APPENDIX A | Evaluation Methods

In support of the African American Men and Boys Task Force (AAMBTF) initiative, the evaluation was designed to assess a subset of AAMBTF grantees' implementation processes and progress toward programmatic goals, and to examine their outcomes across each of the four priority areas. The evaluation design was guided by the following primary research questions:

1. How successful has each grantee been in executing its proposed implementation plan?
2. How successful has each grantee been in reaching its stated goals?
3. What collective impact have the AAMBTF programs had within each priority area?

The evaluation described in the main report examines how well programs implemented their planned activities (process evaluation), and assesses the impact that the programs had on participants (outcome evaluation). RAND's team worked collaboratively with each grantee to articulate specific program goals. After each grantee specified the overarching goals, we worked together to develop specific objectives and to identify indicators that could be used to measure progress in each goal area. The goals, objectives, and indicators were documented in a matrix that provided the basis for the quarterly progress report format described below. The process also provided an opportunity for grantees to receive technical assistance in areas of need related to their program or evaluation.

We used the process and outcomes data collected to develop the cross-site analyses in the main body of this report.[1] The detailed program profiles describe the development and implementation of each program (Appendix B). We used the completed program descriptions to synthesize information and identify the factors related to program context, features, and implementation processes that are described in the main report.

Process Evaluation

The process evaluation component was designed to assess progress toward programmatic goals and to document implementation, including the barriers and facilitators to implementation. We used a variety of techniques to examine the implementation process, including quarterly progress reports, key informant interviews, program observations, program performance interviews, document review, and regular e-mail and telephone communication. These activities, which we will describe in more detail, varied according to the stage of program implementation.

[1] Dana Schultz and Lisa Sontag-Padilla, *Building Better Boyhood Programs: Evaluation of Programs Funded by the African American Men and Boys Task Force Initiative*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, RR-1150, 2015. As of August 31, 2015: http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1150.html

Quarterly progress reports. Beginning in the first quarter of 2012, each active grantee completed quarterly progress reports. The first section of the report asked a series of open-ended questions to allow the grantee to comment on overall implementation, any changes during the reporting period, any challenges or barriers to implementing the program, and how those challenges or barriers were or would be addressed. This section also provided an opportunity for the grantee to ask the Heinz or RAND team any questions related to the program or the initiative overall. The second section of the report had a table that allowed the grantee to report on progress toward the overall goals and specific objectives. The grantees were asked to provide both indicator and activity updates for each objective as appropriate. The indicator updates were such things as the number of sessions, number of participants, or average pretest scores. The activity updates included more-qualitative information, such as the meeting topics or project types. Each quarter, we compiled the information from the quarterly progress reports into a summary for each grantee with a progress update on enrollment, sessions, attendance, and each program component. The summary also included any outcome information available that quarter.

Key informant interviews. To understand the implementation process and overall progress, we conducted interviews with personnel actively involved in the development and implementation of each program. Beginning in the spring of 2012, the RAND team conducted interviews on a biannual schedule. For each grantee, we interviewed the program coordinator (if applicable) and one or two others who were involved in program delivery, such as group facilitators, mentors, etc. We used a semistructured interview guide focused on a variety of aspects of program implementation, including planning, the different program components, staff training, facility and/or organizational changes, program management, stakeholder engagement, information dissemination, and implementation processes. The questions covered barriers and facilitators to program implementation, adjustments made, organizational or staff changes, ongoing staff development, degree of stakeholder involvement and necessary resources.

Program observations. To understand the program setting and delivery, we observed program sessions starting in the fall of 2012 for all active grantees. Whenever possible, we observed a “typical” session of the grantee’s primary program component, usually a group workshop or curriculum session. In some cases, we were able to observe several program components (e.g., a group workshop and tutoring).

Program performance interviews. To assess program capacity and performance of tasks associated with high-quality programming, we conducted program performance interviews in the spring of 2013 with the program director/coordinator for all active grantees. We adapted a program performance interview protocol developed to assess performance of activities targeted by the ten steps of the Getting to Outcomes (GTO) model to guide these interviews.[2] The interview protocol included sections on goals and objectives, implementation, planning, process evaluation, outcome evaluation, continuous quality improvement, and sustainability with specific questions in each area. Two members of the RAND team independently scored each question, then rated each area to assess performance and capacity using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from no implementation or integration to good implementation or integration.

Document review. For each grantee, we reviewed all available documents including proposals, planning materials, program descriptions, curricula, and training manuals. If these materials were not available, we used verbal reports from those involved in program planning and implementation for this information.

Regular e-mail and telephone communication. We also gathered descriptive and contextual information about implementation via regular email and telephone communications with program staff.

Outcome Evaluation

For the outcome evaluation component, we worked with each grantee to determine whether they were already collecting outcome data or planned to collect outcome data. We used an interactive process with the grantees to determine what potential data were available or could be collected to assess outcomes linked to the program's goals. There was variability across the grantees in the stage of implementation, which limited the availability of outcome information for grantees that were entering the final six months of their grant period during the evaluation process. Other grantees were still in the planning or early implementation stages at the start of the evaluation period, which allowed us to provide more guidance on selecting and using appropriate measures of knowledge, attitudes, or behavior. Additionally, the grant period for several grantees was extended via new grants, allowing us to work with grantees to reevaluate and adjust goals and objectives and improve their fit with the program. We included any specific outcome indicators in the matrix described above and asked the grantees to report on the outcomes data in the quarterly progress reports. For some grantees, we provided technical assistance related to data collection (e.g., measure selection, tool development) and analysis to improve the quality of the information provided and increase grantee capacity for evaluation.

---

[2] Matthew Chinman, Pamela Imm, and Abraham Wandersman, *Getting to Outcomes™ 2004: Promoting Accountability Through Methods and Tools for Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, 2004. As of July 22, 2015: http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR101