



E001031

PROGRAM EVALUATIONPanel Discussion

Monday 8:00 a.m.
January 20, 1975

Moderator:

Gordon R. Engebretson, Ph.D.
Deputy Director, Florida RMP
Telephone: 813/253-0931
Member: Program Accountability Reporting
A cooperative group from the RMP's
formed to develop national descriptive and
evaluative information about RMP programs.

Participants:

O. Lynn Deniston, M.P.H.
Program in Health Behavior, SPH 2
University of Michigan
Telephone: 313/764-9494
Evaluation of Michigan program, and others

Evelyn V. Hess, M.D., F.A.C.P.
Professor of Medicine
University of Cincinnati Medical Center
Telephone: 513/872-4701
Developer ARA standard data program

Carl W. Schwartz
PIMA Health Systems
Telephone: 602/881-4770
Evaluation of Arizona program and others

This will confirm our telephone conversations regarding the need for a panel discussion on program evaluation at the arthritis conference in Kansas City, January 19 - 20. The panel is scheduled on the enclosed program for 8:00 a.m. Monday morning, January 20. This timing is poor with respect to the assistance with program evaluation factors which may be needed in the Sunday workshops. It is suitable, however, with respect to the crucial conference workshops scheduled immediately after the panel discussion. The experiences you individually encounter on Sunday may permit specific commentary during the panel discussion with regard to substantive project evaluation, as distinct from overall arthritis program evaluation, or assessment limits.

Background: The pressures under which the arthritis grant applications were developed contributed to a generally poor response to program evaluation requirements. Lack of staff at DRMP prevents development of this program element. The rapid phase-out of DRMP, and the transitory position of the RMP's makes followup of arthritis program evaluation impossible. A meeting last November with representatives of the organizations which are sponsoring the conference resulted in consensus and agreement to convene the conference, seek to assure that the experiences of the grant program are documented, and reinforce the evaluation/assessment forces which exist.

Panel Problems: What scale or intensity of evaluation is appropriate with regard to the various kinds of projects being undertaken? What scale, or intensity of assessment is appropriate with respect to the total program, or identifiable segments of it? How should these tasks be accomplished? What resources are available to undertake them? How reasonable are the costs involved?

Commentary: I am enclosing for background two of the better suggestions for evaluation which were received in response to our call for suggestions last Fall (No. Carolina, and Colorado-Wyoming). If any of you have material which might be helpful to project and program heads, you may wish to bring handouts (150 copies). We will have reproduction facilities at the conference, and the Kansas RMP will make its facilities available if you cannot bring copies.