Summary of Questions from participants during the webinar and responses from the program sponsors.

Question	Answer
Can't a researcher and evaluator be the same? For example, in the case of Community-Based Participatory Research.	Sure. However, evaluation and research are different things and therefore evaluators and researchers are trained slightly differently. Researchers are typically trained in the designs and methods accepted by their discipline as well as the theories associated with their substantive area. Training for evaluators is more interdisciplinary in nature since they often conduct work in more than one disciplinary area (e.g. education, public health, juvenile justice). Additionally, evaluators may have been trained in a broader array of designs and methods (e.g. qualitative and quantitative). You bring up a good point about the case of community-based participatory research. It seems that CBP researchers and evaluators would have a number of things in common- including the engagement of stakeholders.
Do you support using the evaluation metrics associated with the techniques of project management?	I am assuming here that the reference is to what we would typically call program monitoring. Program monitoring has been defined by Chen (2005) as "…a set of 'vital statistics' concerning the program implementation and outcomes." (p. 181) These "vital stats" are typically quantitative in nature, they are collected periodically (e.g. annually), and are meant to be indicative of program performance. So one might set up a monitoring system to help provide regular information to program managers or program staff about how many activities have been conducted (e.g. # of trainings held), how many individuals have been reached (e.g. # attending training sessions), and perhaps even to keep track of program outcomes (e.g. # of hospitalizations in the county for a given health outcome). This type of information can be very helpful to program managers and staff, however when possible it should also be accompanied by deeper evaluative activities. Monitoring will tell us what is occurring—evaluation can help us to better understand why things are occurring or how they happened.
How do you interact with those resistant to change? What strategies?	That's a great question and you might need to consider whether there are stakeholders that you can bring together in the same room or whether you just need to go to them on the side. Sometimes the best thing to do is to approach someone: "I know you have concerns about this program, let me talk to you about how we're moving forward with this and what kinds of results we think we can get and take action on and what hear what concerns you about this. Are there questions that we could include in this evaluation that would make you feel better about what we're doing, are there kinds of actions you're looking for that you need information to support?"

	Part of what you're trying to do is you're trying to diffuse it a little bit so that they can't just stand on the side and be a complete naysayer, but you're asking them to step in and be constructive. And how you do that, might vary depending on who it is. But I think what's important is you're saying "I'm hearing your concerns and I'm giving you an opportunity to give constructive input". It can also be helpful to develop and complete small, focused projects that are capable of yielding quick results. These results can be readily shared and when individuals see the type of information and tools that are produced from the experience, they may be less resistant to participation and/or change.
Is it possible to see that state asthma program instrument? Where on the Web will the instrument be available, please?	Currently the instruments are still undergoing development and revision, and therefore are not available on the CDC asthma program website. State asthma programs funded by the CDC can obtain a copy of the draft instruments by consulting with their project officers. Others may contact Leslie Fierro at let6@cdc.gov or Maureen Wilce at muw9@cdc.gov to obtain a draft copy of these instruments.
Do you have any additional suggested reading or textbooks or manuals to learn basics of evaluation, the big picture?	There are many excellent resources available for learning about evaluation. • There are many resources listed on CDC's evaluation working group website: http://www.cdc.gov/eval/resources.htm. If you have an interest in CDC's Framework for Program Evaluation in Public Health we would strongly recommend reviewing the *Introduction to Program Evaluation for Public Health Programs: A Self-Study Guide* which can be obtained at: http://www.cdc.gov/eval/evalguide.pdf. • In terms of textbooks, there are many. One of the most frequently used textbooks is *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* by Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W., and Freeman, H.E. If you are particularly interested in the utilization based approach we leaned towards on the webinar you may be interested in *Utilization-Focused Evaluation* by Michael Quinn Patton. A 4th edition of this text recently was published, I do not have experience with it, but found the 3rd edition to be helpful. There are many other nice texts out there that I have run across over the years, some include: *Evaluation in Organizations* by Darlene Russ-Eft & Hallie Preskill; *Practical Program Evaluation*, by Huey-Tsyh Chen; and *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* edited by Wholey, J.S., Hatry, H.P., and Newcomer, K.E. • There are also a variety of training opportunities in evaluation. The American Evaluation Association (AEA) offers trainings before and after their annual conference (www.eval.org) and CDC and AEA host a summer evaluation institute every year (more information on this

	is available on the AEA website- www.eval.org). Additionally there are a number of professional development workshops- some popular ones are hosted by Evaluator's Institute now located at George Washington University (http://tei.gwu.edu) and Claremont Graduate University (http://www.cgu.edu/pages/983.asp#Training).
Intrigued by developing mock reports to facilitate conversations about use - at what step would this be done?	In the case of the program monitoring system that we described we used this technique during Step 3 ("Focus the Evaluation Design"). It was helpful in thinking through what we needed to know as part of the monitoring system we were building, not just what we might have wanted to know or found generally interesting. Also, once we saw the type of information we were likely to receive, we could say a little more about the potential usefulness of the information for conducting our work. Sometimes the information would not be useful, but might be if we change the question wording or the answer type (e.g. change to a text box rather than forced choice quantitative answers). In other situations once we saw a potential report we decided the information just simply would not be useful. In other situations we looked at the mock report and interpreted it in light of the input we received from the individuals who filled out the form—which lead us to realize that the picture we were seeing was not necessarily as accurate as we desired and we couldn't get more accurate data without unduly increasing the burden on the respondent. In these instances the questions were omitted from the instrument. So the mock report was one input of many that helped us to think through the utility piece of the puzzle, thereby allowing us to focus our evaluation more.
When in the program's timeline is best to begin engaging stakeholders? At the very beginning? What if the program has already begun?	It is often the case that evaluations will be developed after a program is already underway. Although it is ideal to develop evaluations along with the program planning stage, the ideal situation rarely occurs. So, we would recommend engaging stakeholders when you begin developing your plan for evaluation. The sooner you can engage stakeholders the better. For example, in Step 2 of the CDC Framework a program description is created. It is important to have stakeholders involved at this stage, it is possible that stakeholders will have different ideas about how a program will be conducted and/or what may result from the program (e.g. the purpose of the program). The sooner these types of "issues" can be worked through the better positioned
The framework does not state the problem (how many children have asthma?) before you engage the stakeholders. When or where is this done?	The problem the program is addressing should be articulated with the stakeholders as part of Step 2, "describing the program."

In the real world, a funding proposal requires a logic model that spells out what you plan to evaluate and how it will be accomplished. It is usually not acceptable to say that we will involve stakeholders before deciding on the evaluation process. Any comments?	Good point. The ideal situation would be one in which you were provided with 6 months to a year or so to plan evaluation activities prior to committing to them, but this is certainly a very rare situation. If at all possible, when developing your logic model for the program (which should articulate what your program is designed to do not what will be evaluated) it would be helpful to get some buy in from at least primary stakeholders. If this is not possible, you may be able to revise your logic model after it has been submitted as part of your application. Many funders anticipate that programs will revisit their logic models. Perhaps you could also ask at least some of your potential program stakeholders what they would like to learn about in an evaluation of the program, and propose some evaluation activities as part of your application that would help to address these. Since many programs are funded for multiple years, it may be possible to present what you plan on doing the first year as part of your application, and then engage with your stakeholders following the awarding of funds to come up with an evaluation strategy that covers future years. This offers the opportunity to engage stakeholders in thinking through how to evaluate new activities. Even if you have program activities that extend over multiple years, it may be possible to examine different aspects of these activities beyond year one—this would provide an opportunity to engage stakeholders in discussions about what information they would find useful.
Is it ever appropriate to pay/stipend certain stakeholders for their participation?	I've been involved in evaluations where you're working with a particular community and you actually need sort of stakeholder representatives of that community to help with a lot of activities whether involved translation or gaining access. And in that case, if you're really asking them to do an important part of the work, and they're not people who have the opportunity to, or who can justify that in the context of their jobs, it might be important, in fact, to pay them. So it depends on the kind of role that you're asking of them. And I'd add to that, with some of our program sites, we've talked about stakeholders who may be included—that is those individuals who are affected or maybe affected by the evaluation or by the program. And so in those instances, if you are going to engage those people in the process, you might want to offer things that can help them get to your meetings. For example, you might want to offer child care, maybe transportation, those sorts of things to help facilitate and make it a little bit more likely that they will be able to have their voices heard in the process. And if you're doing focus group or collecting information from a group in some way, it's not uncommon to provide food.

When working with volunteers, how do you gather evaluation data in a comfortable way and with ease but still get worthwhile data?	I’m not sure there is any one “right” way to do this, but here are some thoughts: 1. Make sure to offer training sessions to the volunteers to help increase the likelihood that volunteers across settings are on the same page and collecting similar data in a similar way, 2. Consider offering small incentives—even just small tokens of appreciation, 3. Check in with the volunteers on a regular basis to see whether any issues or questions are arising, and 4. Be sure that volunteers know why they are collecting data and what will be done with it especially if they are going to assist with interpreting the results from data analyses (clarity and transparency are important). Also, please remember that if volunteers are participating in data collection and/or analysis activities they will need to be trained in human subjects so that they can offer the right protections for the data that is provided.