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Stated Evaluation Expertise

Professional evaluation experience varies significantly across the CTSA

• Most familiar with survey methods, but I am not a professional evaluator....

• I've conducted external evaluations and taught graduate courses in evaluation since 1982. I consider myself competent in naturalistic, experimental, quasi-experimental designs and psychometric as well as qualitative information approaches using various evaluation models, program theory, logic models, etc. I'm currently completing the 3rd Edition of the Program Evaluation Standards, and as part of that 5 year process have reviewed the most recent evaluation scholarship intensively.

• I have extended non-parametric methods based on u-statistics to create more objective evaluation criteria.

• The collection of metrics, information and data as it relates to grant submissions and the overall evaluation of an organization.

• I am a generalist, with specific training in business. I have experience in using business data to improve systems and processes (e.g., Six Sigma, LEAN design, process reengineering) and developing/implementing these systems.

• I am familiar with educational testing and measurement as well as with mixed methods and survey design as well as some qualitative methods (analysis of variance models).
"Is Evaluation at your CTSA considered a Separate KF or part of the Administrative KF?"

Nearly 50/50 Split: Evaluation seated in Administration KF vs. a Separate KF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A separate Key Function (or Core)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A part of the Administration KF?</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments for “Other”:

- In grant year one we were considered a part of the Administration KF. However, moving into grant year two we have become a separate KF core although we work very closely with the Administration core.

- While evaluation is considered a separate key function, it is run out of our administrative offices.

- Both of the above. Evaluation started as a part of administration but has morphed into a key function that others in the University are calling upon.

- Over the past two years, much of the oversight for the "tracking" data collection (e.g., for service logs) has been assumed by Administration KF.
Evaluation Management and Leadership Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Senior Leadership Teams (N=33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91% of respondents have a senior leadership group in charge of day-to-day decision making at their CTSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53% of respondents said that evaluation was represented on that team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Management-Level Committees (N=33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73% of respondents also have a committees structured at the level of KF management (not-directors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52% of respondents said that evaluation was represented on that team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation-Specific Committees (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44% of respondents have a group structured exclusively around evaluation issues at their CTSA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often does your evaluation team meet with your PI? (N=28)

- Weekly: 10
- Bimonthly: 4
- Monthly: 9
- Quarterly: 3
- Once a year: 2
CTSA evaluators indicated that KF report evaluation data directly to the Admin KF more often than they report the same data to the Evaluation KF.
Comments on Evaluation Working Groups

• We do, but it is not formally structured and tends to change with each evaluation focus, set of questions, or challenges. It tends to be more ad hoc.

• Eval Committee consists of an individual from each institution.

• Our Evaluation Research Core meets weekly and often invites representatives from other Cores/KFs to our meetings; We also meet twice a month with the Strategic Development Core to coordinate activities and collection of day-to-day operational metrics and impact evaluation data.

• Representatives from each of the key function programs meet regularly for discussion and coordination of contingencies and dependencies.

• We have an Evaluation Working Group that consists of key operational representatives of each KF and meets every other month.

• Evaluation working group meets biweekly, all KFs are represented.

• The Admin Core has assumed oversight of tracking activities for service logs and for each KF's achievement of aims/milestones. The Admin Core and Evaluation Specialist meet weekly about tracking activities.

• We have a formal committee established by our grant proposal and we are in the process of formalizing another working committee with a representative from each KF.

• Not yet, but once the teams are established we will include representatives from some of the KFs, but not all.
Evaluation Resources and Scope

57% said they have 1 or 2 evaluation staff. No FTE continuity (see below).

**Please list the number of evaluation staff at your CTSA. (N=33)**

- Two (45%)
- Four (12%)
- One (12%)
- Three (9%)
- Less than one (9%)
- Twelve (3%)
- Eight (3%)
- Six (3%)
- Five (3%)

**How Many FTE are on your Evaluation team? (N=31)**

- 0.75 (19%)
- 1.25 (16%)
- 1.75 (13%)
- 0.5 (13%)
- Less than 0.25 (10%)
- 1.5 (6%)
- 0.25 (6%)
- 4 (3%)
- 2.75 (3%)
- 2.5 (3%)
- 2 (3%)
- 1.75 (3%)

Evaluation work is spread out across other KF (outside of evaluation).

- 91% get support on evaluation projects from other KF (such as Biomedical informatics and Administration)
- Only 9% get support from subcontractors
- 91% say the KFs are responsible for collecting evaluation data
Comments on Evaluation Resources and Scope

• Our evaluation program is intertwined in the management of our program; each component has an individual who is responsible for collecting and reporting data for their component, which is part of their management duties.

• There are a number of staff from other areas that are participating in evaluation but their effort is not technically considered to be part of the evaluation function.

  • Director .50 FTE...Analyst/Evaluator 1.0 FTE...Data Assistant (undergrad. workstudy student) .25 FTE

  • There are folks in our component/programs that fulfill evaluation functions in those programs on an as needed basis.

• Many of the data relevant for evaluation is planned to be obtained from the system run by the Bioinformatics core.

• It is evolving. We had more than 1.0 FTE, then we hired a consultant to revamp our team, now we are transitioning to having approximately .4 management of the evaluation program, plus small amounts of faculty FTE, plus we are hiring a data manager.

  • Right now, we have allocated in addition to me 2 staff, 1 post doc, and one grad student to work on the CTSA evaluation. The staff, post doc and grad student are small percentages of time. The .50 FTE is based on my contribution. In addition, individual key function (core) directors and staff allocate time as needed to evaluation.

    ...The actual FTE allocation is impossible to determine.
Given the fluidity of evaluation staffing and projects demonstrated on the previous slides, how can one accurately assess how much is spent on evaluation?

Using your best estimate, what percentage of the total CTSA budget is devoted to evaluation?

- 1% or less of total budget (14)
- 5-10% of total budget (7)
- Do Not Know (12)

- 36%
- 43%
- 21%
Multi-Institutional Composition

Most common: 1 med school, 1-4 hospitals, 1 major university and no major practice groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical schools</th>
<th>Hospitals</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Major Practice Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Medical schools**: 90% of CTSAs had only one affiliated med school.
- **Hospitals**: The number of affiliated hospitals varied across CTSAs. (33% had one hospital, 23% had two, 20% had four, 17% had three, and 7% had zero.)
- **Universities**: 70% CTSAs had only one affiliated university
- **Major Practice Groups**: 47% of CTSAs had zero affiliated major practice groups.

N=30
"Yes, we have an official definition at our CTSA for:"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSLATIONAL &quot;PHASE&quot;</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTSA &quot;MEMBER&quot;</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCIPLINE</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLABORATION</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar chart showing the distribution of definitions among responses:

- TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH: 16 responses
- TRANSLATIONAL "PHASE": 16 responses
- CTSA "MEMBER": 16 responses
- COMMUNITY: 7 responses
- DISCIPLINE: 6 responses
- COLLABORATION: 5 responses
We are currently redeveloping nested logic models. However, the process is very time consuming and difficult. It would be easy to have one that is for show, but trying to develop good program theories for the KF orchestrated into an overall model is very difficult, perhaps too difficult....

Our current Logic Model is very similar to the one included in our proposal.

Our proposal included a logic model but we've completely moved away from this and use Program Management....

There are logic models for several KFs but not all.
“How does your CTSA track progress within each KF?”

Consensus re Methods.
No Consensus re Freq.

- Our programs/components track their own progress. Our executive sponsors do require programs to routinely do a check in of where they are relative to their goals. The frequency differs across programs... Annually, we require the program to annotate their SMART goal document with their progress.

- Some progress markers are specific to projects and have variable reporting related to the length of the project.

- Usage tracking is evolving. It has moved from annual to semi-annual to an (about to be launched) real time reporting system.

- Data are entered by each KF into a centralized data base managed by the evaluation KF. This is highly collaborative.
Evaluation Tools and Methods

- I checked yes even if these are in development for implementation this year.
- Many of these tools are used by our other programs and not necessarily evaluation. These programs and their staff reach out to their KF counterparts at other institutions when they need assistance and such requests don't necessarily filter through our evaluation.
- Individual key functions employ all of the above. However, these are not currently being used by the Evaluation group although we intend to in the future.
- We are relatively new and plan to do most of the above.
CHALLENGES AND BEST PRACTICES

1) Data Challenges
2) Funding/Resources
3) Leadership
4) Complexity
5) APR/NCRR

1) Supportive Leadership
2) Clear Delegation to KFs
3) Importance of Baselines
4) Evaluation Working Group
5) Mixed-Methods

N=33