

APPENDIX 2



**Ethnographic Assessment & Evaluation Systems (EAES)  
Working Paper Series, #2**

**Introduction to  
Ethnographic Assessment & Evaluation Systems**

By

**Tony L. Whitehead, Ph.D., MS.Hyg.  
Professor of Anthropology and Director, CuSAG**

Department of Anthropology  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland 20742

November 3, 2002.

## Table of Contents

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1. INTRODUCTION TO “ETHNOGRAPHIC ASSESSMENT & EVALUATION SYSTEMS” AND THE “CULTURAL ECOLOGY OF HEALTH AND CHANGE”	2
1.2. THE EAES IS A <i>TRIANGULATED</i> APPROACH TO PROGRAM EVALUATION	3
1.3. THE EAES IS ORIENTED TOWARDS ASSESSING COMPLEXITY IN THE EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY BASED INITIATIVES	3
1.4. THE EAES IS AN EVALUATION SYSTEM ORIENTED TOWARDS <i>PROJECT SUCCESS</i> RATHER THAN PROJECT FAILURE	4
<b>2. THE FIRST SYSTEM OF THE EAES: PROGRAMS IN ETHNOGRAPHIC ASSESSMENT AND FORMATIVE EVALUATION (EAFE)</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1. EAES FORMATIVE EVALUATION PROGRAM 1: EVALUATING THE PRESENCE OF <i>PROJECT CULTURE DEVELOPMENT (PCD)</i> ACTIVITIES IN CBI IMPLEMENTATION	5
2.2. EAES FORMATIVE EVALUATION PROGRAM 2: INTEGRATING COMMUNITY AND CULTURAL ASSESSMENT WITH FORMATIVE EVALUATION ACTIVITIES	6
2.3. EAES FORMATIVE EVALUATION PROGRAM 3: ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT CULTURE OF A COMMUNITY BASED INITIATIVE.	8
<b>3. FROM FORMATIVE TO PROCESS EVALUATION AND PROJECT MONITORING</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1. USING THE CSAPPE TO DESIGN A CBI	9
3.2. CREATING PROJECT PHASES FOR PROCESS EVALUATION AND MONITORING ACTIVITIES	10
3.3. METHODS OF PROCESS EVALUATION AND MONITORING	10
<b>4. FROM PROCESS TO OUTCOME EVALUATION</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1. EAES'S PROGRAM USING MORE TRADITIONAL APPROACHES TO CBI OUTCOME EVALUATION	11
4.2. EAES PROGRAM IN CBI OUTCOME EVALUATION WITH TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PROJECT MONITORING	11
<b>5. FROM OUTCOME TO IMPACT EVALUATION AND "CULTURAL TRANSFORMATION"</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>6. OPERATIONALIZING SYSTEMS OF THE EAES: <i>THE EAES WORKSHEETS</i></b>	<b>12</b>
7. OPERATIONALIZING SYSTEMS OF THE EAES: EVALUATION OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS, AND METHODOLOGIES BASED ON CSAC CATEGORIES.	13
<b>APPENDIX 1</b>	<b>14</b>
SUMMARY OF ETHNOGRAPHIC ASSESSMENT & EVALUATION SYSTEMS’ PROGRAMS AND EXAMPLE OF METHODS	14
2. EAES PROGRAMS IN FORMATIVE EVALUATION	14
<b>APPENDIX 2: ACRONYM GLOSSARY</b>	<b>17</b>

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Introduction to “Ethnographic Assessment & Evaluation Systems” and the “Cultural Ecology of Health and Change”

Ethnographic Assessment & Evaluation Systems (EAES) is one of four subsystems of the Cultural Ecology of Health and Change (the CEHC--See Appendix 1 for list of all acronyms). The CEHC is an anthropologically informed applied research and technical assistance system developed by Tony Whitehead, Professor of Medical Anthropology at the University Of Maryland The focus of the CEHC is on "community based initiatives" (CBIs), with which Dr. Whitehead has more than 30 years of professional experience, in the U.S. and abroad. The other three subsystems of the CEHC are:

- (1) Ethnographically Informed Community & Cultural Assessments Research Systems (the EICCARS), a multi-method research system used to collect holistic or systemic data about the community or population that is being targeted by a CBIs.
- (2) The CEHC System in Project Design and Implementation Plan (the PDIP).
- (3) The CEHC System in Project Implementation Programs (the PIPs)<sup>1</sup>

The four applied research and technical assistance programs of the CEHC are informed by three integrated CEHC paradigms developed by Dr. Whitehead:

- (1) The Cultural Systems Paradigm (the CSP);
- (2) The Cultural Systems Approach to Change (the CSAC); and
- (3) The Cultural Systems Approach to Program, Planning and Implementation (the CSAPPE).

Each of these paradigms informs various components of each the four CEHC systems. As such, while a graphic illustration of these three conceptual paradigms is provided in Appendix 2, descriptions of these paradigms will be provided in the following discussion when they come up in relationship to various EAES programs<sup>2</sup>. At the same time however, in discussing any one of the four CEHC systems, there needs to be a brief introduction to the other three, because of the continuity or overlap between all four programs, and between the three CEHC paradigms. This continuity or overlap is due to the fact that the CEHC was developed with great emphasis given to *contextual "holism"* or comprehensiveness and *socio-cultural process*. Thus in terms of contextual comprehensiveness, the CSP is a comprehensive paradigm that *informs the development and implementation of community research that will aid in understanding the complexity of issues* that are related to any human problems to be targeted by a CBI. The CSAC is a paradigm for *conceptualizing* contextually comprehensive CBIs. The CSAPPE is a comprehensive approach to *operationalizing* the categories of the CSAC for the *effective design, implementation and evaluation* of CBIs. These paradigms then contribute to the comprehensiveness of *each* of the 4 CEHC systems. At the same time, within the conceptualization of the CEHC, contextual comprehensiveness and process are emphasized by advocating that all four of the CEHC systems (program planning, program implementation,

---

<sup>1</sup>Similar to the present EAES working paper, there are similar working papers for the other three CEHC programs. There are also a number of Program Training Manuals (PTMs) used to train others in the CEHC methodologies. Moreover, whereas these CEHC programs, working papers, and PTMs are developed for use in geographical communities as the social unit of focus, similar CEHC programs and materials are being developed to focus on organizational, institutional, corporate, and bureaucratic cultures.

<sup>2</sup>There is another working paper, ""Paradigms of the Cultural Ecology of Health and Change,"" which describes the three paradigms in great detail. This document is available on request.

community assessment research, and program evaluation) be viewed as a continuum, and that all three of the conceptual paradigms (the CSP, the CSAC, and the CSAPPE) are viewed as interrelated. This continuity or overlap will become clearer in the remainder of this paper as we discuss various aspects of the EAES.

## **1.2. The EAES is a *Triangulated Approach to Program Evaluation***

Process in the EAES is also conceptualized in the goals and methods of each of the four CEHC systems. The concept of *triangulation* is at the root of such conceptualization. When most researchers discuss triangulation, they usually describe it in terms of simply the triangulation, or mixing of research methods. In the four CEHC systems EAES however, the suggestions of Denzin (1970) are followed, of three approaches to triangulation: triangulation of methods, of theories, and of researchers. As such, in the EAES, in addition to its goal of assessing whether a project has succeeded or failed in achieving its desired outcomes, as is the case in traditional approaches to evaluation, the EAES goes further through its use of multiple *theories of socio-cultural dynamics* and *multiple methods of information gathering*, so as to *continually inform* project personnel on *strategies* that might be *used to achieve desired project outcomes*. In the triangulation of researchers, the EAES not only advocates technically trained researchers from multiple research orientations, but also the inclusion of residents from the communities targeted by a CBI as members of the research team.

As discussed in more detailed in a full CEHC document (programs and paradigms) that is being developed, the programs and paradigms of the CEHC are informed by a wide range of theories from social psychology, community health education, and anthropology. The theoretical foundation of the CEHC systems, however, is anthropological theory, and its primary body of theory on the concept of culture. The multi-method approach to information gathering in the two primary research systems of the CEHC, the EAES and the EICCARS, includes both *quantitative* and *qualitative* research strategies. The more specific methods found in each of these research paradigms will be discussed later. However, in the EAES methods from both are used in the four evaluation programs of the EAES: *formative, process, outcome, and impact evaluation*. Process is then emphasized in the EAES by treating each of these evaluative programs, not as a separate and bounded research activity--as is done in most other approaches to project evaluation--but as *one continuous evaluation research process*. These research activities are treated as process strategies so as to *continually inform* and *monitor* project implementation in order to assist CBI personnel in realizing *maximum success* in achieving project goals and objectives.

## **1.3. The EAES is Oriented Towards Assessing Complexity in the Evaluation of Community Based Initiatives**

The communities targeted by CBIs, and the processes involved in planning and implementing them are filled with a variety of human complexities. Community complexities include the various social, cultural (or ethnic), interpersonal, and intrapersonal variations that exist among various populations within these communities. Program planning and implementation complexities include not only the previously stated population based complexities, but also the various groups that might need to be drawn into the planning and implementation process if such initiatives are going to be successful. With regards to the latter are the different administrative levels that might be involved in a specific initiative, such as offices of the federal (e.g., the U.S. Center for Disease Control and Prevention, or the CDC), the state (e.g., a state health department), and local (e.g., a local health department) levels. Then at the local level, there may be numerous organizations, groups, and individuals that may also have to be involved if the project is to be successful.

There are a number of existing frameworks for evaluating different components of community

based intervention projects (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 1999; Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, 2002; Chavis, et al, 1993; Crowley, et al, 2000; Fetterman, et al; Gabriel 1997; Goodman 1998; Goodman et al 1995; Hays et al, 2000; Kaftarian & Yin, 1997; Kaftarian & Yu, 2000; Lackey, et al, 2000; Yin & Ware 2000). However, most CBI evaluation models either place *greater emphasis on project outcomes* (in terms of achieving long term goals and objectives) and less on the input activities necessary to achieving such outcomes; or, in recent years, *greater emphasis on input activities* (or capacity building), and less attention to outcomes. As we shall soon see, the EAES maintains balance in the assessment of these two important components of project planning and implementation through its programs in *formative, process, outcome* and *impact* evaluation that will soon be discussed.

#### **1.4. The EAES is an Evaluation System Oriented Towards *Project Success* Rather than *Project Failure***

Whitehead has often received criticism from those who follow a more traditional approach to evaluation, who refers to his approach as *not* an evaluation format, but rather a *form of technical assistance*. Whitehead's response to such criticism is that his approach *evaluates for program success*, and *not* the *failure* that is frequently recorded when traditional approaches to evaluation are applied to community based health and social programs. He argues that traditional approaches to evaluation based on notions of *empirical positivism* are highly oriented towards project failure because positivist paradigms *do not allow for the complexity and dynamics of the communities targeted by such programs*. Moreover, he argues, evaluation programs based in empirical positivism are inadequate in assessing the *dynamics* (socio-cultural processes) and *complexities that emerge when projects are brought together with targeted communities*, or to take advantage of the possible learning that could occur throughout the implementation of complex CBIs. Thus for Whitehead, as will become clearer in the following discussion of the EAES's approach to formative, process, outcome and impact evaluation, the primary orientation of the EAES is *not to contaminate* evaluation outcomes with strategies that might be considered technical assistance; but to carry out an evaluation which allows for the best opportunities for learning to take place among the project personnel, the community targeted by the project, and by the evaluators. In fact, as will be seen in the following discussion of the four evaluation programs of the EAES, the EAES does not discard the more significant components of traditional approaches to program evaluation, but combines them with other methods for providing greater learning opportunities for all involved in the project, including the evaluators. In the end, it is Whitehead's belief that in order to achieve such a learning goal would provide a much more objective approach to evaluation than would some pretense at objectivity represented by rigid empirical positivism.

The criticism that Whitehead has received to his approach to evaluation similar to the criticism that has been directed towards "Empowerment Evaluation<sup>3</sup>," a more established and widely used evaluation technique that also emphasizes an evaluation process that facilitates empowering CBI staff to evaluate their own programs toward greater success. The similarities in these criticisms are based on the fact that many of the techniques used in empowerment evaluation are similar to those that Whitehead has built into the formative and process evaluation programs of the EAES. However, the EAES *moves beyond* the complete focus on capacity building and the ownership over the evaluation process by CBI staff and community residents, elements of empowerment evaluation, to an integration of these formative and process evaluation components with outcome and impact evaluation.

## **2. The First System of the EAES: Programs in Ethnographic Assessment**

---

<sup>3</sup>See Fetterman 1994a, 1994b, 2001; Fetterman et al 1996; Altman 1996)

## and Formative Evaluation (EAFE)

In the EAES, ethnographic assessment and formative evaluation (EAFE) is considered critical, and thus considerably more space is given in the present document to EAES approaches to EAFE than to the other three evaluation systems (process, outcome, and impact evaluation). First of all there are three EAFE programs in the EAES, two which involves *the participation of technicians trained in EAES methodologies at the start of the planning or implementation of a CBI, or a program of multiple CBIs*, and a third in which those trained in EAES methodologies becomes involved *after the implementation of a CBI or a program of multiple projects, have already begun*. In this section, we will first discuss the two EAES formative evaluation programs in which trained technicians are involved at the beginning, and then we will discuss the third program.

### 2.1. EAES Formative Evaluation Program 1: Evaluating the Presence of Project Culture Development (PCD) Activities in CBI Implementation

As stated earlier, the four systems of the CEHC are highly interrelated, and in various places they overlap. Formative Evaluation Program 1 of the EAES overlaps with the CEHC System in Project Design in and Implementation Plan (the PDIP). Thus we need to first acquaint the reader of this document with the PDIP. The PDIP emerged because of the need by CBIs to develop proposals with *clearly stated* project goals and objectives, and the *strategies* for achieving those desired outcomes, in order to assure project and funding success. However, in his 30 years of experience with CBIs, Whitehead has often found that such clarification is frequently absent from CBI proposals, and when a project goals, objectives, and strategies are clearly stated, the implementation of those strategies is a very difficult process. In some cases he found that that *while the strategies for achieving stated project goals and objectives were clear to those who wrote the project proposal, there was little emphasis given to sharing this vision to the many others who would be given some of the responsibilities to actually carrying them out*. Whitehead found this problem to be particularly acute in those cases in which *projects were to be carried out by coalitions or partnerships of different organizations or stakeholders*. Within such project structures, there are frequently problems related to *unclear delineation of task responsibilities for partner organizations and their staffs, or unclear lines of supervision that cut across partnership organizations, or the absence of strategies for addressing past conflicts or present turf issues* that may exist among the partners. But even in projects proposed to be carried out by single organizations, Whitehead often found that there was *little time given by the project leadership to passing on to their rank and file staff the leadership's conceptualization of the project and how it should implemented*. Thus the failure of such CBIs in reaching their stated goals and objectives were often times related to the *lack of a common or shared orientation of as how to carry out project strategies or tasks*), as various staff persons were left to operate based on their own individualized conceptualization of their tasks.

From such experiences, Whitehead concluded that if CBIs, particularly those with multiple stakeholders, were to enhance their success in achieving their desired outcomes, then there was a need at the outset of a project to give some time to the to the development of what he calls a *"project culture;"* or to use more common terminology, a need to carry out an activity to get everyone who would be critically involved in the implementation of the project *"on the same page."* As such the PDIP consist of a single program, a *Project Culture Development (PCD) Workshop*. The primary goal of the PCD is: *getting all of those who are to be involved in project implementation, especially project leadership, on the same page* with regards to project goals, objectives, and the strategies for achieving these goals and objectives.

With regards to the EAES approach to formative evaluation, the goals of the PCD workshops are similar to the Empowerment Evaluation Model (EEM) discussed earlier. However, while recognizing the value of EEM's model for keeping this activity simple, in Whitehead's opinion, it is *too emergent and open*. In other words, the PCD is based on the idea that more direction can

be provided project personnel without making the activity too complicated.

If Whitehead and/or his associates who use the CEHC are asked to carry out an evaluation of a CBI at the very beginning of project implementation, then the EAES Formative Evaluation Program 1 would consist of carrying out the same PCD Workshop that is carried out in the PDIP. However, if Whitehead and associates are asked to carry out an evaluation of a CBI *after* project implementation was significantly underway, then the EAES Formative Evaluation Program 1 would consist of assessing whether *the project had carried out any project culture development activities*, and if it did, *what was involved in those activities*, and what was *their impact* in terms of project function and predictability for achieving project goals and long term objectives. The results from this assessment would then be provided to project leadership with a consultation to incorporate these findings into ongoing project implementation. On the other hand, if no project culture development activities had been carried out at the initiation of the evaluation, then Whitehead and/or his associates would recommend carrying out a PCD Workshop. As such, the CEHC Program Technical Manual (PTM) for the PCD Workshop, that heavily utilizes the CSAC and the CSAPPE, is referred to in carrying out EAES Formative Evaluation Program 1

## **2.2. EAES Formative Evaluation Program 2: Integrating Community and Cultural Assessment with Formative Evaluation Activities**

Similar to the way that the EAES Formative Evaluation Program 1 overlaps with the CEHC System in Program Design and Implementation Plan (PDIP), the EAES Formative Evaluation Program 2 overlaps with the CEHC System in Community and Cultural Assessment, or the Ethnographically Informed Community and Cultural Assessment Research Systems (EICCARS). As such, the EICCARS is briefly reviewed in discussing EAES Formative Evaluation Program 2. First we will review what the EICCARS is.

Because of the complexities involved in communities targeted by most CBIs, and the complexities involved in the planning and implementation of CBIs in these communities as discussed earlier, the EICCARS is a very large research system that involves *multiple research methodologies* and *a number of different working papers and training manuals* to describe these methods and how to use them. By way of a brief introduction here, the EICCARS goes beyond most other approaches to community assessment research (or CAR) that primarily utilize existing statistical and other secondary data, and sometimes the survey, as the only primary data collection methodologies. While the EICCARS also includes these methods, they are complemented with a range of ethnographic, qualitative, and geographic methods. More specifically, included among the methods of the EICCARS are the following:

- (1) The initiation of the EICCARS by assessing all relevant *existing statistical and "textual" data* available on the target community or population (i.e., written narratives from scientific and popular literature, media productions, audio and visual products, and other contextual data sources).
- (2) The establishment of computerized data bases for community assessment, which in the EICCARS are organized into 15 data profiles: (a) Geographic; (b) Demographic; (c) Economic; (d) Educational; (e) Health; (f) Housing and Human Ecology; (g) Governance and Political; (h) Crime and Judicial; (i) Transportation; (j) Communication; (k) Play, Recreation, and Leisure; (l) Cosmological; (m) Cultural; (n) Historical; and (o) Community Resources. (These community profiles and their data indicators are discussed in greater detail in an EICCARS Information Package that can be secured on request).
- (3) The EICCARS uses a comparative approach in the organization of statistical data. The statistical data used in the EICCARS are usually those data collected by the U.S. Census

bureau and other federal, state, and local statistical data collection entities. The comparative approach used in the EICCARS in the initiation of community profiles is to organize data by profile indicators for the nation (e.g., the U.S.), the state (e.g., Maryland), the city (e.g. Baltimore) or county (Prince Georges), study community (e.g., the several zip codes targeted by the present study); sub-community within the study community (e.g., the municipalities within the two zip codes covered in the present study), and down to the neighborhoods within sub communities. This comparative approach allows us to see whether the statistics at lower geographical units (e.g. sub-communities and neighborhoods are higher or lower than those of larger geographical units).

- (4) Because of the EICCARS' approach to understanding sociocultural contexts, processes, and meaning systems, not only are ongoing data collection advocated, but so are multi-method approaches including both open ended (qualitative) and structured/measurement (quantitative) research methods. Among the qualitative methods used in the EICCARS are:
- (a) ethnographic methods of observation and participant observation;
  - (b) a number of different approaches to ethnographic interviewing, including a variety of strategies for the ethnographic interviewing of individuals, and of groups (including focus groups);
  - (c) oral and life histories;
  - (d) neighborhood mapping (using Geographical Information Systems Technology);
  - (e) document and policy analysis;
  - (f) organizational assessments;
  - (g) household, family, kinship and social network analysis;
  - (h) and the analysis of audio, visual, and living texts.

The quantitative methods used in the EICCARS are surveys of probability samples, and quasi-experimental studies<sup>4</sup>.

Next we will briefly discuss the rationale for using the EICCARS in planning the planning and implementation of a CBI, and why an EICCARS research activity is considered important in the evaluation of a CBI.

The rationale for the EICCARS evolved very early in Whitehead's when he came to recognize that the failure of many CBIs to achieve their original proposed goals and objectives at a satisfactory level was due to the fact that *project personnel frequently knew very little about the vast complexities of the communities that their projects were targeting*. As such, he increasingly came to believe that *effective* CBIs are those whose *design, implementation, and evaluation* plans are informed by a comprehensive body of data collected about the communities or populations being targeted by these projects. The CSP (Appendix 2, Figures 2A and 2B) reflects his belief that such comprehension is achieved through a holistic approach to community assessment research. While CBI scholars, program planners and activists, and their sponsors continue to give more attention to evaluation research than to community assessment, Whitehead came to

---

<sup>4</sup> The EICCARS also has an important training component with the goal of transferring any and all of the research methodologies discussed above to the appropriate staff and organizations with whom CuSAG works. This is done through 1-3 day short courses, 1-4 week intensive short courses. These methodological training vehicles are also available to those organizations whose programs CuSAG evaluates.

the conclusion, from his many years of working with CBIs, *that evaluation programs without community assessments*, particular in the case of socially and culturally diverse programs and communities, will then be *evaluations designed for failure*. A major problem is that without comprehensive community assessment data it becomes difficult to design a program that is appropriate or relevant to the specific communities being targeted by the project. Moreover, as *barriers* and *enablers* to project success emerge during implementation (as they always do), project staff may not be able to recognize them or be prepared to address them. Without understanding and addressing such issues, achieving project outcomes are jeopardized, without a clear understanding of why. In such instances says Whitehead, the project may only add to the growing sentiment among those setting health policy that "you can't change people's behavior, so why do we continue to put resources into such interventions."

Unfortunately, Whitehead says that in his experience, many CBIs rarely give serious attention to carrying out an adequate community assessment. He found, in fact, that usually when he has been asked by a CBI, or its sponsor, for assistance with evaluation or community assessment, it is usually when the project is well into its implementation. However, he is strongly of the opinion that some type of information regarding the success of a CBI is still dependent on a body of knowledge regarding the communities targeted by the project. As such, Whitehead now always tries to impress upon the leadership of projects with whom he consults, or its sponsors, of the importance of collecting community and cultural assessment data to further inform project implementation. As we shall soon see in the later discussion on outcome evaluation, it is within the format of community and cultural assessment data activities that baseline data important to showing project success in achieving proposed goals and objectives are also collected. It is for these various reasons that in the EAES Formative Evaluation Program 2, Whitehead and/or his associates assess whether any community or cultural assessment has been carried out by project staff, and whether there are relationships between those data and the proposed project goals and long term objectives. If community and/or cultural assessment data have not been collected, then the collection of such data is strongly recommended, and as part of its formative evaluation activity, Whitehead and/or associates will offer direction in the use of those parts of the EICCARS that has relevance to their particular project<sup>5</sup>.

### **2.3. EAES Formative Evaluation Program 3: Assessment of the Project Culture of a Community Based Initiative.**

EAES Formative Evaluation Program 3 utilizes EAES methods to assess the important project "stakeholders," including participating organizations, institutions, persons and programs. Data for this assessment are collected first through the analysis of all project documents, with a focus on project stakeholders. There will also be a project assessment focus group/workshop<sup>6</sup> carried out with representatives from project stakeholders during the first three months of the proposed evaluation, in which one area of query will be to explore the different organizations

---

<sup>5</sup> As stated above, the EICCARS also include a number of monographs and training manuals associated with these various methods, as well as a manual for the identification, employment, training, and monitoring of project staff members in the collection of data using these methods. It should be noted however, that all of the above methods are not chosen for most community assessment or formative evaluation research activity. Which of these methods that might be chosen for a specific community assessment or formative evaluation research activity is dependent on what it is that the CBI is attempting to accomplish, and the resources available for such research. The latter is significant because each of the methodologies used have costs, with some being more expensive than others.

<sup>6</sup> In the CEHC's Project Design and Implementation Planning (the PDPI) and the EAES, focus groups are used to explore project characteristics and outcomes with project leadership. They also have proven valuable in the development of rapport and trust between project stakeholders and the CuSAG teams carrying out the CEHC consultations. But sometimes the focus group format is extended into one that may be called a workshop because in large groups, the deliberations from small focused group discussions are carried back to the local group so as to share and achieve some consensus regarding these deliberations.

involved with the project being evaluated. Stakeholder organizations will then be contacted and asked for organizational documents for analysis regarding their primary mission and organizational activities, years in existence, and the role that they play in relationship to the project. Semi-structured ethnographic interviews will also be carried out with representatives from each stakeholder organization or group with the same lines of inquiry applied to their documents as were applied to project documents.

In addition to focusing on stated stakeholders of the project being evaluated, CuSAG also assesses whether there are other organizations in the project's targeted community that are involved with programs related to the particular focus of the project, but may not have been involved with this specific project. This is an area in which this EAES formative evaluation program overlaps with EICCARS methodologies. That is, this EAES formative evaluation program is similar to, or is part of the ongoing ethnographic assessment of the targeted community or population. In this overlap with the EICCARS, relevant formative evaluation data in this EAES program are organized into the most relevant EICCARS community data profiles. For example, other organizations involved in activities similar to those of the project being evaluated, are organized into the EICCARS Community Resources Profile. Any health or social information related to that of the project being targeted are stored in the EICCARS Health, or other appropriate EICCARS Profile. If any such organizations are identified, interviews will be requested of representatives from each organization, similar to the interviews carried out with representatives of the stakeholder organizations of the project being evaluated. These interviews will consist of inquiries regarding organizational mission, structure, and activities. In addition, non-project but related organization representatives will also be asked whether they have heard about the project being evaluated, have they had any interaction with or relationship to this project, and if so has this relationship been beneficial and why, and if they have not, would they like to have such a relationship, and why. And finally, this assessment of relevant community features usually does not end with the formative stage of the evaluation, but often times continues into the EAES process, outcome, and impact evaluation phases, as the project being evaluated should be expected to become part of the community's socio-cultural system to facilitate the Sustainability of project outcomes. (More on this is discussed below in the Section on the EAES Programs in Impact Evaluation)

### **3. From Formative to Process Evaluation and Project Monitoring**

#### **3.1. Using the CSAPPE to Design a CBI**

As discussed above, the EAES uses its PCD Workshop to establish a project culture and to detail project implementation (CSAC) categories and project implementation activities. The CSAPPE, used to achieve a shared project culture and the implementation plan, is similar to most other program planning schemes in that it generates the project implementation plan by **starting with the desired outcomes, and working backwards through the input programs**. In more traditional evaluation language, achieving those objectives associated with desired outcomes (knowledge enhancement, attitudinal and behavioral change, and the sustainability and diffusion of change) may be referred to as **long-term** goals and objectives; while the input programs are scheduled as **intermediate** and **immediate** goals and objectives. The implementation plan is developed by working backwards from long term goals and objectives, because the long term goals and objectives are the desired outcomes of the project—the bottom line. The immediate and intermediate goals and objectives are things that need to be achieved to get to that bottom line. Or stated in another way, the goals and objectives of intermediate activities are actually the strategies for achieving long term goals and objectives, and the goals and objectives of immediate project activities are sometimes the strategies for achieving intermediate and long term goals and objectives. Yet, while the generation of the implementation plan is a process working backwards from long term to immediate goals and

objectives, the actual implementation of the plan is a forward process, from immediate project activities, through intermediate, through long term, or desired project outcomes.

### **3.2. Creating Project Phases for Process Evaluation and Monitoring Activities**

In the EAES, formative evaluation moves into process evaluation by taking the total of the time lines needed to carry out all project activities (design, implementation, and evaluation), according to the CSAC categories, and divide them into project phases (e.g., quarterly or every 3 months). For example, during the first phase, activities related to putting project resources in place (i.e., the CSAC category of Resources Development) may be carried out. During the second phase, designing materials (the CSAC category of materials development) that may be used in community recruitment and participation (the CSAC category of community participation) in the third phase may be carried out, and so on. This process of dividing the implementation (CSAC) categories into phases will be one of the final activities carried out during the PCD Workshop.

### **3.3. Methods of Process Evaluation and Monitoring**

These phases become the primary means of process evaluation, which is oriented towards such achievements: (1) determining the degree to which the program is being implemented as planned; (2) identify ways of improving the program; and (3) assessing the quality, timeliness, acceptability, and feasibility of the intervention activities. However, the EAES goes further in delineating the strategies for achieving these process evaluation goals, including:

- (1) The employment of simple (one page) Project Barriers and Enablers Recording Forms to be used by project staff to record barriers and enablers as they experience them during project implementation. These forms are to be sent immediately after such experiences to CuSAG for compilation and analyses. Project staff members responsible for the objectives, strategies, and tasks for a specific project phase are asked to get them in before the Process Evaluation Workshop (more on this in the following item) held at the end of the phase, so that CuSAG has time to compile the barriers and enablers experienced before the Workshop is held.
- (2) Two day Process Evaluation Workshops to be held at the end of each project phase. The first 1 1/2 days of these workshops are organized around the barriers and enablers experienced during the project phase that is ending, explorations into how barriers might be overcome and enablers further enhanced and utilized; while the last half of second day is used to review the objectives, strategies/tasks, task assignments, schedules, and measurable indicators for the next project phase. In addition to addressing project barriers and enablers across sites, this process also serves to empower participants by increasing their problem solving skills in implementing community based programs. The data collected from the Project Barriers and Enablers Recording Forms are used to begin the workshop. These workshops are audio taped, and the audiotapes transcribed, creating a body of qualitative data that will provide insight on the barriers and enablers across project sites.

## **4. From Process to Outcome Evaluation**

Outcome evaluation is an assessment of whether a project has achieved its overall or long term goals and objectives. Because the EAES views formative, process, and outcome evaluation as components of an integrated process, the strategies used in the formative and process evaluation processes keep the project on track towards achieving its long term goals and objectives. Indeed the goals and objectives to be achieved during the latter process evaluation phases are in fact the project's outcome evaluation. As such, the last one or two process

evaluation workshops should focus on the achievement of the project's goals and objectives.

There are two EAES Systems in outcome evaluation:

- (1) The EAES System that uses more traditional approaches to CBI Outcome Evaluation;
- (2) The EAES System in CBI Outcome Evaluation with Technical Assistance and Project Monitoring

#### **4.1. EAES's Program Using More Traditional Approaches to CBI Outcome Evaluation**

In the EAES system utilizing more traditional approaches there are two programs;

- (1) The EAES Program that utilizes pre-and post-test measures; and
- (2) The EAES Program using a more quasi-experimental approach involving experimental and control target communities/populations.

A major activity in both of these programs is the development of standardized measures and data collection instruments. For example an interview instrument is developed to be administered in a pre-test and post-test administration to those that will be exposed to the project as a pre-test, and again after exposure. The Quasi-Experimental Program also administer these instruments as a pre-test and a post-test to a non-exposed population sample that is selected to match the characteristics of the exposed sample in every variable that may have an outcome on program outcomes, except those variables that are associated with the project's intervention. The type of intervention used in a CBI (e.g. an intervention utilizing the mass media versus an intervention utilizing interpersonal facilitation) determines how these EAES outcome evaluation program are carried out, and which structured instruments are used. More detail on the techniques used in these outcome evaluation programs is provided in greater detail in the monographs that are being developed about the CEHC, and another monograph that is being developed for the EAES. .

#### **4.2. EAES Program in CBI Outcome Evaluation with Technical Assistance and Project Monitoring**

EAES's Program in CBI Outcome Evaluation with Technical Assistance and Project Monitoring includes many of the same methods used in the EAES Traditional Outcome Evaluation Program. This second CEHC outcome evaluation program also includes, however, some of the technical assistance and monitoring activities used in the formative evaluation and process evaluation programs discussed earlier. Such formative and process evaluation techniques are used to assure that the project can be effectively evaluated, and that project planners and personnel can achieve maximal success possible. Utilized above, used as a preface to carrying out these traditional CEHC evaluation approaches. All of the techniques used in this second evaluation program are explained in greater detail in the monographs that are being prepared for the CEHC and the EAES Manual

### **5. From Outcome to Impact Evaluation and "Cultural Transformation"**

In the EAES, the concept of outcome evaluation discussed in the preceding section and our use of "impact evaluation," that will be discussed here are in the reverse order of how they are used in contemporary treatments of these concepts. That is, in most other uses of these concepts, outcome evaluation is defined in terms of whether or not a CBI has achieved its desired outcome (long term goals and objectives); whereas outcome evaluation assesses the eventual outcome of the project or the community. In the EAES on the other hand, we refer to *outcome evaluation as the assessment of whether a project has achieved its desired outcomes, and impact*

*evaluation is an assessment of the impact of the CBI on the community or population to which the CBI has been administered.* Reasons as to why the EAES differs in its use of these concepts are provided in the more detailed CEHC and EAES monographs that are being developed. The achievement, or lack of achievement of long-term project goals and objectives, also represents part of the evaluation of the "impact" of the project. Impact may also be demonstrated from the broad contextual body of data collected through the use of the three paradigms of the CEHC. However, the use of these paradigms also advocate that the desired outcomes associated with "*cultural transformation*" (change which is institutionalized to assure **routinization, sustainability, and diffusion**) within the community or population targeted by the project be included as part of the evaluation of impact.

The primary rationale for what the CSAC considers to be cultural transformation is related to the fact that **change is not truly change unless it is sustained beyond the immediate conclusion of the implementation of a funded project.** We know from anecdotal evidence that even projects that prove themselves "successful" by demonstrating the smallest allowable measurement of change when outcome evaluations are conducted, soon return to pre-project patterns of targeted attitudes and practices. In fact what we might measure as success at the immediate conclusion of a project may simply be an artifact of the fact that the support that has been provided by the project is still present; and or there may still be positive feelings between the project and community cultures.

In summary, true impact (sustainable change) cannot be evaluated simply at the end of the project; but must be assessed after some time has passed since the project ended. Thus the EAES calls for an assessment to be made after at least one year has passed since the project ended. If the long term change goals and objectives are still in place, including the institutionalization of these changes and their diffusion beyond those initially receiving the treatment, then cultural transformation is taking place.

The CSAC proposes that true sustainability of change or cultural transformation may not be demonstrated until the social (support) systems and ideas (attitudes, beliefs, values) that have been provided by the project culture have been taken over and maintained by the community culture. At the immediate conclusion of short term projects, particularly those of 3 years or less (the length of the so-called "demonstration" projects funded by public agencies), and even those of 5 years, a "foundation" for cultural transformation might have taken place; but only time can tell whether that foundation will turn into a truly cultural transformation characterized by change which is sustainable and diffused. **Because of these characteristics of cultural transformation, we propose that the evaluation of a project be continued for at least two years beyond the conclusion of the funding of the project; or that the evaluation team is brought back for a final evaluation two years after the conclusion of funding.**

In the EAES, it is propose that its impact evaluation strategies be carried out at least one year following the outcome evaluation so as to assess the *sustainability, routinization* and *diffusion* of a CBI's desired outcomes as indicators of true change. To measure such indicators, there are structured instruments that are developed and applied to those who were exposed to the CBI, called the "Exposed Impact Interview Guide" (the EIIG) and the Non-Exposed Impact Interview Guide (the NIIG). But more qualitative ethnographic methods are also used such as ethnographic observations, and natural conversation, key informant, in-depth or focus group interviews. These methods are also used to assess the impact a CBI on its target community or population beyond the project's desired outcomes. More information on the impact program of the CEHC is provided in the Full CEHC Manual and the EAES Manual (See Section 4).

## **6. Operationalizing Systems of the EAES: *The EAES Worksheets***

Appendix 3 provides worksheets for the evaluation team to develop their evaluation research

design. These worksheets begin with a cover page that first asks for general information regarding the name of the project, the name and address and contact person of the organization implementing the project to be evaluated, and a project code number to be filled in by the evaluator. The second part of the cover page asks for an abstract of the project, including its goals and overall objectives. Then the name of the evaluator is provided, and then the type of evaluation being evaluated, which in the EAES formulation are *formative evaluation and descriptive assessments, process evaluation and monitoring, outcome evaluation, and/or impact evaluation*. That is followed by a matrix which similar shows these five approaches to assessment and evaluation, and that they will be discussed in terms of evaluation objectives, research questions, research methods, research tasks, task assignments, and schedule or timelines. Then there are two worksheets. The first worksheet is a guide for generating evaluation objectives, research questions, research methods, and the second worksheet research tasks, task assignments, and timelines. The top of these sheets ask for the project title, and which assessment or evaluation category is being explored on this sheet. The second sheet also asks for which objective, which research question, and which research method is being explored in terms of tasks, assignments, and timelines.

### **7. Operationalizing Systems of the EAES: *Evaluation Objectives, Research Questions, and Methodologies Based on CSAC Categories.***

To further facilitate the use of these worksheets, Appendix 4 is a matrix of general issues to be considered to guide the completion of Worksheet I: evaluation objectives, research questions, and research methods, based on the CSAC categories, in relationship to descriptive assessments, formative evaluation, process evaluation and monitoring, outcome evaluation, and impact evaluation. This section is simply a discussion of the contents of the matrix, offering a direction for completing Worksheet I. *Evaluators should remember, however, that their project may not call for all five ethnographic assessment and evaluation systems (i.e., descriptive assessments, formative evaluation, process evaluation and monitoring, outcome evaluation, and impact evaluation), but all five are presented in Appendix 4, and discussed in this section, from which evaluators may simply focus on the information provided for the one EAES system that fits their specific project.*

## APPENDIX 1

### Summary of Ethnographic Assessment & Evaluation Systems' Programs and Example of Methods

#### 1. Introduction to the Ethnographic Assessment & Evaluation System

#### 2. EAES Programs in Formative Evaluation

##### 2.1 EAES Formative Evaluation Program 1: Project Culture Development (PCD) Review and/or Implementation

**2.1.1. Review for Presence of Project Design Activities that Involved Various Stakeholders.** Method include project document analysis, ethnographic observations and participant observation, and informal, semi-structured, and possibly structured interviewing

**2.1.2. Possible PCD Workshop,** if review finds project design inadequate for evaluation purposes, or for the purpose of establishing a "project culture.

##### 2.2 EAES Formative Evaluation Program 2: Project Culture Assessment Review and/or Implementation

**2.2.1. Conduct Cultural Assessment of the Various Organizations and Significant individuals Involved in the Project.** Methods include project document analysis, ethnographic observations and participant observation, and informal, semi-structured, focus group, personal or oral histories, and possibly structured interviewing (e.g. formal domain analysis).

##### 2.3. EAES Formative Evaluation Program 3: Community and/or Cultural Assessment Review and/or Implementation.

**2.3.1. Review for Presence of EICCARS.** Methods include project document analysis, and informal, semi-structured, focus group, and/or possibly structured interviewing.

**2.3.2. Carry out EICCARS Activities,** if review finds project design inadequate for evaluation purposes, or for the purpose of establishing a "project culture. Research methods used might include any of the following, statistical and other secondary data analysis, community windshield and walking tours, observations and participant observations in community settings and gatherings, community mapping using GIS technology, various forms of ethnographic interviewing, including informal, semi-structure, focus group, and structured interviewing (i.e. cultural domain analysis and/or surveys). Community based Participatory Research, in which community members are trained to assist in these methodologies.

#### 3. EAES Programs in Process Evaluation and Project Monitoring

##### 3.1. EAES Process Evaluation/Monitoring Program 1: Project Culture Development Review and/or Implementation.

**3.1.1. Project Culture Development Review.** This is done to establish the structure of the project design, and whether a project culture development process was carried. The review of the project design is to assess whether the project was organized into phases for the EAES approach to process evaluation and monitoring. The methods used are the same discussed in Section 1.1.1 above.

**3.1.2. Perhaps carry out PCD Workshop,** if review finds project design inadequate for

evaluation purposes, or that there seems to be problems in the project culture that could affect project outcomes.

### **3.2. EAES Process Evaluation/Monitoring Program 2: Phasic Project Monitoring and Evaluation**

**3.2.1. Assessment of Project-Community Dynamics.** If funding allowed, local ethnographer hired for assessment of project dynamics using participant observation, informal and semi-structured interviewing, and other methods if necessary. If not supported by evaluation funding, a staff member is trained to carry out such functions, and report back to CuSAG.

**3.2.2. Recording Phase Task Progress, Barriers and Enablers.** A simple 1-2 page form is maintained by project staff responsible for tasks during specific project phases upon which they record their tasks, when tasks started, when they ended, and the barriers and enablers experienced in the completion of specific tasks. These forms are collected by CuSAG staff person, or project supervisor responsible for completing objectives for a specific phase, and passed on to CuSAG weekly for analysis.

**3.2.3. Recording Progress of Project Phase Objectives, Barriers and Enablers.** A simple 1-2 page form is maintained by project staff responsible for achieving objectives for specific phases, with dates of completion, and barriers and enablers. These forms are passed on to CuSAG a week before the end of the specific project phase.

**3.2.4. Optional Two day Process Evaluation Workshops (PEWs).** This particular EAES program is optional because it is a traditional technical assessment (TA) activity, rather than a tradition evaluation function. As a traditional TA activity, it is one of the Cultural Ecology of Health and Change's (CEHC's) Project Implementation Programs (PIPs). They are offered in the EAES to sponsors who are interested in the EAES's "Evaluation for Success" perspective. PEWs are held at the end of each project phase. The first 1 1/2 days of these workshops are organized around the barriers and enablers experienced during the project phase that is ending, explorations into how barriers might be overcome and enablers further enhanced and utilized; while the last half of second day is used to review the objectives, strategies/tasks, task assignments, schedules, and measurable indicators for the next project phase. In addition to addressing project barriers and enablers across sites, this process also serves to empower participants by increasing their problem solving skills in implementing community based programs. The data collected from the Project Barriers and Enablers Recording and Progress of Objective Forms are used to begin the workshop. These workshops are audio taped, and the audiotapes transcribed, creating a body of qualitative data that will provide insight on the barriers and enablers across project sites. The last half day is spent with project staff responsible for the next phase, reviewing the objectives, strategies, tasks, assignments, and timelines.

## **4. EAES Programs in Outcome Evaluation**

**4.1. EAES Outcome Evaluation Program 1: Using Traditional One Group Pre-and Post Test Measures.** This program uses a primary quantitative or measurement approach to measure long term outcomes. A standardized interview tool is developed to be administered those exposed to project interventions both *prior to* and *following* project duration to assess project outcomes. This approach may also be used in formative and process evaluation in order to assess measurable outcomes of specific project interventions. A **time series** approach may also be added, when possible, in which the tool, or some part of it, or a similar one is administered at specific time intervals during projects implementation. In the case of the latter, this approach is administered to assess measurable outcomes for immediate and intermediate objectives (See Table 2).

**4.2 EAES Outcome Evaluation Program 2:** Using Traditional Quasi-Experimental Approaches. This program also uses pre-and post-test measures administered to the project participants exposed to project interventions. It also includes a comparison or *control* group not exposed to project interventions, and to whom the same pre-and post-tool instruments are administered. Where possible, randomized samples are used to assign those exposed (*experimental*) and controls. Multiple time series, in which the tools are administered at specific times to both controls and experimental, may also be used.

**4.3. EAES Outcome Evaluation Program 3:** The EAES Program of Integrating Traditional Evaluation Approaches with EAES Formative and Process Evaluations. This program combines the outcome evaluation approaches cited in 3.1 and 3.2, with some of the formative evaluation methods discussed in Sections 2 and 3. These methods may be combined with such qualitative approaches as open ended individual or group interview carried out in pre-and post formats, as well as observations of dynamics during the implementation of interview.

## **5. EAES Programs in Impact Evaluation and Assessment of "Cultural Transformation"**

**5.1. EAES Impact Evaluation Program 1: Assessment of Sustainability of Change.** This program assesses at 6 months, one year, or some other time period following project end, whether the changes measured at project's end still prevail. The same instruments used to measure outcomes at project end are repeated, but *only to those project participants exposed to the project's interventions.*

**5.2. EAES Impact Evaluation Program 2: Assessment of Diffusion of Change.** This program also uses a pre-post test survey format, but it is administered to a random sample of the community residents beyond those who had been exposed to the project's interventions. However, this instrument is administered pre-project, end of project, and at 6 months, one year, or some other time period following project's end. Such issues to be explore include: (1) the level of health knowledge, attitudes, practices (KAPS) and health status issues targeted by the project exists in this surveyed sample; (2) whether these KAPs have existed for sometime, or whether they came about recently; (3) were they knowledgeable about the project; (4) did they participate in the project; (5) how had they heard about the project; (7) would they say that their particular KAPs and health status were due to the project, and so on.

**5.3. EAES Impact Evaluation Program 3: Assessment of Institutionalization of Change.** This program assesses the degree to which project interventions have been institutionalized into the health and social service infrastructure of the community. This activity is also carried out at 6 months, one year, or some other time period following project's end. The methods used here involve informal and formal individual or group ethnographic interviewing, organizational document analysis, etc.

**5.4. EAES Impact Evaluation Program 4: Assessment of Unplanned Outcomes.** This particular issue is explored by adding components to the methods discussed in 4.1., 4.2., and 4.3., and more traditional ethnographic and qualitative interviewing carried out with a sample of project participants who had been exposed to the intervention.

## APPENDIX 2: Acronym Glossary

<b>CAR</b>	Community Assessment Research
<b>CBI</b>	Community Based Initiative
<b>CEHC</b>	Cultural Ecology of Health and Change
<b>CSP</b>	Cultural Systems Paradigm, a CEHC theoretical paradigm
<b>CSAC</b>	The Cultural Systems Approach to Change, a CEHC theoretical paradigm
<b>CSSAPPE</b>	The Cultural Systems Approach to Program Planning, Implementation and Evaluation, a CEHC theoretical paradigm
<b>CuSAG</b>	Cultural Systems Analysis Group, an anthropologically based unit at the University of Maryland College Park
<b>EAES</b>	Ethnographic Assessment & Evaluation Systems, the CEHC system of evaluation programs
<b>EICCARS</b>	Ethnographically Informed Community & Cultural Assessments Research Systems, the CEHC system of community & cultural systems research
<b>PBERF</b>	Project Barriers and Enablers Recording Form
<b>PCD</b>	Project Culture Development
<b>PDIP</b>	The CEHC System in Project <u>D</u> esign and <u>I</u> mplementation <u>P</u> lan
<b>PIPs</b>	The CEHC System of <u>P</u> roject <u>I</u> mplementation <u>P</u> rograms
<b>PTMs</b>	CEHC <u>P</u> rogram <u>T</u> echnical <u>M</u> anuals