

AEA/CDC Summer Evaluation Institute

Offering 6: Accountability for Health Promotion Programs—Practical Strategies and Lessons Learned

Description: Over the past decade or more, policy makers and others have called for greater accountability in the public sector. With ever-decreasing resources for public health, decision-makers want specific types of information to assess the “value” of continued investment in disease prevention and health promotion programs. For accountability purposes, how do we assess whether our public health programs are effective and result in progress toward program goals? This session will describe several strategies to assess program accountability including performance measurement, expert review and appraisal, and questions-oriented approaches. An emphasis will be given toward application and constructive use of these strategies for program improvement purposes. Practical examples demonstrating these approaches will be shared and potential, real-world challenges and lessons learned discussed.

Audience: Those working in public health contexts.

Michael Schooley is chief of the Applied Research and Evaluation Branch, Division for Heart Disease and Stroke Prevention with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. He has contributed to the development and implementation of numerous evaluation, applied research and surveillance projects, publications and presentations. **Amy DeGroff** is an evaluator working in the Division of Cancer Prevention and Control with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Ms. DeGroff conducts qualitative research and evaluation studies and currently oversees a large scale multiple case study of a colorectal cancer screening program.

Offered (Two Rotations of the Same Content - Do not register for both):

- Monday, June 23, 2:30 – 4:00 PM
- Tuesday, June 24, 2:30 – 4:00 PM

2008 SUMMER EVALUATION INSTITUTE
June 23-25, 2008

Session: ACCOUNTABILITY FOR HEALTH PROMOTION PROGRAMS

SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Barry, Michael A. 2000. How can performance standards enhance accountability for public health? *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice* 6, no. 5: 78-84.
2. Behn Robert D. 2003. Why measure performance? Different purposes require different measures. *Public Administration Review* 63, no. 5: 586-606.
3. Broom, C., S. Caudle, E. T. Jennings, and K. Newcomer. 2002. Meeting the challenges of performance oriented government. In *Meeting the challenges of performance oriented government*, ed. K. Newcomer, E.T. Jennings, C. Broom and A. Lomax:. Washington, DC: American Society for Public Administration/Center for Accountability and Performance.
4. Halverson, Paul K. 2000. Performance Measurement and Performance Standards: Old Wine in New Bottles. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice* 6, no. 5: vi-x.
5. Hatry Harry P. 1999. *Performance measurement: Getting results*. Washington D.C.: Urban Institute Press.
6. Poister, Theodore H. 2003. *Measuring performance in public and nonprofit organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
7. Newcomer, Kathryn E. 1997. Using performance measurement to improve programs. *New Directions for Evaluation* 75, no. Fall: 5-14.
8. Radin Beryl A. 2006. *Challenging the Performance Movement*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
9. U.S. Government Accountability Office. 2005. *OMB's PART reviews increased agencies' attention to improving evidence of program results*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-06-67.