



KnoxCommunity

Health Service

*Working together -
a healthy partnership*

INTEGRATED HEALTH PROMOTION EVALUATION PLAN - 2006-2007

EVALUATION PLAN - PHYSICAL ACTIVITY/MENTAL WELLBEING AND SOCIAL CONNECTEDNESS SHARED OBJECTIVES 1-3

OBJECTIVE 1

Year	06-07			
IHP Priority Goal	Physical Activity + Mental Wellbeing and Social Connectedness SHARED OBJECTIVES			
Population target group(s)	Women with Children living in Bayswater- Physical activity Women parenting in difficult circumstances- Mental wellbeing and Social Connectedness			
Objective 1	Key Questions (What do we need to know to decide if we have achieved this objective?)	What information do we need to answer these questions?	How will this information be collected, by whom and by when?	Budget \$, hours, other
Objective By June 2007, develop collaborative partnerships (including Knox City Council) and a network of relevant local agencies, schools, community groups to guide program development and help facilitate future community change.	Process Evaluation 1. Have partners & network members found the process collaborative? 2. What efforts were made to involve local groups/ schools/ agencies/ businesses etc. and how useful were they? 3. Have collaborative activities started with any partners/networks?	1. Regular satisfaction feedback from each partner agency/business etc 2. Project network list (interest) 3. Documenting of activities/unexpected outcomes	1. Minutes of partnership meetings (project worker). Project diary by project worker to include evaluative comments from partnership/network groups. June 2007 2-3. Attendance sheets at events, meetings etc. by project worker Satisfaction surveys of partnership steering group by worker 6 monthly from Feb 2007. Information collected by Project worker and working group members – ongoing	

<p>Impacts 6 Partner agencies are engaged on the Women And Physical Activity (WAPA) Working Group. 3 Memorandums of Understanding Developed 75% of the 6 partners rate partnership as collaborative 10 agencies join the network 2 promotional items (eg. newsletter) produced and received by network</p>	<p>Impact Evaluation 1. How many agencies on the WAPA group? On network? Are main key stakeholder groups & change agents included? 2. To what extent are partnerships collaborative? 3. How many promotional items to network?</p>	<p>1. Partnership membership list No. of MOUs Database of network 2. Analysis of MOUs; Partnership Analysis Tool (PAT) for Partnership/ group relevant network members 3. No. promotional items and documented feedback/ outcomes</p>	<p>1-3. Collation of the following information for Interim Evaluation report in June 2007 by Project worker</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership group membership • MOUs analysis and compliance • Network database (compared with original stakeholder map from beginning of project) • PAT data • Collation of attendances, promotional items, collaborative plans or projects as evidence of community engagement • Collation of feedback/impacts from promotional items 	<p>TOTAL 74 HOURS</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------

OBJECTIVE 2 - PHYSICAL ACTIVITY/MENTAL WELLBEING AND SOCIAL CONNECTEDNESS

Year	06-07			
IHP Priority Goal	Physical Activity + Mental Wellbeing and Social Connectedness SHARED OBJECTIVE			
Population target group(s)	Women with Children living in Bayswater- Physical activity Women parenting in difficult circumstances- Mental wellbeing and Social Connectedness			
Objective 2	Key Questions (What do we need to know to decide if we have achieved this objective?)	What information do we need to answer these questions?	How will this information be collected, by whom and by when?	Budget \$, hours, other
Objective By June 2007 gain relevant and appropriate information from the target group to guide future development, utilising Peer Researchers.	Process Evaluation 1. How well did mothers (peer researchers, research participants) rate their involvement?	1. Reasons for joining, evaluative comments through the process, and reasons for drop outs.	1. Document progress/evaluative comments/reasons for drop out in project diary. Project Worker - ongoing	
Impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 Bayswater mothers engaged as peer researchers • 50% complete training and plan to continue involvement • 90% rate high enough skill/knowledge/confidence to carry out 	Impact Evaluation 1. What number and to what degree did target group participate as researchers in the research?	1. Enrolment sheets filled in by interested in peer research, attendance sheets at training	1-2. Following impact data collated by project worker for Interim Evaluation report: June 2007: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • total peer researchers/total interested • evaluation data from peer researcher survey and focus group data • Project diary data on no. of mothers consulted and from where, and how they were involved 	TOTAL 119 HOURS

research	2. How confident are researchers to continue beyond training?	2. Survey of Peer researchers' ratings of confidence and skill before and after training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data re research participants: no's, overall satisfaction following their involvement. 	
----------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

OBJECTIVE 3 - PHYSICAL ACTIVITY/MENTAL WELLBEING AND SOCIAL CONNECTEDNESS

Year	06-07			
IHP Priority Goal	Physical Activity + Mental Wellbeing and Social Connectedness – SHARED OBJECTIVE			
Population target group(s)	Women with Children living in Bayswater- Physical activity Women parenting in difficult circumstances- Mental wellbeing and Social Connectedness			
Objective 3	<i>Key Questions (What do we need to know to decide if we have achieved this objective?)</i>	<i>What information do we need to answer these questions?</i>	<i>How will this information be collected, by whom and by when?</i>	<i>Budget</i>
Objective By June 2007 to evaluate and document the initial development and implementation of a Participatory Action Research (PAR) model in a local context.	Process Evaluation 1. Has the census tool been assessed, piloted and checked by relevant academics/experts? 2. Have necessary changes been used to adapt the tool? 3. Were agencies used as destinations satisfied with process of census implementation? 4. Are project workers/peer researchers informed and confident in using process evaluation tools?	1. Minutes from meetings with/reviews by academics regarding tool 2. Notes on changes made to tool as outcome of review. 3. Satisfaction feedback on process from census destinations 4. Satisfaction feedback from staff about process evaluation tools.	1. Minutes collected and changes made by Project Worker May 2007 2-4. Stakeholder Forum in May 2007 will provide an opportunity to collect <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback from staff/peer researchers about usefulness of process data tools. Data from centres implementing the tool about it's usefulness Project worker and Partnership working group will collate information for inclusion in the Interim Evaluation report.	

<p>Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academically valid, locally appropriate census tool developed • Valid data from 30 mothers and representative no. of destinations • 1 interim report comprising relevant process data 	<p>Impact Evaluation</p> <p>1. Is the tool valid, credible, reliable as assessed by academics/consultants, relevant council management and key stakeholders?</p> <p>2. Are practical processes in place for gathering of census and process data?</p>	<p>1. Meeting minutes reviewing tool with each groups: academic, WAPA Working group and relevant council management</p> <p>2. Data collection plan in place for census data</p>	<p>1. By June 2007 Project Worker and members of the Participatory Action research working group to meet with University staff /other consultants to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review pilot tool • Check data validity <p>2 & 3. Interim Evaluation report June 07 by project worker to include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collation of census tool data and review outcomes • process data 	<p>TOTAL 364 HOURS – This is the total for the objective</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

EVALUATION PLAN - PHYSICAL ACTIVITY – OBJECTIVE 4

Year	06-07			
IHP Priority Goal	Physical Activity			
Population target group(s)	Women with Children living in Bayswater			
Objective 4	Key Questions (What do we need to know to decide if we have achieved this objective?)	What information do we need to answer these questions?	How will this information be collected, by whom and by when?	Budget \$, hours, other
By June 2007, to both engage local mothers parenting in difficult circumstances as researchers and gather data about their needs to ensure future activities respond to the issues of vulnerable populations.	Process Evaluation? 1. Who is enrolled in the peer research? How successful have engagement strategies with those parenting in difficult circumstances been? 2. Have their barriers/concerns been adequately addressed? Have necessary supports been put in place? Has the process been satisfying?	1-2. Feedback from these mothers as part of the process; what they need, how satisfied they are with process steps etc.	1. Enrolment form and interview of prospective peer researchers to include: perceived barriers and enablers to involvement – Project Worker & KCHS staff June 2007 2. Project diary by project workers to include steps to respond to needs of peer researchers. Health Promotion Worker - ongoing	

<p>Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30% initial researchers come from groups identified as parenting in difficult circumstances, • 50% of these complete training. • 80% rate high satisfaction with their involvement 	<p>Impact Evaluation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What percentage peer researchers and research participants are parenting under difficult circumstances? 2. How engaged and involved were researchers? 3. How satisfied were peer researchers with the processes to date 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demographic data/self reports on peer researchers and participants via enrolment forms/participant's survey instrument 2. Number of researchers who complete training by June 2007 on attendance sheets 3. Feedback from peer researchers regarding training and mentor support provided to date via Peer researcher survey (see Obj 2) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1-3. Interim Evaluation report June 07 by project worker to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of Peer researchers parenting in difficult circumstances • % of research participants parenting in difficult circumstances • ratings from these groups about the extent they were supported/barriers to involvement were addressed 	<p>TOTAL 56 HOURS</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------

EVALUTION PLAN - MENTAL WELLBEING & SOCIAL CONNECTEDNESS – OBJECTIVE 4

Year	06-07			
IHP Priority Goal	Social Connectedness			
Population target group(s)	Women parenting in difficult circumstances living in Bayswater			
	<i>Key Questions (What do we need to know)</i>	<i>What information do we need to answer these questions?</i>	<i>How will this information be collected, by whom and by when?</i>	<i>Budget</i>
<p>Objective 4 By June 2007 share learning's with and gain input from OEPCP members regarding Participatory Action research strategies currently adopted by KCHS.</p>	<p>Process Evaluation 1. What OEPCP activities were run relevant to engaging and working with vulnerable populations? 2. How useful have they been in improving the capacity of KCHS staff to undertake work in this area?</p>	<p>1. List of activities, working groups and forum organised by PCP members 2. Feedback from KCHS staff on effectiveness of partnership work via the PCP to improve engagement with vulnerable populations.</p>	<p>1. Activity Log kept in project diary recording events and attendance. HP Co-ordinator and Project workers- ongoing 2. Development and implementation of an internal survey to rate usefulness and provide feedback towards further planning for PCP activities. HP co-ordinator June 2007</p>	
<p>Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in 100% of activities. • Development of a mechanism to share learning's from KCHS community engagement and action research strategies. 	<p>Impact Evaluation 1. Were all major PCP planning and working group activities supported by KCHS? 2. How did other OEPCP agencies rate this mechanism in terms of usefulness for their work?</p>	<p>1. Notices of relevant events collated from OEPCP List of KCHS staff attendance at relevant activities 2. Feedback/ ratings of usefulness of shared learning's from KCHS from OEPCP members</p>	<p>1. Collated by HP co-ordinator and project workers June 2007 2. OEPCP members: Evaluation sheet developed as part of organising OEPCP activities.</p>	TOTAL 38 HOURS

EVALUATION PLAN - FINAL QUESTIONS – PHYSICAL ACTIVITY AND MENTAL WELLBEING & SOCIAL CONNECTEDNESS – COMBINED

	<i>Key Questions (What do we need to know to decide if we have achieved this objective?)</i>	<i>What information do we need to answer these questions?</i>	<i>How will this information be collected, by whom and by when?</i>	Budget
Overall aspects of the project (for example, whether achieved, cost effectiveness, opportunity for improvements)	How effective has the combined physical activity and mental wellbeing program been at garnering community support and involvement in the first year?	Satisfaction information Rates of Participation Stakeholder feedback	All methods described above in the Interim Evaluation report- Health Promotion workers- May 2007	NA
Preparation of evaluation report			Interim Evaluation report	
Dissemination			To key stakeholders	

EVALUTION PLAN - TOBACCO, ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG ISSUES

Year	2006-2007			
IHP Priority Goal	Smoking			
Population target group(s)	Young People			
Objective 1	<i>Key questions (what do we need to know to decide if we have achieved this objective?)</i>	<i>What information do we need to answer these questions?</i>	<i>How will this information be collected, by whom and by when?</i>	<i>Budget</i>
Objective: By June 2007, to work in partnership with 5 member agencies of the Smoke Free Knox Committee to develop and pilot school based smoking prevention Strategies.	Process evaluation 1. Does the partnership share equally in planning, development and implementation of the project? 2. What will assist schools in creating a whole of school approach including parents' teachers and young people?	1. Partners perceptions of the strength and effectiveness of the current partnership. 2. Information from school principals and senior staff about school based barriers and enablers.	1. VicHealth Partnership Analysis tool- Feb 2007 meeting, KCHS Youth Health worker 2. Interviews with school staff, March / April 2007, KDGP and KCHS staff	

<p>Impact: 50% of schools participating, alter or amend policies, procedures or activities to support smoking prevention</p>	<p>Impact evaluation 1. Do schools take on the smoking prevention message beyond the workshop?</p>	<p>1. Have schools initiated a number of other activities or changes with or without partnership assistance as a result of intervention?</p>	<p>1. Phone check in June 2007 – Youth Health Worker Survey administered Dec 2007 – earlier than this may not yield results- Youth Health Worker & KDGP</p>	<p>TOTAL – 58 HOURS</p>
<p>Overall aspects of the project (for example, whether achieved, cost effectiveness, opportunity for improvements)</p>	<p>How effective has the youth project been at engaging young people? Has the program introduced an intention to change (if a smoker) or reinforced position not to? Has the program impacted on parents of the young people?</p>	<p>Information collected at various points from young people (eg Launch-completed, first school – Feb 2007) and fed back into the design for continued quality improvement</p>	<p>KDGP, Youth Service and KCHS Youth Health Worker and School Nurse as appropriate collect information pre and post workshop and from school staff and parents</p>	
<p>Preparation of evaluation report</p>			<p>Evaluation report will be prepared by Dec 2007 in line with requirements of additional funding provided by School Focussed Youth Service to support GP involvement</p>	

Dissemination			Report will be disseminated via the School Focussed Youth Service network to other schools and via the Youth Service Provider Network to other agencies.	
----------------------	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

EVALUTION PLAN - SEXUAL HEALTH – OBJECTIVE 1

Year	2006-2007			
IHP Priority Goal	Sexual Health			
Population target group(s)	Young People			
Objective: 1	<i>Key questions (what do we need to know to decide if we have achieved this objective?)</i>	<i>What information do we need to answer these questions?</i>	<i>How will this information be collected, by whom and by when?</i>	<i>Budget</i>
Objective: By June 2007 form a collaborative partnership group and network with key stakeholders.	Process evaluation 1. Are partner agencies clear on their roles and responsibilities? Is there are a working, viable partnership with the key agencies committing time and resources as agreed in the MOU? Is the partnership meeting its agreed goals as identified in the Terms of reference? 2. Does the Network Engagement Strategy to ensure the broader network of agencies have “buy in” to the project?	1. Partners reflect on strength, usefulness, effectiveness and clarity of partnership arrangements. 2. Partners and stakeholders feedback on the effectiveness of activities within the Network Engagement Strategy	1. VicHealth Partnership Analysis tool administered by KCHS Health Promotion worker- May 2007 2. Youth Service Provider Network meeting and Newsletters used to workshop/invite feedback on processes- February & June 2007	

<p>Impact:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Terms of Reference for Core Partnership group established 2. Memorandum of Understandings signed with 4 partners 3. 80% of partners rate partnership as collaborative 4. Network Engagement Strategy developed and implemented 	<p>Impact evaluation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partners- Has the partnership involved a high level of collaboration and sharing of resources? 2. Network- Is there a comprehensive Network Engagement Strategy developed and in place? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partners reflect on level of engagement/partnering achieved. 2. Are activities in the Strategy being implemented as planned 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. VicHealth Partnership Analysis tool administered by KCHS Health Promotion worker- May 2007 2. Activity Log within Project Diary maintained detailing types and numbers of activities. Health Promotion Worker - ongoing 	<p>TOTAL – 35 HOURS</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

EVALUTION PLAN - SEXUAL HEALTH – OBJECTIVE 2

Year	2006-07			
IHP Priority Goal	Sexual health			
Population target group(s)	Young People			
Objective 2	<i>Key questions (what do we need to know to decide if we have achieved this objective?)</i>	<i>What information do we need to answer these questions?</i>	<i>How will this information be collected, by whom and by when?</i>	<i>Budget</i>
Objective: By June 2007 plan and commence consultation on young people's access to sexual health information, support and services	<p>Process evaluation</p> <p>1. Are the processes for engaging and consulting with young people and service providers appropriate and effective?</p> <p>2. Are there specific barriers and enablers to the consultation process, especially for young people from marginalised groups?</p>	<p>1. Ongoing input into consultation process from young people. Measures of satisfaction from young people & service providers regarding the processes of consultation.</p> <p>2. As above.</p>	<p>1. Data from Workshops at school and with the 3 community groups. Survey with young people who have been directly involved. Youth Health Worker – Jan- June 2007</p> <p>2. As above but some data re barriers and enablers may be obtained with support from workers with appropriate experience with the target groups of young people.</p>	

<p>Impact:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 group of young people have participated in leading peer research activities in a local school. 2. 3 workshops with 3 marginalised groups of young people conducted. 3. 1 Research Framework document developed. 4. 1 consultation workshop with local and regional service providers. 	<p>Impact evaluation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are groups of young people fully engaged and involved with the consultation process? 2. Is the consultation process answering the research questions about young people and their access to sexual health information, support and services? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participation rates of young people who nominate in workshops and training activities. List of services involved in consultation process. 2. Information on potential or actual gaps in research data is identified through data collection and analysis phases as outlined in the Research Framework 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Activity Log within the Project Diary will record and monitor participation levels. Youth Health Worker – ongoing 2. Quality audit of data by other KCHS Health Promotion Workers/external Partners– June 2007 	<p>TOTAL – 75 HOURS</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------

EVALUTION PLAN - SEXUAL HEALTH – OBJECTIVE 3

Year	2006-2007			
IHP Priority Goal	Sexual Health			
Population target group(s)	Young People			
Objective 3	<i>Key questions (what do we need to know to decide if we have achieved this objective?)</i>	<i>What information do we need to answer these questions?</i>	<i>How will this information be collected, by whom and by when?</i>	<i>Budget</i>
Objective: By June 2007 participate in partnership with Ranges CHS, and other agencies and schools to create an evidence based model which utilises health education and drama processes to generate health messages for young people.	Process evaluation 1. Have partners found the process collaborative? Is there evidence of the model being developed? 2. Are their barriers to engaging with and working collaboratively with schools?	1. Regular satisfaction feedback from each partner organisation. Documenting progress of model development through Action Research. 2. Measures of satisfaction from school nurse and drama teacher regarding the process of engagement.	1. VicHealth Partnership Analysis Tool administered. 2. Project worker project diary including barriers and enablers to collaborative process.	TOTAL – 15 HOURS

<p>Impact:</p> <p>1. Participation in 100% of action research activities 2. 1 Agreement with local school in place to support further development of model</p>	<p>Impact evaluation</p> <p>1. Has KCHS fully participated in all activities to develop model? 2. Has a comprehensive and realistic agreement been developed with the local school?</p>	<p>1. Partners reflect on level of engagement by all partners. 2. Information and feedback from the school nurse and drama teacher about the agreement reached?</p>	<p>1. VicHealth Partnership Analysis Tool administered. Minutes of partnership meetings. 2. Contract of commitment signed by KCHS and local school</p>	
<p>Overall aspects of the project (for example, whether achieved, cost effectiveness, opportunity for improvements)</p>	<p>How effective have the various strategies in this priority been at engaging young people in the process?</p>	<p>Information collected at various points from young people, partner agencies, partner school and fed back into action research process for quality improvement.</p>	<p>Project Worker, Partners and Health Promotion co-ordinator – ongoing over three years</p>	
<p>Preparation of evaluation report</p>			<p>Development of the Research Framework to allow later development of an evaluation report. Contribute to development of report by Ranges CHS on the CHAD action research project.</p>	
<p>Dissemination</p>			<p>Work collaboratively with Ranges CHS and partner organisations to disseminate report.</p>	