of the men and almost 60% of the women had not completed schooling beyond primary education. The median income was low; and many residents were self-employed. Almost two-thirds of the community members identified as Christian while about 25% considered themselves Muslim. Patriarchy—the concentration of both individual and institutional power in the hands of men—was a dominant aspect of the social-cultural context. Men were widely considered to be the head of the household and women were usually expected to be subservient.

Program Theory of Change

Problem

Gender-based violence against women (VAW) and the threat of such violence violates women's human rights, constrains their choices and negatively impacts their health and well-being as well as ability to contribute to the community

Barriers

- Dominant social norms, values, beliefs, attitudes, behaviors, and practices condone VAW and support impunity
- Lack of social support for victims
- Lack of knowledge about VAW and related existing laws and local resources

Interventions

- Communication material dissemination
- Local activist recruitment and support
- Community activist trainings

Outputs

- Social groups and structures have the capacity to organize collectively and facilitate social change
- Community-level prevention and response mechanisms are active and effective

Outcomes

- Increased support by community members for survivors
- Women survivors safely use appropriate resources and services
- Improved knowledge of existing laws and resources addressing VAW

Impacts

Women are free from all forms of gender-based violence and the threats of such violence

SESSION 1. INTRODUCTION TO PARADIGMS AND QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

Session Duration

4 hrs., 30 mins.

Session Learning Objectives

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

- Understand and compare the four major paradigms of evaluation
- Compare and contrast the use of qualitative methods for evaluation as opposed to 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

Teaching Methods

- Facilitator presentation
- Small group activity
- Large group debate
- Plenary discussion

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

Materials Needed

- PowerPoint presentation: Session 1: Introduction to Paradigms and Qualitative Evaluation
- Flipchart paper and markers (enough for four groups)
- For instructor: Paradigm debate sample answers in Appendix A
- Group activity handout in the participants' guide under Session 1

Session Plan

Time	Title and description	Methods/activities
1 hr.	**What's the point?** • Group discussion of the purpose of evaluation **Breaking the code** • Presenter introduces the concept of paradigms and how they lay the foundation to all evaluation	Facilitator presentation, storytelling, and discussion
1 hr., 30 mins.	**Paradigm war games** • Participants break into groups to present the first three foundation paradigms and enact a debate	Small group work and debate
1 hr., 30 mins.	**The third wave** • Participants are split into groups with the same Tanzanian evaluation project and asked to present their various approaches to the evaluation employing each of the four paradigms • Presenter presents various approaches to evaluation	Small group work and plenary discussion
30 mins.	**Pragmatic Approach** • Summarize the benefits of pragmatic approach	Facilitator presentation

Session Activities

Part 1. What's the Point?/Breaking the Code (1 hour)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 1: Introduction to Paradigms and Qualitative Evaluation

Instructions:

1. Facilitator introduces the topic using the slides
2. Pose these questions (on the "What's the Point" slides):
    a. Why do we conduct research, monitoring, and evaluation?
    b. What's the point of these activities?
    c. What makes these activities worthwhile?
3. Allow 5–10 minutes for plenary discussion
4. Continue with the "Breaking the Code" presentation. There are prompts throughout the slides in the notes to engage participants with various questions. (45 mins.)

Part 2. Paradigm War Games Activity (90 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 1: Introduction to Research Paradigms and Qualitative Evaluation; paradigm debate sample answers in Appendix A; participants handout in their guides under Session 1.

Instructions:

1. Divide participants into three groups
2. Have groups plan a defensive stance for their policy and attack plan relating to the other two paradigms (30 mins.)
3. Class debate (Combined 50 mins. [10 mins. per group presentation; 20 mins. debate])
4. Facilitator roundup (10 mins.)

Part 3. The Third Wave Activity (90 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 1: Introduction to Paradigms and Qualitative Evaluation; third wave sample answers in Appendix A; participants handout in their guides under Session 1.

Instructions:

1. Presenter defines pragmatism and discusses the use of mixed-methods using the slides (5 mins.)
2. Participants divide into four groups representing each of the major paradigms
3. Groups design an evaluation around the Tanzanian case; they fill out the information on their handouts from their guides (30 mins.)
    a. Develop a particular evaluation question and expand on the research context
    b. Develop research design employing each paradigm (slide 22)
4. Each group presents their plan to the class (10 mins. each)
5. Class discussion on different designs and ways qualitative and quantitative methods complement one another; use the third wave activity sample answers from Appendix A to help you to give feedback to the groups (15 mins.)

Part 4. Summary of the Pragmatic Approach (30 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 1: Introduction to Paradigms and Qualitative Evaluation

Instructions:

1. The presenter should summarize pragmatism and discuss the use of mixed-methods using the slides.

SESSION 2. CREATING AND CONCEPTUALIZING QUALITATIVE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Session Duration

3 hours

Session Learning Objectives

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

- 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 the program's theory of change
- Conceptualizing evaluation questions

Teaching Methods

- Facilitator presentation
- Small group activity
- Plenary discussion

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

Materials Needed

- PowerPoint presentation: Session 2: Creating and Conceptualizing Qualitative Evaluation Questions
- Group work handout in participants' guide

Session Plan

Time	Title and description	Methods/activities
1 hr.	**Conceptualizing the question** • Group discussion on the purpose and use of qualitative evaluation questions • Facilitator presentation on how to formulate questions for specific types of evaluations	Facilitator presentation and plenary discussion
30 mins.	**Practice** • Presenter gives sample evaluation questions and asks for participant feedback on the appropriateness of each evaluation question	Facilitator presentation and plenary discussion
1 hr., 15 mins.	**Group work** • Evaluation question writing • Discussion in plenary and presenter feedback	Group work and plenary discussion
15 mins.	**Summarizing** • Plenary discussion to summarize key points and wrap-up session	Plenary discussion

Session Activities

Part 1. Conceptualizing the Question (1 hour)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 2: Creating and Conceptualizing Qualitative Evaluation Questions

Instructions:

1. Facilitator uses the slides to guide a discussion on the purpose of evaluation questions and how types of evaluation inform the question. Allow time for discussion and questions.

Part 2. Practice (30 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 2: Creating and Conceptualizing Qualitative Evaluation Questions

Instructions:

1. The facilitator uses slides 23–26 to guide a discussion of working through the example evaluation questions

Part 3. Group Work (1 hour, 15 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 2: Creating and Conceptualizing Qualitative Evaluation Questions; sample answers in Appendix B; participant handout in Session 2 of their guides

Instructions:

1. Divide participants into four groups and assign each group a type of evaluation
2. Groups work to design 2–3 evaluation questions related to the case study that fit their assigned type of evaluation. Groups then identify and describe key concepts (45 mins.)

3. Groups present in plenary; feedback is provided; use the examples in Appendix B as needed to give feedback and/or other examples (30 mins.)
4. Facilitator roundup (5 mins.)

Part 4. Summarizing (15 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 2: Creating and Conceptualizing Qualitative Evaluation Questions

Instructions:

1. Presenter asks participants to summarize the following (8 mins.):
    a. Purpose of evaluation questions
    b. Four main types of evaluation discussed and how they differ
    c. Purpose of conceptualizing key terms
2. Give time for participant questions (7 mins.)

SESSION 3. TROUBLESHOOTING IN SELECTED QUALITATIVE METHODS FOR EVALUATION

Session Duration

3 hrs., 15 mins.

Session Learning Objectives

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

- Explain the pros and cons of 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

Teaching Methods

- Facilitator presentation
- Paired activity
- Small group activity
- Large group activity
- Plenary discussion

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

Materials Needed

- PowerPoint presentation: Session 3: Troubleshooting in Selected Qualitative Methods for Evaluation
- Group activity handout: Focus group discussion (in participants' guide)
- Five envelopes with cut-out strips of paper with "roles" for focus group discussion practice; roles at end of activity—see list of roles at end of this session guide to print and cut out
- Participants' guide, Appendix D: Examples of Effective Probes

Session Plan

Time	Title and description	Methods/activities
30 mins.	**Introduction to qualitative data collection methods** • Group discussion on common methods used to collect data for qualitative evaluation • Focus discussion to highlight selected methods: observation, in-depth interviews, focus group discussions	Facilitator presentation and plenary discussion
45 mins.	**Observations** • Group discussion on purpose, strengths, and challenges in conducting observations • Role play scenario: participants observe a scenario and take observation notes • Plenary discussion on what was observed	Facilitator presentation, large group activity, plenary discussion
45 mins.	**Interviews** • Group discussion on purpose, strengths, and challenges in conducting interviews • Facilitator offers tips and techniques for successful interviewing • Partner practice: in pairs, practice interview techniques, particularly probing • Plenary discussion on challenges and experiences conducting interviews	Facilitator presentation, paired activity, plenary discussion
45 mins.	**Focus group discussions** • Group discussion on purpose, strengths, and challenges in conducting focus group discussions • Facilitator offers tips and techniques for successful interviewing • Group practice: In small groups, practice focus group discussions • Plenary discussion on the challenges and experiences conducting focus group discussions	Facilitator presentation, small group activity, plenary discussion
30 mins.	**Summarizing** • Group discussion to summarize key points and wrap-up session **Summary Slide and Questions**	Plenary discussion

Session Activities

Part 1. Introduction to Qualitative Data Collection Methods (30 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 3: Troubleshooting in Selected Qualitative Methods for Evaluation

Instructions:

1. Facilitator should lead discussion on the most common data collection techniques: Observations, interviews, and focus group discussions. Ask for participants to describe each.

Part 2. Observations (45 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 3: Troubleshooting in Selected Qualitative Methods for Evaluation

Instructions:

1. Practice observing during a role play scenario: Facilitator will ask three participant volunteers to act out the scenario in the PowerPoint slides (Slide 10).
2. Participants will practice taking observation notes during the acting.
3. Discuss in plenary what notes they made. Compare and contrast who captured which details. (15 mins.)

Part 3. Interviewing Activity (45 minutes)

Instructions:

1. In groups of two, they will practice probing when interviewing. One partner is the interviewer and one is the interviewee.
2. The interviewer should start an interview with a question on something personal, so that the interviewees can see what it feels like to answer questions themselves about personal topics. Questions could include:
    a. "What influenced your decision to come to this training?"
    b. "What led you to working in public health?"
    c. "How did you decide what clothing to wear today?"
3. Tell the interviewers that their job is to find out the actual, underlying reason(s) without letting the informant know what he/she thinks of the interviewee's answers or suggesting any reasons for the behavior/choice. Probing is very important in this. Explain that probing is like peeling away the layers of an onion, with the objective of getting to the center of the onion rather than staying at the surface. Interviewers should use as many different techniques as possible and take notes on the answers. They can reference Appendix D in their handbook for some examples of good probes.
4. Ask interviewees to respond truthfully. They should also look for signs of what the interviewer wants them to say, or what the interviewer thinks about interviewee responses.
5. Interviewing should take five minutes.
6. Then, they should reverse the roles so that everyone gets a chance to be interviewer and interviewee. (5 mins.)
7. Now ask the groups (you can select a particular group or ask the whole group):
    a. How did the results of probing compare with the initial answer to the question?
    b. How did it feel as a respondent to be probed?
        - Did you fell that probes helped you to give better information or not?
    c. Did interviewees sense how the interviewer felt about the answers? Or whether they could tell what the interviewer was looking for with certain questions?

Adapted from:

The CORE Group Social and Behavior Change (SBC) Working Group. (Date unknown). Training in qualitative research methods: Building the capacity of PVO, NGO, and MOH Partners. Washington, DC. Retrieved from https://www.mchip.net/sites/default/files/qrm_complete.pdf

Part 4. Focus Group Discussions Activity (45 minutes)

Materials needed: Participants have the group activity handout in their guides under Session 3; you also need to hand out the envelopes with slips of paper that have the roles on them

Instructions:

1. Divide participants into groups of 5–7. Explain that they will conduct a mock focus group with the materials provided (envelope with slips of paper denoting roles; topic guide handout). Each person is assigned a "role" (see below) to act out during the focus group discussions (FGD). (30 mins.)
2. At the end of the 30 minutes, bring the group back together for discussion. Ask what they thought worked well, what the challenges were, how challenges can be mitigated, and other related questions. (15 mins.)

Roles to print on slips of paper and have one person in each group randomly choose one from an envelope (print 5 sets of these and have five envelopes with one set in each):

The Dominator—tries to assert authority or superiority in manipulating the group or certain members of the group (e.g., interrupting the contributions of others, etc.).

The Opinion-Giver—states her/his belief pertinent to a suggestion made. The emphasis is on what she/he believes should be the group's view of pertinent values.

The Aggressor—may deflate the status of others, expresses disapproval of the values, acts, or feelings of others.

The Blocker—tends to be negativistic and stubbornly resists, disagreeing and opposing without or beyond "reason."

The Distractor—changes direction of the conversation.

Shy Sal (or Shy Sally)—does not say much, looks very shy, does not keep eye contact, speaks in a low voice.

The Self-Confessor—uses the audience opportunity which the group setting provides to express personal, non-group oriented "feeling," "insight," "ideology," etc.

SESSION 4. DEVELOPING DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

Session Duration

2 hrs., 30 mins.

Session Learning Objectives

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

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

Topics Covered

- Types of data collection tools for qualitative evaluation
- Structure of qualitative evaluation data collection tools
- Techniques for achieving flexibility (content mining, content mapping, enabling techniques)
- Stages of the topic guide

Teaching Methods

- Facilitator presentation
- Paired activity
- Plenary discussion

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

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

Materials Needed

- PowerPoint presentation: Session 4: Developing Data Collection Tools
- Flip charts and markers
- Case study in participants' guide
- Appendix A in participants' guide

Session Plan

Time	Title and description	Methods/activities
45 mins.	**Structure of qualitative research data collection tools** Facilitator presents material and leads discussion	Facilitator presentation and plenary discussion
45 mins.	**Practical session on asking questions for qualitative evaluation** Engage participants using the case study to identify relevant questions for: • Content mapping • Content mining	Small group activity
20 mins.	**Enabling and projective techniques** Facilitator leads discussion on enabling and projective techniques to aid in data collection	Facilitator presentation and plenary discussion
40 mins.	**Stages in the topic guide** Discuss stages in the topic guide: • Using the funnel approach • Introduction stage • Core interview or discussion stage • Winding down stage	Facilitator presentation

Session Activities

Part 1. Structure of Qualitative Research Data Collection Tools (45 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 4: Developing Data Collection Tools

Instructions:

1. Present the slide material and engage class in discussion throughout.
2. Be sure to allow opportunities for participants to give examples of types of questions.

Part 2. Asking Questions for Qualitative Evaluation (45 minutes)

Instructions:

1. Divide participants/students into pairs. Let class review details of the case study including the sample evaluation questions from Session 2.
2. Pairs will then write out two interview questions and two probes for each question from the case study. Each group should select one of the evaluation questions and one key objective already developed from the case study and formulate specific questions for it. Pairs should also consider who the participant will be (community member, man, woman, local leader, program officer, etc.)
3. **Groups A:** Write two **content mapping** questions along with two probes each that can be used to identify dimensions related to the selected evaluation questions/objective.
4. **Groups B**: Write two **content mining** questions along with two probes each that can be used to identify dimensions related to the selected evaluation questions/objective.

5. Groups will have 20 minutes to develop specific questions and then the whole group spends 20 minutes to discuss in a plenary and provide feedback.
6. Facilitator should take 5–10 minutes to summarize and address any misunderstandings.

Part 3. Enabling and Projective Techniques (20 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 4: Developing Data Collection Tools

Instructions:

1. Present the slide material.
2. Ask participants to briefly discuss the merits of using a vignette as well as the potential negatives (i.e., influencing the interview by providing a specific example) when you arrive at that slide.

Part 4. Stages in the Topic Guide (40 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 4: Developing Data Collection Tools

Instructions:

1. Present the slide content.
2. Take participants through the two "tips…" slides to rewrite the poor examples of questions. Ask the participants for examples of better questions. You can use the rewritten examples in the slide notes if needed.

SESSION 5. SAMPLING STRATEGIES AND SATURATION

Session Duration

2 hrs., 30 mins.

Session Learning Objectives

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

- Identify types of sampling strategies employed in qualitative evaluation research
- Explain the concept of data saturation and how to identify this during fieldwork
- Recognize considerations that have an impact on the sampling strategy(ies)
- Discuss strategies to reduce bias in sampling

Topics Covered

- Types of qualitative sampling approaches
- The concept of data saturation
- How and when to determine data saturation
- Factors that influence sampling
- Reducing biases in sampling

Teaching Methods

- Facilitator presentation
- Individual activity
- Paired activity
- Plenary discussion

Required Reading

Patton, M.Q. (1990). Purposeful Sampling. In *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (pp. 169–185). SAGE Publications, Inc. Retrieved from http://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.

Materials needed

- PowerPoint presentation: Session 5: Sampling Strategies and Saturation
- Flip charts and markers
- Sampling activity handout in participants' guide under Session 5
- Answer guide for facilitators in Appendix D

Session Plan

Time	Title and description	Methods/activities
45 mins.	**Types of qualitative sampling strategies** Present and discuss sampling strategies	Facilitator slide presentation, plenary discussion, individual and paired activity
45 mins.	**Concept of data saturation** Present and discuss data saturation	Facilitator slide presentation and plenary discussion
45 mins.	**Factors influencing sampling** Engage participants to discuss: • Budget/time and other fieldwork considerations • Variation in participants	Individual activity, paired activity, plenary discussion
15 mins.	**Strategies for reducing bias in sampling** Present material on maintaining a reflexive diary and discuss in plenary	Facilitator presentation and plenary discussion

Session Activities

Part 1. Types of Qualitative Sampling Strategies (45 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 5: Sampling Strategies and Saturation, sampling activity handout in participants' guide under Session 5; and answer guide for facilitator in Appendix D of facilitators' guide

Instructions:

1. Present the slide material and engage class in discussion throughout.
2. Be sure to allow opportunities for participants to give examples of how they have approached sampling in their work.
3. Carry out the "Think, Pair and Share" activity (20 mins.)
   a. Ask participants to turn to the sampling activity in their handbooks. They are to read and provide answers by selecting the most appropriate sampling strategy for each scenario. (5 mins.)
   b. After individual work, participants are to pair-up with the person sitting next to them and share their answers with each other. (5 mins.)
   c. After sharing with partners, each pair presents their answers to the class for plenary discussions. (5–10 mins.)

Part 2. Concept of Data Saturation (45 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 5: Sampling Strategies and Saturation

Instructions:

1. Present the slide material and engage class in discussion throughout.

Part 3. Factors Influencing Sampling (45 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 5: Sampling Strategies and Saturation

Instructions:

1. Present the slide on factors influencing sampling and ask participants for ideas on how each one could influence sample size and/or approach. (10 mins.)
2. Divide participants into three groups and assign each one a group to focus on: international NGO, government, or local organization.
3. Each group will focus on one type of funding agency and discuss how that type of organization as a funder and/or audience can influence the determination of sample size in your study. So, depending on who your funder and/or audience is, your study sampling will be affected. (25 mins.)
4. Have each group share their key points in plenary and discuss. (15 mins.)

Part 4. Strategies for Reducing Bias (15 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 5: Sampling Strategies and Saturation

Instructions:

1. Ask participants what they think bias in sampling is and then use slide notes to describe.
2. Ask participants what ideas they have for how to potentially reduce bias in sampling and then move to next slide and present/discuss the approaches listed there.
3. End with the slide of presenting the tips for questions to ask when evaluating a sampling approach.

SESSION 6. QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES FOR DRAWING THEMES

Session Duration

3 hours

Session Learning Objectives

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

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

Topics Covered

- Overview of qualitative evaluation analysis
- Analysis techniques
- Stages of analysis/thematic analysis
- Code identification using the hybrid approach
- Developing a codebook
- Identifying and reviewing themes

Teaching Methods

- Facilitator presentation
- Paired or small group activity
- Plenary discussion

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

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

Materials Needed

- PowerPoint presentation: Session 6: Qualitative Data Analysis Techniques for Drawing Themes
- Flip charts and markers
- Five or more copies of coded transcripts cut into pieces (see Appendix E)
- Envelopes

Session Plan

Time	Title and description	Methods/activities
45 mins.	**Overview of qualitative analysis**: • What is qualitative analysis? • Different approaches and methods in qualitative analysis	Facilitator presentation
45 mins.	**Stages of analysis/data coding** • Introduction to coding • Inductive and deductive approaches • Developing a codebook	Facilitator presentation and plenary discussion
45 mins.	**Identifying and reviewing themes** Explain and discuss the processes for identifying themes: • What is a theme • Systematic theme search • Connecting codes to identify themes	Facilitator presentation and plenary discussion
45 mins.	**Practice with coding** • Reviewing themes • Corroborating with team members • Facilitator summarizes important steps in the process of coding and corroborating results	Facilitator presentation and small group or pair activity and plenary discussion

Session Activities

Part 1. Overview of Qualitative Analysis (45 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 6: Qualitative Data Analysis Techniques for Drawing Themes

Instructions:

1. Present the slide material.
2. Be sure to follow the prompts in the presentation notes to engage participants in discussions on slides four and six.

Part 2. Stages of Analysis/Data Coding (45 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 6: Qualitative Data Analysis Techniques for Drawing Themes

Instructions:

1. Present the slide material.
2. Be sure to follow the prompts in the presentation notes to engage participants in discussions on the slide, "Developing a codebook," and on the slide "Codebook: Example of a codebook entry."

Part 3. Identifying and Reviewing Themes (45 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 6: Qualitative Data Analysis Techniques for Drawing Themes; codebook in participants' guide under Session 6; transcript in participants' guide under Session 6

Instructions:

1. Present the slide material.
2. Be sure to follow the prompts on the first slide to ask about themes.
3. For the individual exercise, "testing the codebook:"
    a. Participants should use the sample codebook for the case study and the transcript in their guides under Session 6. They should practice applying codes A.04, A.05, and/or A.06 to the transcript. (10 mins.)
    b. Then as a group, discuss (10 mins.):
        i. Which codes are relevant?
        ii. Which areas had no codes?

Part 4. Practice with Coding (45 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 6: Qualitative Data Analysis Techniques for Drawing Themes; five or more copies of coded transcripts cut into pieces (see Appendix 6); envelopes

Instructions:

1. Participants are to be divided into smaller groups of 3–4 people or paired up.
2. Give each pair/group an envelope containing several coded transcripts that have been cut into pieces. These should have come from copies of the codes and code names that are in the appendix for Session 6 in this facilitators' guide.
3. Ask participants to work in pairs or groups to create code piles using the various coded transcripts in the envelop. Coded transcripts that are used to create a pile should be related or may have some overlaps. After piles are created, a theme, which may be a name or phrase, should be given to each pile. They have 20 minutes.
4. Participants are then to discuss their themes in plenary for 20 minutes. Each group will present their theme(s), give an explanation for that theme, and also a rationale for selecting that theme.
5. Finishing remaining slides in the presentation.

SESSION 7. QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS: HANDS-ON

Session Duration

3 hrs., 45 mins.

Session Objectives

By the end of this session, students will be able to:

- 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 and/or graphics

Teaching Methods

- Facilitator presentation
- Practical session with qualitative software
    - **Please note: This session requires a facilitator with experience in Atlas.ti, NVivo, Dedoose, or other qualitative software
- Individual activity
- Paired activity
- Plenary discussion

Required Reading

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi, 3rd Edition. Pp. 440–447;462–481. 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

Further Reading

Kozinets, R.V. (2015). *Netnography*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

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

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

Materials needed

- PowerPoint presentation for Session 7: Qualitative Data Analysis: Hands-On
- Analysis chart design example in participants' guide under Session 7
- Handout 2: Oportunidades example sample in participants' guide under Session 7
- Handout 2a: Oportunidades example additional charts in participants' guide under Session 7
- Session 6 case study sample codebook (in participants' guide) (same codebook as Session 6)
- Session 6 case study sample transcript (**Please note: Facilitator may wish to code in their software in advance in order to use precoded transcripts as keys during presentation and activities) (transcript in participants' guide) (same transcript as Session 6)
- Software (facilitator's choice) for practical session
- Participants' guide, Appendix F: Choosing Qualitative Data Analysis Software (QDAS)

Session Plan

Time	Title and description	Methods/activities
30 mins.	**Review of analysis: main analytical techniques, main processes and activities for analysis** • Questions and clarifications from previous day • Being prepared for "hands-on" work for analysis	Plenary discussion
1 hr., 30 mins.	**Designing steps for analysis using selected analytical technique**	Facilitator presentation
1 hr.	**Coding exercise** • Participants practice coding using the handout and then compare their coding results in pairs • Facilitator leads a discussion on participant coding choices • Facilitator then demonstrates applying the codes using software	Facilitator presentation (demonstration) and paired activity
45 mins.	**Using software** • Facilitator discusses different software options • Facilitator demonstrates using software for analysis	Facilitator presentation

Session Activities

Part 1. Review of Analysis (30 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation for Session 7: Qualitative Data Analysis: Hands-On

Instructions:

1. Present the first few slides through the objectives.
2. On the "Analysis Process" slide, pose the top two questions and discuss with the group. Then, pose the last two questions and discuss as needed.

Part 2. Designing Steps for Analysis Using Selected Analytical Technique (1 hour, 30 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation for Session 7: Qualitative Data Analysis: Hands-On

Instructions:

1. Present the slide material. Stop and discuss with the participants throughout, as there is a lot of content to get across and you want to keep them engaged.

Part 3. Coding (1 hour)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation for Session 7: Qualitative Data Analysis: Hands-On; transcript excerpt in participants' guide under Session 6

Instructions:

1. The participants will perform an individual and paired coding exercise. The participants will use one real transcript excerpt from the case study with numbered rows.
2. Each participant will work to assign one (or more) codes to each row/paragraph. Once they do it individually, they will compare coding in pairs.
3. After that, the instructor will use the screen to show participants how each code can be applied to different text segments using the software of choice. The instructor should have prepared this ahead of time. The instructor will ask participants:
    a. From which line to which line did you apply (name of one code)?
    b. After that, participants will say from which line to which line they did apply the code.

This process will be repeated two or three times.

1. Then go through the slides presenting on use of social media data to wrap-up this section of the session.

Part 4. Software Demonstration (45 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation for Session 7: Qualitative Data Analysis: Hands-On; transcript from the previous exercise; analysis software

Instructions:

1. Go through the slides beginning with the "Step 3. Analysis Tools" slide.
2. When you get to "Step 4," you will teach the participants some of the basic functions of the program.
3. Taking the codebook that was used in the previous exercise; the instructor demonstrates the following actions after the demonstration slide:
    a. Create a project.
    b. Add two interviews from the VAW program.
    c. Add at least three codes from the Chips codebook.
    d. Create document and codebook (sometimes referred to as code families or trees, depending upon software).
    e. Code at least three segments, asking the group how to apply at least one or two codes, using experience from the previous activity.
    f. Create at least one memo. The instructor will generate some memos to demonstrate the process and purpose of memo creation in analysis.
    g. Generate one output from the coded sections in the exercise.

Once the last four steps are done, the facilitator will open the precoded (key) transcripts. The facilitator will be able to show one example output of a qualitative set of data in the software. If they wish, the facilitator can generate one or two outputs with memos and show the participants. The outputs will allow participants to see the material that an evaluator will analyze during a qualitative evaluation.

SESSION 8. QUALITY RESEARCH STANDARDS FOR QUALITATIVE INQUIRY: TRUSTWORTHINESS

Session Duration

2 hrs., 15 mins.

Session Objectives

By the end of this session, students will be able to:

- Describe the various approaches and principles of establishing quality in qualitative research (will include data and logical triangulation)
- Compare the relative merits of approaches to establishing quality in qualitative research
- Evaluate which approach the funder/client/audience would be most comfortable with
- Justify the choice of approach to qualitative norms to be applied for a particular study
- Develop a plan for establishing trustworthiness in a qualitative component of an evaluation

Topics Covered

- Trustworthiness with respect to evaluation in health systems
- Trustworthiness and the audience
- Trustworthiness and language
- Practical application of trustworthiness

Teaching Methods

- Facilitator presentation
- Small group activity
- Plenary discussion

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

Materials needed

- PowerPoint presentation: Session 8: Quality Research Standards for Qualitative Inquiry: Trustworthiness
- Template for group activity—"Putting Quality First," in participants' guide under Session 8

Session Plan

Time	Title and description	Methods/activities
1hr.	**A productive love affair** Guba & Lincoln and the birth of trustworthiness Trustworthiness in qualitative research	Facilitator presentation
1 hr., 15 mins.	**Putting quality first** Participants break into groups to develop a practical plan for ensuring quality in qualitative research: • Theoretical planning • Operationalization **Summary and questions**	Facilitator presentation, small group activity, plenary discussion

Session Activities

Part 1. A Productive Love Affair (1 hour)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 8: Quality Research Standards for Qualitative Inquiry: Trustworthiness

Instructions:

1. Present the slide content up until the slide on criteria for assessing trustworthiness.
2. On this criteria slide, give participants the chance to answer what they think the qualitative version of the quantitative criteria is, and then show the answer. Do this one by one.
3. Continue with the slides through, "More Strategies."

Part 2. Putting Quality First Activity (1 hour, 15 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint presentation: Session 8: Quality Research Standards for Qualitative Inquiry: Trustworthiness; handout in participants' guide under Session 8; sample answer sheet in facilitators' guide, Appendix F

Instructions:

- Participants break into groups for the group activity. Divide the participants in groups of 4–5. Have each group use the template provided in the participants' guide and indicate (30 mins.):
  - Their theoretical planning
  - Aspects of trustworthiness they will address
  - Practical implementation of the trustworthiness aspects identified (e.g., how would you conduct member checks in Tanzania?)
- Have each group present their plan to the class (7 mins. each group)
- Class discussion (10 mins.)
  - Focus the discussion on creativity and appropriateness of the plans
  - See Appendix F, Session 8 for example activity responses and considerations to point out
  - Use the "Summary" slide to help

SESSION 9. DEVELOPING A FIELDWORK PLAN FOR QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

Session Duration

2 hrs., 45 mins.

Learning Objectives

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

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

Topics Covered

1. From A to Z in qualitative evaluation fieldwork
2. Fieldwork: time and budget
3. Fieldwork team, aspects of quality and care
4. Agent and government regulatory aspects
5. Special considerations in qualitative evaluation
6. Management of crisis during fieldwork

Teaching Methods

- Facilitator presentation
- Small group activity
- Plenary discussion

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. Retrieved from https://www.dropbox.com/s/hyac5hvvn91grae/Condensed%20Overview%20of%20RealWorld%20Evaluation%202nd%20edition.pdf?dl=0

Further Reading

Patton, M.Q. (2005). Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice (4th Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

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.

Materials needed

- The fieldwork road steps under Activity 1 printed from Appendix G on individual cards/paper slips—print five sets of these
- Sample order of fieldwork road steps in Appendix G (for facilitator reference)
- Flip chart paper (five pieces)
- Tape
- Session 9, Activity 1 instructions in participants' guide
- Timeline chart (print one blank copy for each team) from Appendix G, Activity 2
- Timeline chart sample answers (for facilitator) from Appendix G, Activity 2
- PowerPoint presentation Session 9: Developing a Fieldwork Plan for Qualitative Evaluation

Session Plan

Time	Title and description	Methods/activities
45 mins.	**Activity 1: The road of the fieldwork** • Group activity to explore common steps in the process of conducting fieldwork	Small group activity, plenary discussion
45 mins.	**Fieldwork: Time and budget** • Time and budget under "ideal" circumstances • Time and budget under practical circumstances—ways to save time and money **Activity 2: Timeline** Group activity to develop a sample evaluation timeline	Facilitator presentation, small group activity, plenary discussion
30 mins.	**Fieldwork team: Quality and care.** • Differences between quantitative and qualitative "ideal" teams • Training, safety, and behavior in the field	Facilitator presentation
15 mins.	**Funding agency and government regulatory aspects** • Agency approvals or review needed, etc. • National, district-level, or local council or tribal authority approvals, etc. • Transparency laws (to be addressed in ethics session, too)	Facilitator presentation
30 mins.	**Special considerations in qualitative evaluation** • Working with special populations (under-age, drug users, those with behavior considered illegal, etc.) • Management of crisis during fieldwork **Summary and questions**	Facilitator presentation

Session Activities

Part 1. The Fieldwork Road (45 minutes)

Materials needed: Cards with different steps must be given to the teams. The steps must be printed and placed on cards (each step on a card, cards must not have a number) for the teams to order the different steps of the field work. See Appendix G for details and cards to print.

Instructions:

1. Divide the group into teams with a minimum of three and up to five or six people.
2. Explain that the purpose of the exercise is for team members to discuss the order of steps to follow during fieldwork.
3. Provide an envelope with the cards, each card has a field work step; the cards must be ordered and pasted on a wall or a flipchart.
4. Once the teams have ordered the cards, the facilitator will compare the order given by the teams with the order given in the present planning.
5. The ideal order from the perspective of the teams will be discussed in plenary.
6. Once the exercise is completed, the group will gather in a plenary and the facilitator will supervise as groups describe and discuss the complete fieldwork sequence.
7. Groups should discuss and ask questions about the ideal sequence for the exercise, facilitator should take note of any concerns or questions that arise and need to be addressed.

Part 2. Timeline (45 minutes)

Materials needed: Session 9 PowerPoint presentation: Developing a Fieldwork Plan for Qualitative Evaluation; timeline chart (print one blank copy for each team) from Appendix G, Activity 2

Instructions:

1. Present the slides from "Fieldwork: Time, Budget, Scope," through "Activity: Timeline." (25 mins.)
2. Carry out Activity 2: The teams that were formed for the first activity will meet again for the present activity. They will seek to generate a timeline for a qualitative evaluation as follows:
    a. Objective of the qualitative evaluation: To know the results of an HIV prevention/intervention aimed at young people between the ages of 15 and 18 who are studying in high school.
    b. To evaluate the intervention, the following field work will be carried out:
        i. Twelve focus groups with young people (six focus groups with women and six focal groups with men, three focal groups with first grade students and three focus groups with senior students).
        ii. Eight semistructured interviews with teachers (four with women and four with men).

    ALL teams will start their activities on January 1 next year.
3. Participants will use the flipchart with the fieldwork steps they have previously ordered at the beginning of the session. Using these steps, they will complete a schedule and compare the estimated time for the evaluation with the other teams. Ten minutes will be given to the teams to discuss.
4. Allow 10 minutes total for the teams to present results in plenary and discuss.

Part 3. The Fieldwork Team: Quality and Care (30 minutes)

Materials needed: Session 9 PowerPoint presentation: Developing a Fieldwork Plan for Qualitative Evaluation

Instructions:

1. Present the slides on "The Fieldwork Team" through "In the Field: Safety and Behavior."

Part 4. Funding Agency and Government Regulations Considerations (15 minutes)

Materials needed: Session 9 PowerPoint presentation: Developing a Fieldwork Plan for Qualitative Evaluation

Instructions:

1. Present slides from "Authorities and Fieldwork" through "Flexibility in Fieldwork."

Part 5. Special Considerations in Qualitative Evaluation (30 minutes)

Materials needed: Session 9 PowerPoint presentation: Developing a Fieldwork Plan for Qualitative Evaluation

Instructions:

1. Present slides from "Evaluation in Crisis" through the end.
2. On the "So…" slide, pose each question to the group for discussion. The answers are included in the slide presentation notes for you.
3. End with the last slide.

SESSION 10. DATA PRESENTATION AND DISSEMINATION

Session Duration

2 hrs., 45 mins.

Learning Objectives

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

- Demonstrate how the proposed data presentation will be appropriate for various stakeholders
- Organize feedback in a manner that presents a coherent and clear storyline
- Formulate a feedback format that provides practical recommendations based on rigorous evaluation data
- Explain how the funder/client/audience may have an impact on how findings are presented and conveyed: data presented to different audiences
- Explain how the type of participants may impact presentation, in terms of potential vulnerable or special populations, while displaying contextual sensitivity
- Propose and negotiate the presentation of feedback with stakeholders (includes discussion on context of countries with mandatory evaluations)

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.* Retrieved from 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/fi les/166_policy_hub_a_quality_framework.pdf

Topics Covered

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

Teaching Methods

- Facilitator presentation
- Individual activity
- Small group activity
- Plenary discussion

Materials Needed

- Session 10 PowerPoint presentation: Data Presentation and Dissemination
- Example qualitative evaluation report contributed by facilitators or the example Castle Maine 500 report included in the curriculum
- Facilitators should get examples of: a) report; b) PowerPoint presentation; c) international conference poster; d) scientific paper → all related to qualitative evaluation results to share with participants as examples
- Examples of using evaluation data by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) (some possible examples are: taxes on sodas and their relation to health and consumption in Mexico, and another international example) for you to share in the presentation
- Handout for "Learning the Lingo" in participants' guide under Session 10

Session Plan

Time	Title and description	Methods /activities
45 mins.	**How to write a report** • Sections for a qualitative evaluation report • How to report/display data	Facilitator presentation
55 mins.	**Evaluating qualitative reports** • COREQ checklist **Activity 1: Reviewing a report** • Groups review handout to determine whether COREQ domains are addressed, how qualitative results are presented, and what evidence supports them	Facilitator presentation, individual activity, small group activity, plenary discussion
1 hr., 5 mins.	**Communicating results** • Handling revisions during external review • Giving recommendations • Appropriate communication of results to audiences **Activity 2: Learning the lingo** • Groups practice establishing trustworthiness with different audiences by crafting an introductory paragraph for assigned audience/client/funder	Facilitator presentation, small group activity, and plenary discussion

Session Activities

Part 1. How to Write a Report (45 minutes)

Materials needed: Session 10 PowerPoint presentation: Data Presentation and Dissemination

Instructions:

1. Present the slides through the slide "Other Ways to Display Data."

Part 2. Evaluating Qualitative Reports (55 minutes)

Materials needed: Qualitative evaluation report sample (facilitator should contribute this or use the example in the curriculum for Castle Maine 500 (you will need to either print or email the report to participants ahead of time so that they have it for the session); the COREQ checklist (participants have this in their guide and it is in this facilitators' guide in Appendix H); and the PowerPoint presentation for Session 10.

Instructions:

1. Begin by going through the COREQ checklist on the slides. (20 mins.)
2. Carry out the report reviewing activity using the COREQ checklist. The full group will be divided into small groups of four. (35 mins.)
    a. Each group will be asked to answer one "question" (i.e., will examine whether the report follows the checklist in one domain of the COREQ). Assign each group one domain. Two teams may answer the same question if there are more than three teams.
    b. The objective of reviewing the qualitative evaluation report will be to answer (one domain for each group) the following questions:
        i. Are the assigned domain questions reported?
        ii. How are qualitative results presented and what evidence supports them?
    c. They will be given 10 minutes to find the information individually.
    d. In their full groups, they should then share opinions and discuss with each other for 10 minutes.
    e. In plenary, ask groups to share whether the qualitative report fulfills the requirements of each COREQ domain. If they do not, the group should suggest how the evaluation report could be revised to fulfill the missing requirements.
    f. Wrap-up the activity with a discussion of presenting central versus peripheral results.

Part 3. Communicating Results (1 hour, 5 minutes)

Materials needed: Session 10 PowerPoint presentation: Data Presentation and Dissemination; Learning the Lingo handout in the participants' guide; and (for facilitator only) the sample paragraphs in Appendix H of this facilitators' guide

Instructions:

1. Present slides from "Report Review and Comments" through "Communicating Results." (30 mins.)
2. Split group into teams to carry out Activity 2: Learning the Lingo. (35 mins.)
    a. Explain that in this activity we will illustrate how, while trustworthiness is always important, the manner in which it is conveyed should be determined by the audience.

b. Assign each group an audience (community, Cambridge University, or World Health Organization). There can be multiple groups with the same audience, if needed.
    i. Each group must write an introductory paragraph on the trustworthiness of its results. They must craft the language for their assigned audience/clients/funders. (15 mins.)
    ii. Each group then presents its paragraph in plenary. (5 mins. each)
c. There are three slides describing the activity after the introduction. This provides the overall structure and time allocation for the activity.
    i. First slide provides the research topic on which the groups are working (note the topic is the same for all groups).
    ii. The following provides the context of the research, and imagery of the landscape and participants.
    iii. The final slide shows the three different possible audiences. Each group is assigned one of these audiences.
d. Conduct a group discussion to clarify/reflect using the "Comments and Questions" slide.

3. Summarize this part of the presentation with the "Summary" slide.

SESSION 11. KEY ETHICAL PRINCIPLES IN QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

Session Duration

3 hrs., 15 mins.

Session Learning Objectives

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

- Specify the basic tenets of ethical protocols for field data collection
- Identify special ethical considerations in qualitative evaluation when using methods such as case studies, focus group discussions, interviews, or observations
- Describe ethical and gender-related issues in evaluation design, data collection, analysis, and dissemination/use
- Understand the potential influence of political and cultural contexts in evaluation
- 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; note cultural- and education-level considerations for the consent process
- Explain data security considerations and steps to ensure data confidentiality

Topics Covered

1. What a protocol/evaluation plan must have with respect to the basics of ethics in social research (informed consent, freedom/leaving the evaluation, equal opportunities, anonymity, confidentiality, no harm/harm reduction)
2. Cultural aspects of evaluation topics, how evaluation and qualitative techniques can lead to subjects' vulnerability
3. Ethical aspects of qualitative inquiry
4. IRB and informed consent
5. Reporting sound data, reviewing with funding agency and government
6. Confidentiality and anonymity in reporting
7. Giving information to funding agency and/or governments

Teaching Methods

- Facilitator presentation
- Individual activity
- Small group activity
- Plenary discussion

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

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

Materials Needed

- Session 11 PowerPoint presentation: Key Ethical Principles in Qualitative Evaluation
- Example of informed consent in participants' guide under Session 11
- Mock IRB activity instructions in participants' guide under Session 11
- Paper and pen for participants

Session Plan

Time	Title and description	Methods /activities
1 hr.	**Protocol/evaluation plan requirements versus basic ethics of social research** • Research with human subjects • Ethics in research (how and why research can harm people) • Ethics and scientific rigor in evaluation **Activity 1: Reflective writing activity** • Individuals think critically and write about their own values, debate as a small group, and share in plenary discussion	Facilitator presentation, individual activity, small group activity, plenary discussion
30 mins.	**Cultural and ethical aspects of evaluation topics** **Cultural** • Sensitive topics in communities • Stigmatized behavior • Vulnerable populations **Ethical** • Ensuring privacy: Choosing the right place and moment (where and when) • Having the correct team (who, and training) • Ethical aspects of qualitative tools	Facilitator presentation
45 mins.	**Informed consent** • What is an IRB • Written and oral informed consent • Informed consent for special populations: under age people, people with developmental disabilities • Informed consent in the field **Activity 2: Reviewing an informed consent form (ICF)** • Small groups review an ICF handout using provided questions and share in plenary	Facilitator presentation, small group activity, plenary discussion
1 hr.	**Responsible data reporting** • Ways to ensure data privacy, security, and confidentiality in fieldwork, data collection, and dissemination **Activity 3: Mock internal review board (IRB)** • Participants read a case study and answer questions, share responses in small groups, and discuss in plenary **Summary slide and questions**	Facilitator presentation, individual activity, small group activity, plenary discussion

Session Activities

Part 1. Protocol/Evaluation Plan Requirements Versus Basic Ethics of Social Research (1 hour)

Materials needed: Session 11 PowerPoint presentation: Key Ethical Principles in Qualitative Evaluation; paper and pen for participants

Instructions:

1. Present slides through "Ethics as a Mirror." (45 mins.)
2. Carry out Activity 1: Reflective Writing (15 mins.). This activity involves helping participants develop critical thinking about their own values; leading a discussion about the subjectivity that relates to values and ethics; and setting the importance of a common understanding of an ethic statement that orients the scientific community towards ethical actions under this common understanding.
    a. Participants should divide into groups of three.
    b. Individually, participants should think about their main values or life principles and write about two. Then, they should write in a simple way a definition for those two and describe how that value or principle can be seen or applied in his or her day-to-day life. Additionally, they should write about "**voluntary participation**" in the context of the development of evaluation and will give one example of voluntary participation in the evaluation of a daily practice. (5 mins.)
    c. Then, the small group comes together to discuss any similarities or differences. (5 mins.)
    d. Finally, bring everyone back to plenary for group discussion. Some points to address include (5 mins.):
        i. We want participants to find out how difficult it is to clearly define their values.
        ii. When they share their ideas with the group, we want them to realize that different people interpret the same value differently. This leads to recognizing how difficult it will be to apply them to their area of work and to agree with other colleagues about their meaning.
        iii. We want them to consider how difficult it is to fully agree regarding values in a "homogeneous group" (evaluators) and help them to think about how complex it could be to understand values shared by communities and the subjects of study.
        iv. The objective of this activity is to help them distinguish between coincidences and not coincidences and to help them be aware of our own biases and values.
            - If any fundamentalist ideals arise, you need to be diplomatic. It could happen and it would be complicated, but the facilitator has to point towards respect between individuals. This exercise is important because we cannot become "unattached" from our own beliefs when we perform both—evaluation and research. Therefore, that is why it is important to be aware of our own personal biases and beliefs.
        v. This is why it is so important to have a firm ethics statement laid out, which orients the scientific community towards ethical actions and under a common understanding of ethics.

Part 2. Cultural and Ethical Aspects of Evaluation Topics (30 minutes)

Materials needed: Session 11 PowerPoint presentation: Key Ethical Principles in Qualitative Evaluation

Instructions:

1. Present slides from "Evaluation: Ethical Practice" through "Gender-Integrated Evaluation."

Part 3. Informed Consent (45 minutes)

Materials needed: Session 11 PowerPoint presentation: Key Ethical Principles in Qualitative Evaluation; example of informed consent forms in participants' guide under Session 11.

Instructions:

1. Present slides from "Basic Ethics in Evaluation" through "Importance of Internal Review." (20 mins.)
2. Carry out the informed consent review activity. (25 mins.)
    a. Split participants into groups of three.
    b. First five minutes they will read the informed consent form individually.
    c. Next 10 minutes each group will analyze the ICF, following the four suggested questions:
        i. Does the ICF provide in-depth understanding of the study objectives and study procedures? If not, why?
        ii. Does the ICF adequately describe the possible risks of the evaluation? If not, why?
        iii. What challenges would you face in the field in your country with this form?
        iv. What changes would you suggest to adapt this to your group work evaluation?
    d. Last 10 minutes, plenary: the group will discuss the questions.

Part 4. Responsible Data Reporting and MOCK IRB (1 hour)

Materials needed: Session 11 PowerPoint presentation: Key Ethical Principles in Qualitative Evaluation; case study from participants' guide; mock IRB activity instructions under Session 11 in participants' guide

Instructions:

1. Present slides from "Anonymity and Confidentiality" through "Ethical Issues Checklist."
2. Carry out Mock IRB activity. (40 mins.)
    a. Based on the case study (VAW) the participants will discuss questions related to ethical aspects of evaluation.
    b. In this exercise, groups will participate in a mock IRB review. Split into groups of three and have them read the case study for 10 minutes.
    c. Then in their small groups, they should answer these questions (15 mins.):
        i. What are the vulnerable populations involved in the CU program? What are the specific ethical problems that could arise when these vulnerable communities are involved in the program activities?
        ii. One of the program activities is related to improving access to legal recourses (police) for victims of VAW. What, if any, are possible negative unintended consequences of this action? And how could these be prevented or minimized if needed?
        iii. What could be key indicators for gender gaps to be included in the qualitative evaluation? How could these be conceptualized qualitatively?
        iv. Under which conditions could voluntary participation in the evaluation be threatened?
        v. What risks, if any, are there to participation in focus groups for the target groups involved in the UC program?
        vi. What kind of protocol could be implemented to ensure that the evaluation will be beneficial for the population?
    d. Have a plenary discussion for 15 minutes with the groups sharing their response to the questions.

SESSION 12. INTEGRATING GENDER INTO YOUR EVALUATION

Session Duration

1 hr., 15 mins.

Session Objectives

By the end of the 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. Retrieved from https://www.measureevaluation.org/resources/publications/fs-17-247b

MEASURE Evaluation. (2017). Gender in Series. 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,* p.czw037. 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.* Great Britain: Oxfam. Retrieved from http://www.genderanddevelopment.org/page/gender-and-mel-resources

Teaching Methods

- Facilitator presentation
- Large group activity
- Plenary discussion

Materials Needed

- PowerPoint presentation: Integrating Gender into Your Evaluation

Session Plan

Time	Title and description	Methods /activities
10 mins.	**Vote with your feet** • Presenter reads aloud provocative statements about gender concepts. Participants move to indicate agree/disagree • Intended to explore, and to enhance awareness of, group and individual beliefs about gender	Large group activity
15 mins.	**Introduction to gender concepts and gender integration in evaluation** • Present key gender concepts, including sex vs. gender, equality vs. equity, and gender inequality and health • Presenter discusses key objectives and considerations regarding integration of gender into evaluation	Facilitator presentation
20 mins.	**Memory Game** • Presenter splits participants into two teams to review key concepts of gender integration using an interactive "board game" • Objective: Teams earn points by (a) matching a pair of cards, and (b) correctly explaining how gender is integrating into the evaluation component indicated on the cards.	Large group activity
30 mins.	**Gender-Integrated Practices/Summary** • Presenter describes, in greater detail, ways in which gender can be integrated into evaluation practices and processes • Presenter opens the floor for question, ideas, and comments • Presenter plays short review video (4 mins.) • Presenter summarizes key points of session	Facilitator presentation, group discussion

Part 1. Vote with Your Feet (10 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint Presentation: Integrating Gender into Your Evaluation

Instructions:

1. Presenter asks participants to stand and move into the center of the room and explains the activity (see notes in Session 12 PowerPoint, slide 3).
2. Presenter reads aloud 2–3 statements from each section ("Statements on Gender Roles and Sexuality," "Statements on Men and Reproductive Health," "Additional Statements on Gender"), reading up to five total statements.
3. After the presenter reads each statement, participants move to the right if they agree, and to the left if they disagree.

4. Once participants have considered the statement and moved accordingly, presenter asks 2–3 participants from each side to explain why they voted the way they did.
5. Presenter facilitates a brief discussion after the activity (<5 mins.). Prompts may include:
    a. Did anything about this activity surprise you?
    b. How did this activity make you feel?
    c. How is this relevant to global health research and evaluation?

Part 2. Introduction to Gender Concepts and Gender Integration in Evaluation (15 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint Presentation: Integrating Gender into Your Evaluation

Instructions:

1. Presenter should present the slides starting from "Our Personal Gender Notions" and ending before the memory game activity.
2. Be sure to ask participants for examples from their own work and lives of gender norms affecting health practices and outcomes so that they can personalize the material.

Part 3. Memory Game (20 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint Presentation: Integrating Gender into Your Evaluation

Instructions:

1. A "board" (slide 20 of the Session 12 PowerPoint) includes six parts of a qualitative evaluation, discussed in both the PowerPoint and readings. There are two cards with each part.
2. Participants divide into two teams, and each team takes turns picking any two cards to "turn over" (click) one at a time. If the team successfully matches a pair, they get to "keep" the cards and get another turn.
3. When a team turns over two cards that do not match, those cards are turned back over and it becomes the next team's turn.
4. When a team matches two cards, they must identify at least one way in which gender can be integrated into that component of the evaluation.
5. In order to win a point, teams must both (a) select a matching pair of cards, and (b) correctly identify how gender can be integrated into that part of the evaluation.
6. The game ends when all cards have been turned over. The team with the most points wins.

Part 4. Gender-Integrated Practices/Summary (30 minutes)

Materials needed: PowerPoint Presentation: Integrating Gender into Your Evaluation

Instructions:

1. Presenter should present the slides starting from "Gender Integrated Practices" through "Questions" to provide details on how gender can be integrated into evaluation practices and processes.
2. Presenter should then open the floor for question, ideas, and comments.
3. Presenter plays short review video. (4 mins.)
4. Presenter then summarizes the key points of the session with the summary slide.

APPENDIX A. SAMPLE ANSWERS FOR SESSION 1 ACTIVITIES

Paradigm Debate

Paradigms: Pros and Cons

	Pros	Cons
Positivist	• Gives validity and objectivity to research • Based on precise methods • Generally replicable • Clear theoretical focus for the research from the outset	• Lacks an in-depth understanding of context • Deterministic view: People are passive and products of their environment • Recognizes only one version of reality
Constructivist/ interpretivist	• Regards the individual as an active agent • Relies on natural forms of human communication to gain understanding in a world that is complex and cannot be reduced to the relationships between a small number of variables • Participatory and inclusive in nature, accommodates human change over time • Recognizes how the researcher impacts data generation	• Almost impossible to reproduce results as the represented version of reality is only known by the actors/subjects themselves • Conclusions can be claimed without validation or data
Critical/ emancipatory	• Seen as a vehicle for social change • Emphasis on community involvement • Allows perspective from marginalized communities in specific historical, political, or economic context	• Limited to a very specific context • Often controversial

Summary:

Positivists are quantitative researchers, often thought of as white-coated laboratory scientists. They seek to ***explain*** reality.

Constructivists/interpretivists may be associated with psychologists trying to ***understand*** the multiple constructed realities.

Critical/emancipatory researchers are the politicians or advocates—they wish to ***argue*** for changes in power relationships and in some cases move towards emancipation.

The Third Wave Activity Sample Responses

A. Positivist

Evaluation component	Description
Evaluation question	To what extent have community attitudes towards men's use of physical violence against a woman changed from baseline to endline of the pilot study?
Sample population	Pair of matched cluster randomized trials with randomization conducted within matched community pairs, half of the communities received the intervention at baseline; three scheduled to receive following pilot phase (highly comparable intervention and control communities)
Data collection methods	Cross-sectional surveys conducted with 500 respondents per community at baseline and end of pilot

B. Constructivist/Interpretivist

Evaluation component	Description
Evaluation question	How has community understanding of VAW changed from baseline to endline during the pilot study?
Sample population	Cluster purposeful sampling representing a cross-section of each community (religious leaders, women, men, youth, etc.)
Data collection methods	• In-depth interviews with a variety of stakeholders • Focus group discussions representing a cross-section of the community

C. Critical/Emancipatory

Evaluation component	Description
Evaluation question	How can a context-appropriate intervention be designed to shift perceptions on VAW in the community?
Sample population	Cluster purposeful sampling representing a cross-section of the community, most specifically women and women's groups. These are partners in the evaluation and not merely participants or an object of study
Data collection methods	• In-depth interviews with a variety of stakeholders • Focus group discussions representing a cross-section of the community • Activist approach to data presentation • Feedback sessions and sustainability discussions with research partners

D. **Pragmatist**

Evaluation component	Description
Evaluation question	How effective has the Community United program been in shifting attitudes among community members of VAW as an acceptable behavior?
Sample population	A triangulated, mixed-method approach to ensure the best possible understanding of the shifting attitudes: • Pair of matched cluster randomized trials with randomization conducted within matched community pairs, half of the communities received the intervention at baseline; three scheduled to receive following pilot phase (highly comparable intervention and control communities) • Cluster purposeful sampling representing a cross-section of each community (religious leaders, women, men, youth, etc.)
Data collection methods	• Cross-sectional surveys conducted with 500 respondents per community at baseline and end of pilot • In-depth interviews with a variety of stakeholders • Focus group discussions representing a cross-section of the community

APPENDIX B. SAMPLE ANSWERS FOR SESSION 2 ACTIVITIES

Creating and Conceptualizing Evaluation Questions: Sample Answers

Evaluation type	Evaluation questions (2–3)	Identify and describe key concepts
Formative	1. What is the **reaction** among **community members** to the **program activities and materials**? 2. To what extent were **program communication materials** successfully **distributed** to **program beneficiaries**? 3. To what extent were **community-level VAW prevention and response mechanisms** active and effective?	**Community members** **Program activities and materials** **Preventions and response mechanisms**
Process	1. To what extent have **program-trained community advocates** implemented **community activities** as planned? 2. How has **community advocate** knowledge of VAW (causes and consequences, laws, resources, etc.) changed? 3. To what extent are the planned **community activities** reaching **men and women in the community**? 4. To what extent are **external factors** influencing **program delivery**? (This may include competing priorities in the community, political unrest, disease outbreak, etc.)	**Program-trained community advocates** **Community activities** **Men and women in the community** **External factors** **Program delivery**
Outcome	1. How have **community members' perceptions** of **VAW** changed? 2. To what extent has **community member** knowledge of **available laws and resources** changed? 3. How has use of **VAW-related resources and services** changed?	**Community members** **Perceptions of VAW** **VAW related resources and services**
Impact	1. How has **acceptability** of **men's use of violence** against a partner changed among **female and male community members**? 2. How have **experiences with violence** changed for **women in the community**?	**Acceptability of men's use of violence** **Community members** **Experiences with violence**

APPENDIX C. SAMPLE GUIDES FOR SESSION 4

Example 1. In-Depth Interview Guide: Community Member

Tell participant: *I want to thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. My name is __________ and I would like to ask you some questions about the Communities United Program here in your village of __________ . Specifically, we are assessing program effectiveness in order to capture lessons that can be used to plan future interventions. This interview should take about one hour. I will be taping this session because I don't want to miss any of your comments. Because we're on tape please be sure to speak loudly so we don't miss your comments. Your responses will be kept confidential. Your name will not be associated with any of your comments. Remember, you don't have to share anything you don't want to and you may end the interview at any time. Do you have any questions for me before we begin?*

1. Please tell me about yourself and your role in this community.
2. Please tell me what you know about the Communities United, or CU, program.
    a. Have you been to any CU-sponsored activities?
    b. What were they?
    c. What did you think of the activities?
3. What do you think causes men to use violence against their wives/partners?
4. In which situations/contexts do you believe it is ok for men to use violence against their wives/partners, if any?
5. How do the community members react when a woman experiences violence?
    a. Men's reactions? Women's reactions?
6. Have community reactions changed since the CU program began three years ago?
    a. In what ways?
    b. What has not changed? Why do you think this is?
7. What help is available for a woman who experiences violence in this community?
    a. Do women utilize this resource? If not, why?
8. What has the community's reaction been to the CU program?
9. How do you believe CU affected what people think about VAW in this community?
    a. Are there other reasons for this change?
10. Do you know any CU trained activists? Can you tell me more about what they do in your community?
11. What parts of the CU program did you like?
12. What parts of the CU program would you change?
13. What makes it difficult to address violence against women in this community?

<u>Closing</u>

I have finished the questions that I had for you. Is there anything else you would like to share with me?

Thank you for the time you spent with me today. If you have any questions or concerns following this, please feel free to call or write to the contact on your copy of the consent form.

Example 2. In-Depth Interview Guide: Program Activist

Tell participant: *I want to thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. My name is __________ and I would like to ask you some questions about your experiences participating in the Communities United Program. Specifically, we are assessing program effectiveness in order to capture lessons that can be used in future interventions. This interview should take about one hour. I will be taping this session because I don't want to miss any of your comments. Because we're on tape please be sure to speak loudly so we don't miss your comments. Your responses will be kept confidential. Your name will not be associated with any of your comments. Remember, you don't have to share anything you don't want to and you may end the interview at any time. Do you have any questions for me before we begin?*

1. Let's start by discussing your Communities United, or CU, program training. Please tell me about it.
2. Which of these strategies did you consider to be most important? Please explain.
3. What CU strategies did you utilize in your community?
    a. How were CU activities received by community members?
4. What worked well? Please explain.
5. What would you do differently next time? Please explain.
6. What CU strategies would you recommend be sustained and/or scaled up?
7. What CU strategies would you recommended be discontinued and why?
8. What were some barriers, if any, that you encountered?
9. What effect, if any, do you feel the CU activities had on the community in which you work?
    a. Attitudes toward VAW as acceptable?
    b. Community reaction to women who experience VAW?
    c. Knowledge of laws against VAW? Of available resources?
    d. Increased utilization to resources?
10. What recommendations do you have for future efforts such as this one?

<u>Closing</u>

I have finished the questions that I had for you. Is there anything else you would like to share with me?

Thank you for the time you spent with me today. If you have any questions or concerns following this, please feel free to call or write to the contact on your copy of the consent form.

Example 3. Focus Group Discussion Guide: Community Members

We are here together today to discuss the Communities United Program to end violence against women. My name is _________ . Our main interest is to learn how the Communities United Program has been received by your community and if the program has helped women and families in this community. We would also like to know your thoughts on how the program is operating and if you have suggestions on how it could be improved. Please remember that your name will be recorded with your response and your views will remain anonymous.

This discussion will take about one hour. We will be taping this session because I don't want to miss any of your comments. Because we're on tape please be sure to speak loudly so we don't miss your comments. Your responses will be kept confidential. Your name will not be associated with any of your comments. Remember, you don't have to share anything you don't want to and you may leave the group discussion at any time. Do you have any questions for me before we begin?

1. Let's start by discussing what you know about the Communities United, or CU, program in your community.
    a. (Explore understanding of the program purpose, aims, etc.)
2. What are some CU activities that have taken place since the program began in 2013?
    a. (Explore who participated, when programs took place, and if there were people who did not participate.)
3. What role did CU community activists play in the activities?
4. How were CU activities received by the community?
5. What parts did people most like?
6. What elements were not as well received?
7. What CU materials have you seen around the community (posters, pamphlets, etc.)?
8. How have community members reacted to CU materials?
9. How have CU activities changed the way people in the community react to violence against a woman? Please explain.
10. If a woman in this community experiences violence from her partner or another man, what would she do?
    a. (Explore who she might go to for help [if anyone], how community members might react, why she may or may not seek help from the police desk.)
11. What do you think causes men to use violence against their wives/partners?
12. In which situations/contexts do you believe it is ok for men to use violence against their wives/partners, if any?

<u>Closing</u>

I have finished the questions that I had for you. Is there anything else you would like to share with me?

Thank you for the time you spent with me today. If you have any questions or concerns following this, please feel free to call or write to the contact on your copy of the consent form.

APPENDIX D. ANSWERS FOR SESSION 5 ACTIVITY

Group Activity: Sampling Scenarios

Facilitator's Answer Guide

Instructions: For each of the four scenarios below, discuss and determine which sampling approach would be most appropriate and why.

Sampling approaches available to you in this activity:

A. Stratified purposive sampling
B. Negative case sampling
C. Snowball sampling
D. Maximum variation (heterogeneous) sampling

Scenario 1

A team is conducting a formative evaluation to improve a pilot program addressing the unique barriers to HIV testing and care facing lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) persons in a community in a rural district of country Z. Country Z has strict and harsh anti-homosexuality laws. The evaluators would like to sample LGBT persons and have allocated 2.5 months in the field for data collection.

Answer: Snowball sampling is an appropriate technique due to the vulnerability of the intended sample population (i.e., LGBT individuals). It may be difficult for evaluators to identify such individuals using other techniques, and may indeed be dangerous to those individuals.

Scenario 2

After a new law is enacted in a state to regulate the accessibility of birth control, a team wants to evaluate the effect of the policy on a broad range of individuals. The state is geographically very diverse, with both large urban centers and agrarian rural communities. There is also considerable diversity in education levels and incomes in the state. The team has enough resources to collect data for up to 10 months.

Answer: Because the explicit goal of the study is to document diverse responses to the new law, a maximum variation sampling technique is ideal. The team should prioritize identifying as diverse a sample as possible, even if it limits the sample size.

Scenario 3

A team is contracted to evaluate a new gender-based violence reduction intervention. The program involves the adoption of a mobile electronic health records application by many different service providers. The team wants baseline data from multiple service providers in both rural and urban settings.

Answer: Stratified purposive sampling—because the team wants to specifically target rural providers, the sampling is purposive. They may choose to stratify their sample by provider type.

Scenario 4

An evaluation team is tasked with evaluating a health systems strengthening intervention in country X. The intervention works with various Ministries/offices (e.g., Ministry of Health, Ministry of Finance, and Office of the President, Civil Service Department) that address financing, leadership and governance, access to essential medicines, the health workforce, and health service delivery. The team wants to conduct key informant interviews with government staff in the relevant offices working with the intervention.

Answer: Stratified purposive sampling—because the team wants to specifically target staff in the Ministries/offices, the sampling is purposive. They may choose to stratify their sample by Ministry/office/department/etc.

Scenario 5

An extremely effective nutrition education program was associated with an increase in the average national consumption of fruits and vegetables by school-aged children, and a reduction in average childhood obesity. However, no significant outcomes were observed among children living in a particular county.

Answer: A negative case sampling technique is appropriate here because the team is interested in understanding something about a group that represents a minority.

APPENDIX E. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SESSION 6 CODE SORTING ACTIVITY

Code Sorting Exercise

Instructor: Make 5–6 copies of these codes and cut them out so that each code topic or quote is on its own slip of paper. The way they are presented here is the answer guide, but they should be cut out and mixed up when given to participants.

CODE PILES (GENDER/VAW)

CODE: How are decisions made within households? *Sample responses from KIIs*

R: It is the man who makes decisions. The woman can contribute but the man has a greater say.

R: When it gets to be the time that we the women are supposed to be involved they will call us, they have a specific day that they use to summon everybody to the chief's palace then they discuss a specific issue.

R: It is a man who makes decisions at home, so if your husband speaks, it is final.

R: The man is supposed to make the decision. This is because he is the head of the family.

1

CODE: Feminine gender roles (What roles do women play in this community?)

R: A woman's role is her domestic role, you have to respect what a man says. "Let's go to the bush," you have to go. Also the man has to go to work, the woman also has to do all the domestic jobs, bathing the children and any other role to perform to make sure the children go to school is your responsibility.

R: The women in this community, our role is to sell things but not all of us have the capital to sell the things. So some people sells things whiles others do day work, especially me.

R: For those who don't sell at home, after the man has gone to farm, she cleans the kids up and sends food to the husband.

2

CODE : Masculine gender roles (What roles do men play in this community?)

R: A man can work, the woman can help the man while he is working so when the man is working then the woman is helping him a bit. It is not right for her to wait for the man to go and bring her something to eat or for her to stay at home while the man will be suffering. You should also help him. It is not right to burden the man with all the work; she should help him.

R: Some men also pass through the bush road on the way to work so they can bring home some cassava for food. So that even if the man is not actively engaged in other house work they will feel alright.

R: Men have their role as do women. For instance, if there is a bush area to be clear, the men will weed and the women will collect the weeds. The men also clean out the dirty gutters. The women, we scrub the area where we go to fetch the water, we scrub there on Wednesdays, so every month we do that.

R: The man's responsibility is to earn money for the house and we all know what a woman has to do at home. Sometimes the workload is too heavy on the woman and sometimes the man has to help out, it could be in the form of helping her in the kitchen.

3

CODE: Causes of VAW (What are the causes of violence?)

R: Some women are being cheated just because they are women. Though you, the woman, may be right, the man tries to cheat you and take what is rightfully yours away from you because he is stronger and more powerful. This is also an act of violence.

R: Some men can be very wicked even to their own wives. Even after they have performed all the customary rites, they would continue to treat you unfairly till you cannot take it anymore. Though you may be married, he does nothing to help care for or provide for the children. It is all the woman's responsibility. Every time you talk about it, he tells you that the child is yours and belongs to your family not his. Can you imagine? After you have had a child with me, isn't it our responsibility to take care of our children? Just because he thinks the children belong to my family and would be of no use to you, he decides to punish the woman this way. Some marriages leave you with very painful experiences.

4

APPENDIX F. SAMPLE ANSWERS FOR SESSION 8 ACTIVITY

Answer Guide

Case Study: Communities United against VAW in Tanzania—Evaluation

Tanzania lies on the east coast of Africa, just south of the equator. It shares borders with Kenya, Uganda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, Burundi, Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique, and the Indian Ocean. Within the borders of Tanzania co-exist approximately 120 ethnic groups, speaking languages representing all four major African language groups. While each ethnic group speaks its own local language, almost all Tanzanians are also fluent in the national language, Swahili (Kiswahili in Swahili), a coastal Bantu language strongly influenced by Arabic. The second official language is English, a vestige of the British colonial period. In general, traditional marriage customs vary by ethnic group.

Similarly, where conditions of extreme poverty obligate male heads of households to migrate in search of work, women in these communities have taken over some of the hard, physical labor. In many modern households in Tanzania, wives and husbands are challenging and questioning one another's changing roles. The disruptive effects of alcohol abuse, HIV/AIDS, and poverty have also placed great strains on relationships within and among families. Violence, especially within a marriage, is commonly accepted at a cultural level and many Tanzanians state a belief that violence against women is an acceptable practice. According to Tanzania's 2015–2016 DHS Survey, 39.5% of all women aged 15–49 had experienced violence after the age of 15, while 41.7% of ever married women had experienced violence committed by a husband or partner.

Organizations such as the World Health Organization, World Bank, Global Fund for Women, and UNICEF have multiple projects in the country to address violence against women (VAW). The Communities United (CU) Program acknowledges that VAW is complex in nature, and thus has designed a community-based intervention to target knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions related to VAW and available resources.

Activity 1. Putting Quality First

Your team is conducting a qualitative evaluation of a violence against women intervention in Tanzania. Put together a rough plan for how you would establish trustworthiness in your evaluation.

1. In the first column of the trustworthiness table (separate handout), note the approach(es) you would take/aspects you address under that quality standard.
    a. For example, carry out member checks under credibility.
2. In the second column of the table, note the practical aspects of carrying that out.
    a. For example, to carry out member checks you need to determine who those members of the community will be, get their approval, make sure your report is in a format and language they can review, build time into your fieldwork schedule for review, etc.
3. You have 30 minutes to draft and then will have 10 minutes to share your plan with the larger group.

Sample Answers for Table

Component of trustworthiness	Aspects addressed	Application (Real world operationalization)
Dependability and confirmability	• Evaluation process • Methodology • Analysis	o Audit trail: storing and cataloging raw data to be useful in the future o Careful documentation of the analytic and interpretation process, code/theme definitions o Keep "field diaries" to note and theoretical or philosophical approach of evaluators which may impact the evaluation o Piloting and refining for data collection tools to be appropriate to study population
Credibility	• Study design • Analysis • Confidence in the study outcomes • Value of the findings	o Appropriate selection of person interviewing (female interviewers for women's FGD, etc.) o Field notes: Was anyone else present during interviews/FGDs? o Consistency between data presented and findings o Work to establish inter-coder reliability during analysis o Consistency between data and findings of study o Participants provide feedback on preliminary findings: Bring findings to women's/men's community group meetings to receive feedback
Transferability	• Sampling • Context • Methodology	o Using maximum variation sampling to capture different tribal and religious backgrounds in communities o Culturally appropriate approach to recruiting participants o Data analysis which captures varying perspectives among sample population o Using illustrative quotes in reports/presentation to capture participant voices and illustrate themes o Thorough field notes to capture important details about the study population and setting o Recording any important details about people who chose not to participate or were not available for interview

Class Discussion on Creativity and Appropriateness: Possible Points to Cover

- Low literacy
  - Recruit through infographics
  - Present results in verbal format at places where women already congregate (e.g., water taps, clinics, washing of clothes, communal cooking)
  - Dress appropriately, ask the women to show you how to dress, teach you about their daily lives, share the power
- Credibility
  - Appropriate training of translators, confidentiality clauses, only females
  - Dress appropriately, spend time with the women in their daily activities, ethnographic principals
  - Care for children while collecting data
- Confirmability and dependability
  - Creative data collection: Collages, drawings, photos, and voice recordings may have risk

APPENDIX G. INSTRUCTIONS AND ANSWER GUIDE FOR SESSION 9 ACTIVITIES

Group Activity 1. The Fieldwork Road

Instructions:

The objective of this exercise is to generate discussion among the participants about the steps that must be taken during the field work. The fieldwork must follow a certain order to make an efficient use of time and resources and to obtain the best result in the evaluation.

The exercise should follow these steps:

1. Divide the group into teams of up to five persons.
2. Explain that the purpose of the exercise is for team members to discuss the order of steps to follow during fieldwork.
3. Provide an envelope with the set of cards to each group, each card has a field work step; the cards must be ordered by each group and pasted on a wall or a flip chart.
4. Once the teams have ordered the cards, the facilitator will compare the order given by the teams with the order given at the end of this appendix.
5. The ideal order from the perspective of the teams will be discussed in plenary.

The following steps must be printed on cards/large pieces of paper (each step on a card, cards must not have a number) so the teams can give them the order they think is best. One step is on each paper/card. Mix up the cards in the envelope so that they are not in the correct order when the teams get them.

Final study design proposal and contract signature (TOR).

Arrive at the field, meet gatekeepers, have a proper introduction with authorities (previous contact needed).

Qualitative experts choose the proper tools (due to topics and subjects)/ protocol/evaluation design.

Talk to the program implementers (start fieldwork/notes). Agree with them about evaluation questions → topics → subjects.

If tools changed a lot after piloting, submit again to the IRB tools.

Go through the review of the ethics committee (IRB).

FIELDWORK time!

In case the field work shows a different reality than previously supposed < Modify your protocol and go back to IRB.

Pilot tools, buy materials and prepare fieldwork. Find and train team for fieldwork.

Find the correct informants:
Who is willing to participate, and why?
Who is not willing to participate, and why?

Start the “formal” analysis.

Finish fieldwork: Go back home.

Find “gaps” and “emerging data,” make decisions in the field.

Take field notes.

Back up information.

Do midpoint analysis meetings with fieldwork team:

In case fieldwork is not going as planned: analyze why (what are the consequences for the evaluation question), make conceptual or methodological adjustments in order to: a) revise the question; and b) revise the methods in order to answer the question.

Apply tools/techniques (interviews, focus groups, etc.).

Order data: finding "gaps" and "emerging data," go back to fieldwork (in case it is needed).

Here is the answer guide for the order:

1. Talk to the program implementers (start fieldwork/notes).
    a. Agreeing with them about questions → topics → subjects.
2. Qualitative experts choose the proper tools (due to topics and subjects): Protocol: Evaluation design.
3. Final study design proposal and contract signature (TOR).
4. Go through the review of the ethics committee (IRB).
5. Pilot tools, buy materials and prepare fieldwork. Find and train team for fieldwork.
6. If tools changed a lot after piloting, submit again to the IRB tools.
7. FIELDWORK time!
    a. F.1. Arriving at the field, meeting gatekeepers, having a proper introduction with authorities (previous contact needed).
    b. F. 2. Finding the correct informants.
        i. Who is willing to participate, and why?
        ii. Who is not willing to participate, and why?
    c. F. 3. Applying tools/techniques (interviews, focus groups, etc.).
    d. F. 4. Taking field notes (each night!).
    e. F. 5. Backing up information.
    f. F.6. Doing midpoint analysis meetings with fieldwork team.
        i. In case fieldwork is not going as planned: analyze why (what are the consequences of the evaluation question), make conceptual or methodological adjustments in order to: a) revise the question; and b) revise the methods in order to answer the question.
        ii. Finding "gaps" and "emerging data," making decisions on the field.
        iii. In case the field work shows a different reality than previously supposed < Modify your protocol and go back to IRB.
8. Finished fieldwork: Go back home.
9. Ordering data: finding "gaps" and "emerging data," going back to fieldwork (in case it is needed).
10. Stating the "formal" analysis time.

Group Activity 2. Sample Timeline Handout

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
a) Talk to program implementers (start fieldwork/notes); agree on the questions → topics → subjects.												
b) Qualitative experts choose the proper tools (due to topics and subjects): Protocol: Evaluation design.												
c) Finalize study design proposal and contract signatures (TOR).												
d) Go through the ethics committee review process (IRB).												
e) Pilot tools, buy materials and prepare for fieldwork; find and train team for fieldwork.												
f) If tools changed significantly after piloting, resubmit to the IRB.												
g) FIELDWORK time! Arrive to the field, meet gatekeepers, have a proper introduction with authorities (previous contact needed).												
h) Identify the best possible informants. Who is willing to participate, and why? Who is not willing to participate, and why?												
i) Apply tools/techniques (conduct interviews, focus groups, etc.).												
j) Take field notes (every day!).												
k) Back up information.												
l) Conduct midpoint analysis meetings with fieldwork team: i. If fieldwork is not going as planned: analyze why (what the consequences for the evaluation question are), make conceptual or methodological adjustments in order to: a) revise the question; and b) revise methods to suit the question. ii. Identify "gaps" and "emerging data," make decisions regarding fieldwork. 1. If needed, modify your protocol and go back to IRB.												
m) Finish fieldwork: Go back home.												
n) Review and organize data: identify "gaps" and "emerging data", go back to fieldwork (if needed).												
o) Start the "formal" analysis.												

Group Activity 2. Sample Timeline Answers (for Facilitator)

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
a) Talking with program implementers (start fieldwork/notes). i. Agreeing with them questions → topics → subjects.	x	X										
b) Qualitative experts choose the proper tools (due to topics and subjects): Protocol: Evaluation design.		X	X									
c) Final study design proposal and contract signature (TOR).			X									
d) Go through the review of the ethics committee (IRB).			x	x	X							
e) Piloting tools, buying materials and preparing fieldwork, finding and training team for fieldwork.					X							
f) If tools changed a lot after piloting, submit again to the IRB tools.					X							
g) FIELDWORK time! i. F.1. Arriving into the field, meeting gatekeepers, having a proper introduction with authorities (previous contact needed)					x	x	X					
ii. F. 2. Finding the correct informants. 1. Who is willing to participate, and why? 2. Who is not willing to participate, and why?					X	x	x					
iii. F. 3. Applying tools/techniques (interviews, focus groups, etc.).					x	x	X					
iv. F. 4. Taking field notes (each night!).					x	x	X					
v. F. 5. Back up information.			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	X	
vi. F.6. Doing midpoint analysis meetings with fieldwork team: 1. In case fieldwork is not going as planned: analyze why (what are the consequences for the evaluation question), make conceptual or methodological adjustments in order to: a) revise the question; and b) revise methods to suit the question. 2. Finding "gaps" and "emerging data," take decisions on the field. 3. In case the field work shows a different reality than previously thought: Modify your protocol and go back to IRB.					x	x	X					
h) Finished fieldwork: Go back home.								X				
i) Ordering data: finding "gaps" and "emerging data," going back to fieldwork (in case it is needed).								x	X			
j) Starting the "formal" analysis.										x	x	X

APPENDIX H. CHECKLIST AND SAMPLE ANSWERS FOR SESSION 10 ACTIVITIES

Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Studies (COREQ): 32-Item Checklist

Developed from:

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.

No. item	Guide questions/description	Reported on page #
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
Personal characteristics		
1. Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	
2. Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? (e.g., PhD, MD)	
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	
Relationship with participants		
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	
7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? (e.g., personal goals, reasons for doing the research)	
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/ facilitator? (e.g., bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic)	
Domain 2: study design		
Theoretical framework		
9. Methodological orientation and theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? (e.g., grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis)	
Participant selection		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? (e.g., purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball)	
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? (e.g., face-to-face, telephone, mail, email)	
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	

No. item	Guide questions/description	Reported on page #
Setting		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? (e.g., home, clinic, workplace)	
15. Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	
16. Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? (e.g., demographic data, date)	
Data collection		
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	
21. Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
Data analysis		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	
Reporting		
29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? (e.g., participant number)	
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	

Group Activity: Learning the Lingo

Sample Answers

Audience	Sample paragraph
For the community	The discussion of trustworthiness for the community will never employ any of the academic language. The evaluator will have to use a translator and possibly pictorial feedback. Male and female groups may have to be addressed separately and the location must be safe and comfortable for the community. The discussion would focus on how the study was supported by local gatekeepers and the intentions of the organization, or evaluation. The credentials of the evaluators will have to be established. This may well include a short introduction by a community leader of the evaluators. Anonymized direct quotations may support this. The focus will also be on the consequential validity. It will be important to focus on what the impact and follow-up from the study will be for the community.
Cambridge University	Presentation for Cambridge University would include quick overview of how trustworthiness was established. The focus would be on methodological rigor and the audit trail. The audience will also be mainly focused on the implications for similar contexts beyond this particular case. Sufficiently rich description will be required to allow for repeating the evaluation in other sites. For example, non-response and response analysis, credentials, funders, etc., for the research. The focus would be on the transferability aspect, though.
World Health Organization	Presentation for WHO would include a quick overview of how trustworthiness was established. For example, non-response and response analysis, credentials, funders, etc., for the research. The focus would be on the transferability aspect, though, including, resources, practicality, and existing WHO network. • Site information • Gate keepers and contacts to gain access • Practical information on efficient ways to reach the community and how to link with existing networks • How to apply the approach to other contexts • What was unique to this context

APPENDIX I. SAMPLE PRE-/POST-TESTS FOR PARTICIPANTS

Qualitative Methods in Evaluation: Pre-/Post-Workshop Survey

We would like to gather some information about your pre-/post-training proficiency level and/or experience relating to the core qualitative evaluation competencies.

Please complete this brief questionnaire by [INSERT DATE]. Thank you!

Please indicate your proficiency level relating to the following qualitative evaluation competencies, by choosing the appropriate level on the scale below.

Novice (limited experience): You have the level of experience gained in a classroom and/or experimental scenarios or as a trainee on-the-job. You are expected to need help when performing this skill.

Intermediate (practical application): You can apply this competency to situations occasionally while needing minimal guidance to perform successfully.

Advanced (applied theory): You can perform the actions associated with this skill without assistance. You are certainly recognized within your immediate organization as "a person to ask" when difficult questions arise regarding this competency. You participate in senior level discussions regarding this competency.

Expert (recognized as authority): You are known as an expert in this area. You have demonstrated consistent excellence in applying this competency across multiple projects and/or organizations. You can provide guidance, troubleshoot, and answer questions related to this area of expertise and the field where the skill is used.

	Novice (1)	Intermediate (2)	Advanced (3)	Expert (4)
a) **Characterization** – 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. (1)	○	○	○	○
b) **Evaluation questions and theory of change** – 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. (2)	○	○	○	○
c) **Methods** – Assess and select appropriate methods for qualitative evaluations. (3)	○	○	○	○
d) **Data collection Tools** – Develop data collection tools that reflect the evaluation question(s). (4)	○	○	○	○
e) **Methods/design of sampling methods in qualitative** – Discuss the nature of sampling participants in qualitative evaluations. (5)	○	○	○	○
f) **Analysis** – Appropriately select qualitative data analysis techniques to develop evaluation question – relevant themes drawing on the evidence. (6)	○	○	○	○

	Novice (1)	Intermediate (2)	Advanced (3)	Expert (4)
g) **Applying qualitative norms in research** – Understand and apply approaches to strengthen trustworthiness/quality of the findings from qualitative evaluation. (7)	○	○	○	○
h) **Fieldwork considerations** (including practical and ethical) – Discuss practical constraints and requirements in qualitative evaluation, and develop a fieldwork plan that takes this into consideration. (8)	○	○	○	○
i) **Data presentation and dissemination** – Evaluate the appropriateness of various types of data presentation and dissemination for particular audiences. (9)	○	○	○	○
j) **Ethical principles for qualitative evaluation** – Identify and address ethical, and political implications of, and considerations in, evaluation work. (10)	○	○	○	○
k) **Addressing gender considerations in qualitative evaluation** – Identify and address gender implications of, and considerations in, evaluation work. (11)	○	○	○	○

APPENDIX J. SAMPLE WELCOME LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS (INCLUDING RECOMMENDED PRE-COURSE READINGS)

[insert date]

Dear participant,

We are very happy that you will be joining us for the workshop on Advancing Qualitative Methods in Evaluation, to be held at [insert location] on [insert dates]. We are writing you to give you more information about the workshop and how we will organize the work.

The purpose of this course is to build participants' knowledge and advance their capacity to apply qualitative methods in evaluation of public health programs. This course contextualizes qualitative research within rigorous evaluation, rather than offering the basics of a qualitative research approach. The workshop is comprised of lectures, practical applications and case studies, and a group project.

It is recommended that before you attend the workshop you review the basic concepts of qualitative methods, including in-depth interviews, focus group discussions, and participant observation. We will not be covering introductory topics in this workshop.

On the concepts of qualitative evaluation, there are good introductory books. We recommend that you review some of the following books/manuals:

- Mack, N., Woodsong, C., MacQueen, K.M., Guest, G., Namey, E. (2005). Qualitative Research Methods: A Data Collector's Field Guide. United States: FHI 360. Retrieved from https://www.fhi360.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/Qualitative%20Research%20Methods%20-%20A%20Data%20Collector%27s%20Field%20Guide.pdf
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods. 3rd Edition. Pp. 598. Chapter 2. Qualitative Design and Data Collection (especially pp. 207-339). Thousand Oaks, CA, USA; London, UK; New Delhi, India: SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (Eds.). (2003). Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers. USA: SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Ulin, P.R. Robinson, E.T., Tolley, E.E. (2005). Qualitative Methods in Public Health: A Field Guide for Applied Research. San Francisco, CA, USA: Jossey-Bass.
- USAID Learning Lab: Evaluation for Evaluation Specialists Training: Qualitative Methods: Retrieved from https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/evaluation-evaluation-specialists-training-qualitative-methods

And, if you would like more intermediate level readings, you should consider reading the following articles/books:

<u>Further resources on data collection methods and consideration:</u>

- Devers, K. J., & Frankel, R. (2000). Study Design in Qualitative Research—2: Sampling and Data Collection Strategies. *Education for Health;* 13(2)263–271.
- DiCicco-Bloom, B., Crabtree, B.F. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical education journal.*
- Guest, G., Namey, E., & McKenna, K. (2016). How many focus groups are enough? Building an evidence base for non-probability sample sizes. *Field Methods;* 29(1):3–22.
- Hewitt, J. (2007). Ethical components of research researched relationships in qualitative interviewing. Qual Health Res; 17(8):1149–59.

- McLafferty, I. (2004). Focus group interviews as a data collecting strategy. *J Adv Nurs;* 48(2):187–94.
- Nakkash, R., Makhoul, J., Afifi, R. (2009). Obtaining informed consent: observations from community research with refugee and impoverished youth. *J Med Ethics;* 35(10):638–43.

<u>Resources on qualitative data analysis:</u>

- Fereday, J., & Miur-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *IJOM;* 50(1).
- MacQueen, K.M., Mclellan, E. Kay, K., & Milstein, B. (1998). Codebook development for team-based qualitative analysis. *Cultural Anthropology Methods;* 10(2).

<u>Further resources on methodological rigor in qualitative research:</u>

- Coryn, L.S. (2007) The Holy Trinity of Methodological Rigor: A Skeptical View. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation;* 4(7):1556–8180. (Required reading for workshop session.) Retrieved from http://evaluation.wmich.edu/jmde/
- Davies, D., Dodd, J. (2002). Qualitative research and the question of rigor. *Qual Health Res;* 12(2):279–89.
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Website: Lincoln and Guba's Evaluative Criteria for trustworthiness: http://www.qualres.org/HomeLinc-3684.html

We strongly suggest that you bring your own laptop.

We also assume that you have familiarity with basic monitoring and evaluation (M&E) concepts.

Please find attached a copy of the agenda with the topics we will cover during the workshop.

An important component of the workshop is the group work. Its goal is to provide you with an opportunity for hands-on experience developing a proposal for evaluating a program. We will review the basic items that should be included in a qualitative evaluation proposal and you and your group will develop one for a health program chosen by the group. Participants will form groups of 4–5 members who will work together during several of the daily afternoon sessions of the workshop. We will provide guidelines for the group work and instructors will be available to provide advice on the development of your impact evaluation proposal. The results of the group work will be presented to the entire workshop and instructors the last day of the workshop.

In order to make the work as meaningful and realistic as possible, groups should base their work on an actual program that is already taking place, or one that is planned to be implemented in the near future. The program may be implemented at the national or regional level. **We are asking you to submit a summary description of a program that you would like to propose to be considered for the qualitative evaluation group work by [insert date].** The description of the program should include: Program goals and specific objectives; program components; key outcomes/concepts of interest; target areas and/or target population groups; program participation selection criteria; implementation plan and timeline; and evaluation plan or activities (if any has been done). The program description should be no longer than two pages. We will review the program descriptions you send and assess which ones are promising for the group work. We will select 4–5 for the groupwork and then share the information with participants before the workshop so that everyone can rate their top three choices. We will then assign participants to groups based on their stated interests and skill levels. Those who submit a program are automatically assigned to theirs if it is selected.

Daily sessions will start promptly at 9am sharp.

Best regards and looking forward to seeing you in [insert location].

[insert signatures]

APPENDIX K. SAMPLE WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

International Workshop on Qualitative Evaluation Methods in Public Health Evaluation

[insert location]

[Insert dates]

<u>EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE</u>

****

1. Please rate the workshop as a whole by circling your answer. (1 is poor and 10 is excellent)

Poor..Excellent

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2. Please rate the following items by circling your answer.

<u>Overall Course Content:</u>

Poor..Excellent

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

<u>Quality of Instruction:</u>

Poor..Excellent

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

<u>Learning Environment:</u>

Poor..Excellent

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

<u>Training Materials:</u>

Poor..Excellent

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

<u>Overall Level of Satisfaction:</u>

Poor..Excellent

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Additional comments or suggestions?

3. The main objectives of this workshop are: To build knowledge about the core competencies of the course audience 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. The course aims to cover the following qualitative evaluation competency categories:

- Concepts, approaches, and purposes of qualitative methods in evaluation
- Creating and conceptualizing evaluation questions
- Troubleshooting selected qualitative methods for evaluation
- 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
- The emergent nature of qualitative evaluation

Please explain if you think the course met its objective. If you think it did not, please explain how it could be improved.

..

4. **Please indicate your current proficiency level relating to the following QE competencies, by circling the appropriate level on the scale below.**

Novice (limited experience): You have the level of experience gained in a classroom and/or experimental scenarios or as a trainee on-the-job. You are expected to need help when performing this skill.

Intermediate (practical application): You can apply this competency to situations occasionally while needing minimal guidance to perform successfully.

Advanced (applied theory): You can perform the actions associated with this skill without assistance. You are certainly recognized within your immediate organization as "a person to ask" when difficult questions arise regarding this competency. You participate in senior level discussions regarding this competency.

Expert (recognized as authority): You are known as an expert in this area. You have demonstrated consistent excellence in applying this competency across multiple projects and/or organizations. You can provide guidance, troubleshoot and answer questions related to this area of expertise and the field where the skill is used.

Competency	Proficiency Level
a. Characterization: Discuss major concepts, approaches, and types of qualitative methods in evaluation, including the purpose of using qualitative methods in evaluation and the use of paradigms in qualitative evaluation.	Novice…………Intermediate…………Advanced…………Expert
b. Creating and conceptualizing evaluation questions: 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.	Novice…………Intermediate…………Advanced…………Expert
c. Troubleshooting in selected qualitative methods (IDIs, FGDs, and observations): Describe ways to mitigate common problems in qualitative methods	Novice…………Intermediate…………Advanced…………Expert
d. Data collection tools: Develop data collection tools that reflect the evaluation questions	Novice…………Intermediate…………Advanced…………Expert
e. Sampling: Discuss the nature of sampling participants in qualitative evaluations.	Novice…………Intermediate…………Advanced…………Expert
f. Analysis: Appropriately select qualitative data analysis techniques to develop evaluation question-relevant themes drawing on the evidence	Novice…………Intermediate…………Advanced…………Expert
g. Fieldwork considerations: Discuss practical constraints and requirements in qualitative evaluation, and develop a fieldwork plan that takes this into consideration.	Novice…………Intermediate…………Advanced…………Expert
h. Ethics: Identify and address ethical, gender-related, and political implications of, and considerations in, evaluation work.	Novice…………Intermediate…………Advanced…………Expert
i. Applying Qualitative norms in research: Understand and apply approaches to strengthen trustworthiness of the findings from qualitative evaluation;	Novice…………Intermediate…………Advanced…………Expert
j. Data presentation and dissemination -- Evaluate the appropriateness of various types of data presentation for particular audiences.	Novice…………Intermediate…………Advanced…………Expert

5. How appropriate were the training methods? Please circle your answer.

Lectures/Presentations:

Inappropriate ....Appropriate

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Case Studies:

Inappropriate ....Appropriate

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Participant Activities/Small Group Work:

Inappropriate ....Appropriate

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Additional comments or suggestions?

6. Please list other topics that you would like to see covered in future QE workshops.

7. How would you rate amount of information presented during the course? Too much? Just right? Too little? Please indicate by circling your answer.

Inappropriate ....Appropriate

Too much Just right Too little

Additional comments or suggestions?

8. How has the workshop inspired you to introduce or apply QE curriculum materials in your work (evaluation, teaching, technical assistance)?

....

9. After completing this workshop, what additional help/training do you think you might need before you are able to implement your new skills?

....

10. In your opinion, who would be the target audience for this curriculum—i.e., who do you think would benefit most from this training?

....

11. How were the facilities at the workshop venue? (1 is poor and 10 is excellent)

Poor .... Excellent

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

What recommendations would you offer to improve the course facilities?

....

12. Additional comments or suggestions?

MEASURE Evaluation
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
123 West Franklin Street Building C, Suite 330
Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA 27516
Phone: +1 919-445-9350
measure@unc.edu
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-17-121B
ISBN: 978-1-64232-073-2 |