University of Southern California
Leonard Davis School of Gerontology
Gerontology 555
Spring 2019

Instructor: George Shannon, MSG, Ph.D.   **Teaching Assistant TBD**
Office: Room 226 B
Class Time: Monday 12:00 PM – 2:50 PM
Office Hours: Monday 12:00 PM – 1:00 PM by appointment
Cell Phone/Text: (323) 821-6813
E-mail: gshannon@usc.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION

There are several career paths available to students after graduation. However, for you to be content and successful in your career, it is important for you to develop the skills that will allow you to perform certain essential tasks at a professional level. One of the skills that you will almost certainly need is program evaluation. As a working, professional Gerontologist, you may be asked by your employer to evaluate evidence-based programs that have demonstrated some success at improving the health outcomes and quality of life for older adults living in the community, for example.

To determine the overall effectiveness of a particular project, program evaluators assess the following processes: Program design, efforts outreach to targeted communities, development of a needs assessment survey, whether the team performed structured or semi-structured interviews and focus groups, implementation, and program outcomes/impact/replication efforts. In this class, we will analyze general principles of evaluation, with a focus on the RE-AIM evaluation framework. The RE-AIM framework provides a concise structure to view the tasks associated with program evaluation; it is currently mandated by the Administration on Aging for evaluating many federally funded projects and is a preferred tool by many other program funders. The goal of this class is to create an understanding and awareness of the processes involved in developing an evaluation proposal. You are encouraged to ask questions if you do not understand something. I will post a link, weekly, in the Assignments Section of Blackboard for that week. Print the handouts and keep them in a notebook as reference materials.

"The right way to do things is not to try to persuade people you're right but to challenge them to think it through for themselves." -- Noam Chomsky

COURSE STRUCTURE

This course is administered through the USC Blackboard Learn learning management system (LMS), accessed at https://blackboard.usc.edu. All course work and normal communications will be managed through the LMS. Matters of a personal nature can be communicated to the instructor by email. Additionally, the class instructor will maintain office hours, detailed above, for face-to-face discussions. In-person meetings may be arranged at other times by emailing the class TA.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

At the end of this course, students will be able to:
1. Discuss the importance of program evaluation in social research

2. Conduct research and evaluation techniques from an interdisciplinary perspective
3. Differentiate between program designs [e.g., randomized control trial (RCT) and quasi-experimental designs].
4. Explain the pros and cons of mixed methods research strategies.
5. Develop an approach to program evaluation, including:
    a. Creating a logic model
    b. Conducting stakeholder interviews and focus groups
    c. Creating a needs assessment survey
    d. Understanding the RE-AIM evaluation framework*
    e. Performing basic mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative) data collection and analysis
    f. Writing an evaluation proposal or evaluating an existing program

*There are several valid evaluation methodologies, in this class we will focus on the RE-AIM framework

REQUIRED REFERENCES

Rossi, Lipsey & Freeman, 2004. Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (7^h Edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Ltd.
Curry, L. & Nunez-Smith, M. 2015. Mixed Methods in Health Sciences Research: A Practical Primer. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Ltd.

ONLINE EVALUATION RESOURCES:

- Evaluation Strategies for Human Services Programs: A Guide for Policymakers and Providers. https://www.bja.gov/evaluation/guide/documents/evaluation_strategies.html
- W.K. Kellogg Foundation. (1998). Evaluation Handbook: Philosophy and Expectations. http://www.wkkf.org/knowledge-center/publications-and-resources.aspx
- W.K. Kellogg Foundation: Logic Model Development. http://www.wkkf.org/knowledge-center/resources/2006/02/WK-Kellogg-Foundation-Logic-Model-Development-Guide.aspx
- The RE-AIM Framework. http://re-aim.org/

ARTICLES FOR ABSTRACT PRESENTATIONS

1. Glasgow, R. E. Vogt, T, M. & Boles, S. M. (1999). Belza, B., Toobert, D. J., & Glasgow, R. E. (2007). RE-AIM for Program Planning: Overview and Applications [Monograph]. Retrieved from www.NCOA.org.
2. Schwingel, A., Gálvez, P, Linares, D, & Sebastião E. 2016. Using a Mixed-Methods RE-AIM Framework to Evaluate Community Health Programs for Older Latinas. J Aging Health. pii: 0898264316641075.
3. Belza, B., Toobert, D. J., & Glasgow, R. E. (2007). RE-AIM for Program Planning: Overview and Applications [Monograph]. Retrieved from www.NCOA.org.
4. Planas L. G. (2008). Intervention Design, Implementation, and Evaluation. American Journal of Health-Systems Pharmacy, 65, 1854-1863.
5. Kohn M., Belza B., Petrescu-Prahova M., Miyawaki C. E. 2016. Beyond Strength: Participant Perspectives on the Benefits of an Older Adult Exercise Program. Health Educ Behav. 43(3), 305-12. doi: 10.1177/1090198115599985.
6. King, D. K., Glasgow, R. E., & Leeman-Castillo, B. (2010). Reaiming RE-AIM: Using the Model to Plan, Implement, and Evaluate the Effects of Environmental Change Approaches to Enhancing Population Health American Journal of Public Health |100 (11), 2076-2084.
7. Jilcott, S. B., Ammerman, A. S., Sommers, J., & Glasgow, R. E. (2007). Applying the RE-AIM framework to assess the public health impact of policy change. Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 34, 105-114.

8. Goode, A. D & Eakin E. G. 2013. Dissemination of an evidence-based telephone-delivered lifestyle intervention: factors associated with successful implementation and evaluation. *Translational Behavioral Medicine,* 3(4), 351–356.
9. McGoey, T. Root Z, Bruner MW, Law B. 2015. Evaluation of physical activity interventions in children via the reach, efficacy/effectiveness, adoption, implementation, and maintenance (RE-AIM) framework: A systematic review of randomized and non-randomized trials. Prev Med. 82:8-19. doi: 10.1016
10. Spencer, L, M., Schooley, M. W., Anderson, L.A., Kochtitzky, C.S., DeGroff, A.S., Devlin, H.M., et al. 2013. Seeking best practices: a conceptual framework for planning and improving evidence-based practices. *Prevention of Chronic Diseases*, 10, 1-9. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5888/pcd10.130186.
11. Ory, M.G., Altpeter, M., Belza, B., Helduser, J., Zhang, C. & Smith, M. L. 2015. Perceived Utility of the RE-AIM Framework for Health Promotion/Disease Prevention Initiatives for Older Adults: A Case Study from the U.S. Evidence-Based Disease Prevention Initiative. *Front Public Health*(2), 143, 1-18. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2014.00143.
12. Samia, L.W., Aboueissa A.M., Halloran J., Hepburn K. 2014. The Maine Savvy Caregiver Project: translating an evidence-based dementia family caregiver program within the RE-AIM Framework. *Journal of Gerontological social Work,* 57(6-7):640-61. doi: 10.1080/01634372.2013.859201.
13. D. A. Dzewaltowski, R. E. Glasgow, L. M. Klesges, Paul A. Estabrooks & E. Brock. 2004, RE-AIM: Evidence-based standards and a web resource to improve translation of research into practice. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine.* 28(2), 75-80
14. Estabrooks, P A. & Allen, K. C. 2013. Updating, employing, and adapting: a commentary on what does it mean to "employ" the re-aim model. *Evaluation Health Professionals, 67-72. doi:10.1177/0163278712460546*
15. Neta, G., Glasgow, R. E., Carpenter, C. R., Grimshaw, J. M., Rabin, B. A., Fernandez, M.E., & Brownson, R. C. 2015. A framework for enhancing the value of research for dissemination and implementation. *American Journal of Public Health*, 105(1), 49-57.
16. Gaglio, B., Shoup, J. A. & Glasgow, R. E. The re-aim framework: A systematic review of use over time. 2013. *American Journal of Public Health,* 103(6), e38-e46
17. Compernolle *et al.2014.* A RE-AIM evaluation of evidence-based multi-level interventions to improve obesity-related behaviours in adults: a systematic review. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 2014, **11**:147 http://www.ijbnpa.org/content/11/1/147
18. Harden, SM, Gaglio B, Shoup JA, Kinney KA, Johnson SB, Brito F, Blackman KC, Zoellner JM, Hill JL, Almeida FA, Glasgow RE & Estabrooks PA. 2015 Nov 8. Fidelity to and comparative results across behavioral interventions evaluated through the RE-AIM framework: a systematic review. Syst Rev.;4:155. doi: 10.1186/s13643-015-0141-0.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND ASSIGNMENTS

Students must formulate and briefly discuss one abstract, participate in online discussions and work with selected to develop a team final project, including, a live PowerPoint presentation (for online students a narrated PowerPoint presentation). The discussion part of your abstract is informal and may be presented from your desk, using the written abstract as reference. Online students will use You Tube to create a presentation of their abstract. Again, these are informal.

Sign up for your individual choice of abstract topic and due date on Google Drive by Week 2. All abstracts, presentations and papers must be submitted both in Google Drive (I will send out the links) and in the appropriate Blackboard Assignments section.

SIGN-UP SHEET

Any changes you make within the sign-up sheet will be tracked, so be careful not to change anyone else's choices or save the document in your name – just put your name in the space provided nest to the name of the article/chapter. It is first come, first choice. If you have a conflict, work it out with the person who has the choice you need.

ASSIGNMENT GUIDELINES:

Knowing how to summarize, analyze and present information is an important skill not only in an academic setting, but also in the work place. As you try your hand at writing and sharing Abstracts in this class, remember that your fellow students are relying on you to broaden their understanding of the ideas and topics we are studying.

Formatting for abstracts
All paper submissions should us APA style guidelines and be grammatically acceptable, single-spaced, left margin, Times New Roman 12. Paper submissions must be submitted as Microsoft Word documents, and include page numbers. Cite to help class members find sources. Papers should be formatted with a heading (left-justified) that includes name, course number, and assignment as follows:

Smith, John
Gero 555
Final Paper

ABSTRACT PRESENTATION
Use the following as a format for your Abstract/Abstract Presentation:

I.   Full reference for article you are abstracting **APA Publication Guidelines, 6th edition**.

II.   Summary: Summarize the thesis or main idea of this article in **one clear and concise sentence or two, at the most**. You might accomplish this by beginning your sentence with the following, "The author(s) argued that…

III.   Main Points:
1.   List three main points from the chapter/article. These should be stated in two or three sentences each. (Your goal is to give other students the benefit of your evaluation of the material).
     a)
     b)
     c)
IV.   Analysis:
1.   Analyze the article using these headings.
     a.   What are the results and/or conclusions? In two or three sentences
     b.   How do these points relate to the topics and themes addressed in classwork?
Thanks to Professor Vern Bengtson

E-CLASS DISCUSSIONS
Every student is expected to participate in the 10 E-class discussions occurring most weeks throughout the semester (worth 100 points, 10 X 10 = 100 points). Online students are required to submit at least two posts each week on the discussion board. In-class students are required to submit at least one post each week on the discussion board. All discussion post must be submitted by that week's due date listed on Blackboard. Do not wait until the last day to post or you will not be able to interact with other students and you will lose points. **Posts must be more than just acknowledgement of someone else's post, you must contribute to the discussion by expanding the content or making an insightful statement that clarifies or disagrees with another posting**. Your discussion grade will result from either or both of two parts: (1) your original comments and (2) your reactions/interactions with others. You may also ask a question of your

own if you need clarification about some point or issue in the weekly book or Abstract Presentation topics. There is no limit to the number of responses or interactions that you may post.

MID-TERM EXAM

A mid-term exam (true/false, multiple choice and short essay questions of 250-300 words) will be administered on Tuesday February 19, 2019 from 2-3 PM. This will be an online exam, you will have 1 hour to complete the exam. This type of online exam requires that you complete the exam within 1 hour from the time you begin. There is no stopping or saving during the exam. The exam will cover material that will have discussed, including the student abstracts during the first 6 weeks of class. All student abstracts will be available on Google Drive.

FINAL PROJECT

Your final project will consist of an oral presentation, written proposal, and project commentary. Class members will work in teams, assigned during the first-class session, to present an oral Abstract Presentation and write an evaluation proposal for a program. The project commentary will be submitted as an individual narrative of the group process.

ORAL PRESENTATION (30 Minutes)

Oral Final Paper Presentations will be scheduled on the Week 13. These final presentations are expected to be cogently conceived and professionally conveyed. The content must relate to course concepts and follow the Final Paper Rubric. Again, class members are encouraged to ask questions for opportunities to earn class participation credit.

PROGRAM EVALUATION OR PROPOSAL (The final papers will be 15-20 pages in length, not counting title page references and addenda.

Using the RE-AIM evaluation framework, your evaluation proposal or program evaluation will include a statement of the problem and a description of the project with a literature review, using a minimum of ten references (you may include materials from this class for some, but not all references), program design (randomized control trial, quasi-experimental, e.g.), target population, sample selection, evaluation goals, and objectives, a methods section, including a logic model, data collection process, outcome measures, and data analysis strategy. Finally, you will develop a budget narrative with a table and a brief timeline that may be in table or graphic form, with a brief narrative, concluding with the final paper to be submitted to the stakeholders, including the funders of the project, administrators of the project, and the participants. I will provide you with a grading rubric that must be followed.

WRITTEN COMMENTARY

Your project commentary represents an individual component of the final project. In your project commentary, you are asked to provide a narrative of the group process. This narrative should act as a personal reflection, and may address what you found to be any group strengths, weaknesses, or challenges. Your commentary may also discuss any qualities or skills that you wish to emulate from your other team members.

LATE ASSIGNMENTS

UNEXCUSED LATE ASSIGNMENTS WILL HAVE 5-POINTS DEDUCTED FOR EACH DAY LATE.

GRADING SCHEME

Assignment	Due Date	Grading Scheme
Curry Chapter and Article abstracts/Abstract Presentations	Please sign-up for abstract articles by the end of the 2nd Class	Abstracts 50 points
E-Class online and In-Class Discussions	10 Weeks over course of semester Weeks 3-12.	Total for each student 10X10=100 points
	Online students will receive a max of 5 points for each of 2 responses for 10 points per week. *In class students will receive a max of 5 points per week for 1 response in online discussions.	
	There will be a separate grading methodology for in-class students: in addition to 5 points for 1 post in the online discussions, in-class students will receive 5 Points for attendance	
Mid-Term Exam	This exam will cover all the material covered in class up to this point	150 points
Final Project (40% of your grade)		
Team Oral Abstract Presentation	Final Abstract Presentations will be submitted on Blackboard before class on the day you present	25 points
Final Paper	Final papers are due at 11:59 PM by April 30, 2018. Late papers will be subject to a 2 point per day penalty.	150 Points
Individual Project Commentary	Project reflections/commentaries are due at 11:59 PM by April 30, 2018 Late papers will be subject to a 5 point per day penalty.	25 Points
Total Points		500 points

As you can see from the table above, the final project is worth 200/500 points. That means you must find a project to evaluate as soon as possible. We will work together to find a project for you, if you do not have one in mind, now. If you are interning for an HCBS organization, for example, you might evaluate one of the HCBS programs. Just begin to consider this, so you are not in a panic a month from now.

COURSE FINAL GRADES WILL BE DETERMINED USING THE FOLLOWING PERCENT SCALE:

A	94-100		C+	77-79
A-	90-93		C	73-76
B+	87-89		C-	70-72
B	83-86		D+	67-69
B-	80-82		D	63-66

If you have completed all of the work in a timely manner, I will round up to the next grade point. (93.5+ to 94,e.g,)

D-	60-62
F	59 and below

WEEKLY READINGS/ SCHEDULING

DATE	DISCUSSION/ASSIGNMENTS	READINGS
Week 1. **January 7**	_**Introduction to Program Planning and Evaluation**_ _**Please introduce yourselve - online in the discussion section**_ _**Discuss Book Chapter/Article Abstracts**_ _**Send questions to:**_ gshannon@usc.edu _**Email Subject line: Gero 555 questions**_	**Check Online resources:**
Week 2 **January 14**	_**Tailoring Evaluations**_ _**Identifying Problems/Issues & Formulating Evaluation Questions**_ **Curry Chapter 1 <u>Abstract #1</u>** **Curry Chapter 2 <u>Abstract #2</u>**	**Rossi Chapter 1** **Rossi Chapter 2**
Week 3 **January 21**	_**Dr. Martin Luther King's Birthday**_	**No Class**
Week 4 **January 28**	_**Needs Assessments/Program Design/Theory**_ _**Stakeholder interviews and focus groups**_ **Curry Chapter 3 <u>Abstract #3</u>** **<u>Curry Chapter 4 Abstract # 4</u>**	**Rossi Chapter 3** **Rossi Chapter 4** **Rossi Chapter 5** **Curry Chapter 3** **Curry Chapter 4**
Week 5 **February 4**	_**Process Evaluation**_ **<u>Curry Chapter 5 Abstract #5</u>** **Curry Chapter 6 Abstract #6**	**Rossi Chapter 6** **Curry Chapter 5** **Curry Chapter 6**
Week 6 **February 11**	_**Developing a Logic Model/Work Plan**_ **Curry Chapter 7 <u>Abstract #7</u>** **Curry Chapter 8. <u>Abstract #8</u>**	**Rossi Chapter 7** **Curry Chapter 7** **Curry Chapter 8**
Week 7 **February 18**	_**Analyzing Program Effects**_ _**Review Logic Models/Work Plans**_ **Curry Chapter 9 <u>Abstract #9</u>** **Curry Chapter 10. <u>Abstract #10</u>**	**Rossi Chapter 10** **Curry Chapter 10** **Curry Chapter 9** **Curry Chapter 10**
Week 8 **February 25**	_**Mid-Term Exam (1 Hour – online)**_ _**This test will cover all the material covered in Class to date**_ _**RE-AIM: Reach**_ **Glasgow 1999 <u>Abstract #12</u>** **Neta 2015 <u>Abstract #13</u>** **<u>Samia 2014 Abstract #14</u>**	**Read:** **Glasgow 1999** **Neta 2015** **<u>Samia 2014</u>**
Week 9 **March 4**	_**RE-AIM: Effectiveness** Neta 2015_ **Schwingel 2016 <u>Abstract Presentation #15</u>** **Gaglio 2013 <u>Abstract #16</u>** **Jilcott 2007 <u>Abstract #17</u>**	**Read:** **Schwingel 2016** **<u>Gaglio 2013</u>** **Jilcott 2007**
Week 10	_**Spring Break**_	**No Class**
Week 11 **March 18**	_**RE-AIM: Adoption & Implementation**_ **Goode 2013 <u>Abstract #18</u>** **Planas 2008 <u>Abstract #19</u>**	**Read:** **Goode 2013** **Planas 2008**
Week 12 **March 25**	_**RE-AIM: Maintenance/Impact**_ **McGoey 2015 <u>Abstract #20</u>** **<u>Ory 2015 Abstract #21</u>**	**See:** _re-aim.org_ **Read:** **McGoey 2015** **<u>Ory 2015</u>**
Week 13 **April 1**	_**Team PowerPoint Presentations of Final Papers**_ _**Keep these tight (on schedule) 5 X 20 minutes +discussion = ~2 hours**_	**Team Presentations**

Week 14 April 8	*Review for Final Papers*	Review team presentations
Week 15 April 15	*ASA Conference in New Orleans* *Please watch online class review*	Online Class only Questions: text 323-821-6813 or email gshannon@usc.edu
May 1	*Study days April 27-April 30* *Final papers must be posted on Blackboard in the assignments section* *no later than 11:59 PM on Wednesday May 1, 2019*	Final Papers Due

STATEMENT FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability must register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP. Please be sure the letter is delivered to me (or to TA) as early in the semester as possible. DSP is in STU 301 and is open 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Website and contact information for DSP:
http://sait.usc.edu/academicsupport/centerprograms/dsp/home_index.html, (213) 740-0776 (Phone), (213) 740-6948 (TDD only), (213) 740-8216 (FAX) ability@usc.edu.

STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

USC seeks to maintain an optimal learning environment. General principles of academic honesty include the concept of respect for the intellectual property of others, the expectation that individual work will be submitted unless otherwise allowed by an instructor, and the obligations both to protect one's own academic work from misuse by others as well as to avoid using another's work as one's own. All students are expected to understand and abide by these principles. *SCampus*, the Student Guidebook, (www.usc.edu/scampus or http://scampus.usc.edu) contains the University Student Conduct Code (see University Governance, Section 11.00), while the recommended sanctions are located in Appendix A.
There is no place in the field of aging for people who do not abide by standard ethical and professional behavior for both academic and clinical settings. Unethical conduct, in violation of USC's Code of Ethics, is not tolerated. Unethical behavior includes cheating, signing another person into class, buying papers that someone else wrote, fabricating research data, making up interviews, misrepresenting yourself in relation to class, and handing in papers or presenting presentations that have not been written by you, in your own words, for this class, for the specific assignment. All written material must be submitted through Turnitin and will not be accepted via email. If you plagiarize others' work of any kind, in a paper, a spoken video or presentation, or discussion post, your paper, presentation, or posts will be reported to the Dean's office and will be turned into the USC Student Judicial Affairs and Community Standards Office. Furthermore, you will receive a Missing Grade for the course until the case is examined. If the SJACS finds that you violated standards, you will fail the class and may be expelled. If you do not use course materials in your writing and presentations, turn in papers that do not demonstrate you have written the paper or speech yourself, present material that you have constructed yourself, and done the assignment as expected, using your own thoughts and learning, your paper will be reported to the Student Judicial Affairs office as well. Turning in a paper, test, or giving an oral presentation that you did not write originally, for this course, is cheating and will be treated as such. Upon enrolling in this course, it is assumed and expected that you have read the syllabus and academic integrity rules, agree to abide by them, and understand that violations will be reported to SJACS and to the Gerontology Dean's Office.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS/COURSE CONTINUITY IN A CRISIS

In case of a declared emergency if travel to campus is not feasible, USC executive leadership will announce an electronic way for instructors to teach students in their residence halls or homes using a combination of Blackboard, teleconferencing, and other technologies.

SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Student Counseling Services (SCS) - (213) 740-7711 – 24/7 on call Free and confidential mental health treatment for students, including short-term psychotherapy, group counseling, stress fitness workshops, and crisis intervention. https://engemannshc.usc.edu/counseling/
National Suicide Prevention Lifeline - 1-800-273-8255 Provides free and confidential emotional support to people in suicidal crisis or emotional distress 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. http://www.suicidepreventionlifeline.org
Relationship & Sexual Violence Prevention Services (RSVP) - (213) 740-4900 - 24/7 on call Free and confidential therapy services, workshops, and training for situations related to gender-based harm. https://engemannshc.usc.edu/rsvp/
Sexual Assault Resource Center For more information about how to get help or help a survivor, rights, reporting options, and additional resources, visit the website: http://sarc.usc.edu/
Office of Equity and Diversity (OED)/Title IX compliance – (213) 740-5086 Works with faculty, staff, visitors, applicants, and students around issues of protected class. https://equity.usc.edu/
Bias Assessment Response and Support Incidents of bias, hate crimes and microaggressions need to be reported allowing for appropriate investigation and response. https://studentaffairs.usc.edu/bias-assessmentresponse-support/