

Lesson 3: Evaluation Within and Across the Policy Process Domains

Lesson Overview

In the previous lessons, you learned about what policy evaluation is and why it is beneficial. In this lesson, you will learn how to perform policy evaluation using the CDC Evaluation Framework.

This lesson will discuss how to engage stakeholders, describe the policy, focus the evaluation design, gather credible evidence, justify conclusions, and ensure use of findings and share lessons learned. The lesson will also provide considerations for and examples of evaluation throughout the policy process.

By the end of this lesson, you will be able to:

- Describe how to apply the CDC Evaluation Framework throughout the policy process.
- Identify key questions to ask throughout the policy process.

This lesson should take approximately 35 minutes to complete.

The CDC Evaluation Framework

Overview of the Framework As It Applies to the Policy Process

You may already be familiar with how to use the CDC Evaluation Framework when evaluating programs, but remember that there are several unique considerations for policy evaluation, as discussed earlier in this course. This section will focus on the framework as it applies specifically to policy.

In this lesson, you'll learn about some considerations for policy evaluation and how the CDC Evaluation Framework can be applied throughout the domains of the policy process.

Unique Considerations for Policy Evaluation

- Policy evaluation is often one of multiple strategies intended to improve health, making identification of impacts and documentation of links between policy and observed outcomes more difficult.
- Policy evaluation may involve data collection efforts at system and community levels (e.g., using surveillance and administrative data).
- Policy evaluation can involve a broad range of stakeholders, who may vary by the particular stage of the policy process.
- Stakeholders must consider federal anti-lobbying guidelines throughout the policy evaluation process.



Step 1: Engaging Stakeholders

Considerations for Policy Evaluation

When engaging stakeholders during a policy evaluation, you may encounter some unique challenges. Because multiple private and public sectors often participate in policy efforts, it can be challenging to come up with a complete list of potential stakeholders. To address this challenge, consider stakeholders from a variety of sectors and disciplines and not just the “usual suspects.” Stakeholders from a variety of fields will provide unique perspectives on the evaluation.

Examples of Stakeholder Key Skills and Expertise

Types of Stakeholders	Skills/Expertise	Key Roles
Policy Experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expertise in policy process ▪ Understanding of critical policy content and implementation factors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describing the policy ▪ Focusing the evaluation design ▪ Justifying results ▪ Ensuring use and lessons learned
Evaluation Experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluation design and methodology ▪ Statistical expertise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Focusing the evaluation ▪ Gathering credible evidence ▪ Justify conclusions
Subject Matter Experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subject matter expertise ▪ Contextual knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engaging stakeholders ▪ Describing the policy ▪ Justifying conclusions ▪ Ensuring use and lessons learned
Those Impacted by Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contextual knowledge ▪ Knowledge of barriers and facilitators to implementation and evaluation ▪ Familiarity with data sources ▪ Alternative perspective on meaning of results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engaging stakeholders ▪ Describing the policy ▪ Gathering credible evidence ▪ Justifying conclusions ▪ Ensuring use and lessons learned
Decision Makers/Others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contextual knowledge ▪ Understanding of critical policy content and implementation factors ▪ Knowledge of barriers and facilitators to implementation and evaluation ▪ Alternative perspective on meaning of results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engaging stakeholders ▪ Focusing the evaluation design ▪ Describing the policy ▪ Gathering credible evidence ▪ Justifying conclusions ▪ Ensuring use and lessons learned



Step 2: Describing the Policy Effort

Considerations for Policy Evaluation

Describing the policy effort, as applied to policy evaluation, involves scrutinizing the features of the policy being evaluated, including its purpose and place in a larger public health context. The description includes information regarding the way the policy was intended to function and the way that it actually was implemented. This step also includes features of the policy's context that are likely to influence conclusions regarding the policy.

When describing a policy effort versus a program, it is important to remember that there may be a number of policy components that have not been clearly defined. Also keep in mind that although sometimes the underlying logic of a policy is clear and evidence-based, often it is not. Logic models are crucial tools in helping to elaborate the goals, content, and context prior to implementing the policy.

Policy Components

Component	Description	Example
Goals and Objectives of the Policy	Articulate the goals and objectives of the policy including the issue or need it is designed to address and potential measures of success, including health outcomes.	The goal of a motor vehicle restraint policy may be to decrease fatal crash-related injuries and the objectives may include increased use of seat belts and decreased crash-related injury severity.
Content of the Policy	Articulate the specific and inferred requirements for implementation including implementation milestones, feasibility of requirements, stakeholders, availability of resources and implementation responsibilities.	Take, for example, a state-wide policy to set nutrition standards for public school. Are the specified nutrition standards based on the best evidence? Does the policy detail how the change will be implemented, monitored, and enforced? Are the resources allocated sufficient to implement the change?
Context Surrounding the Policy	It is also necessary to identify and describe critical contextual variables including political interest, support and resistance, and potential facilitators and barriers to enactment and implementation.	Resistance from vested interests coupled with limited public support have impeded the enactment of many policies such as those requiring graphic warning labels on cigarettes or restricting sales of large-sized sugar sweetened beverages. Implementation also may be limited, such as when state budget cuts eliminate infrastructure required to monitor or enforce new policies.



Component	Description	Example
Underlying Logic and Causal Pathways Supporting the Policy	Articulate the underlying logic and causal pathways supporting the policy. These explain the connection between the activities and the outcomes. They may be informed by public health theory, research, and/or previous evaluations.	The underlying logic behind prohibiting smoking in public areas will reduce exposure to secondhand smoke, which will subsequently decrease related negative health impacts.

Step 2: Describing the Policy Effort

Using Logic Models

A logic model is a helpful tool to achieve clarity and consensus on aspects of the policy efforts. A logic model articulates the underlying logic, assumed causal pathways between a policy or policies and behaviors, as well as the links between those behaviors and long-term outcomes.

The logic model process, depicted in the graphic below, is an easy way to ensure that all stakeholders have the same understanding of the policy and its intended outcomes. Keep in mind that is not always feasible or practical to examine all the policy components in the logic model with one evaluation. Select the graphic for a definition and examples of each evaluation term.

Logic Model

A logic model is a systematic and visual way to present the perceived relationships among resources for a policy effort, the activities of that effort, and the changes or outcomes of that policy. The logic model visually depicts the linear pathways between the policy activities and specific outcomes, as well as the links between intermediate and long-term outcomes and impacts.

For more information, visit the webpage, "Developing a Logic Model or Theory of Change," from The Community Tool Box website. The link is provided in the course Resources.

Evaluation Terms

Term	Definition	Examples
Inputs	Information or resources required for developing/implementing policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding • Staff • Evidence/research base • Stakeholder support
Activities	Actions that comprise the program, in this case identifying the problem and developing and implementing the policy effort.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of policy options • Enactment of policy • Development of regulations • Implementation of awareness campaign around the policy



CDC Introduction to Policy Evaluation Web-Based Course

Term	Definition	Examples
Outputs	Direct products or deliverables that result from the activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Regulations• Enforcement of laws• Incentives• Changes in product design• Reach of policy• Changes in systems that support or facilitate a policy
Outcomes	<p>Short-term, intermediate, and long-term changes in target audience behaviors, awareness of risk factors, attitudes, and knowledge.</p> <p>Long-term changes in indicators are often referred to as impacts. For the sake of this course, we'll use the term "outcomes" to encompass impacts as well.</p>	<p>Short-term/intermediate changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increased rates of physical activity• Attitudes toward healthy eating• Decrease in smoking• Use of seat belts• Change in community norms <p>Long-term changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Decrease in obesity• Decrease in healthcare-associated infections• Decrease in injury rates• Decrease in morbidity• Decrease in mortality• Costs saved



Overarching Policy Logic Model Example

The sample logic model in the table below is aligned to follow the domains of CDC's policy process. It displays typical inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes that can be revised iteratively over time. For the color-coded graphic version of this logic model, see the CDC Policy Evaluation Guide, linked on the course Resources page.

Inputs	Activities	Outputs	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate Outcomes	Long-term Outcomes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context • Problem(s) • Infrastructure • Funding • Staff • Time • Knowledge • Stakeholder 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify problem(s) to be addressed • Engage stakeholders • Education • Review evidence & options (policy analysis) • Prioritize policy option(s) • Identify strategy/ies and how the policy will operate • Policy development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy analytic framework • Prioritized policy agenda/options • Engaged stakeholders • Implementation & enforcement strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy enactment*/adoption • Policy implementation • Policy enforcement (monitoring compliance) • Education, communication, & media 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to physical, economic, social environment • Behavior change • Changes in knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and skills • Changes in social norms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population-level impact on health outcomes • Equitable distribution of improvements across population sub-groups • Cost-effective improvements in population health

Step 3: Focusing the Evaluation Design

Considerations for Policy Evaluation

The design and focus of an evaluation will depend on which domain(s) of the policy process are being examined and the answers to the following questions:

- **Purpose(s):** Why is the evaluation being conducted?
- **User(s):** Who will use the information and what is their focus?
- **Use(s):** How will the information gained from the evaluation be used?

When focusing the evaluation design, consider the feasibility and utility categories of evaluation standards.

Feasibility and Utility

As you may recall, feasibility refers to the efficiency and effectiveness of the evaluation. Feasibility considerations may include factors such as available resources, data, and complexity. Utility standards address the extent to which an evaluation is valuable in meeting stakeholder needs.

Step 3: Focusing the Evaluation Design

Identifying Evaluation Questions

Once the team has pinpointed the focus of the evaluation, the next step is to identify the specific evaluation questions by considering the policy characteristics and intended use, as shown in the table below. A number of different evaluation designs exists. To choose one, consider the evaluation questions in the context of the data and resources available, and select the most appropriate evaluation design given the objective and focus of the evaluation.

Examples of Discussion Questions

Keep in mind that there is no one “right” design. In an ideal world, the team would select the strongest evaluation design regardless of the required data.

Policy Characteristics

- What type of policy is being evaluated (legislative, regulatory or organizational)?
- What level of policy is being evaluated (local, state, national)?
- What type of evidence base exists for this policy?
- How complex is the theory of change and the implementation of the policy?
- What phase is the policy in? Has it been fully implemented?

Intended Use

- What is to be determined and accomplished with the evaluation?
- How will the evaluation be used and who is the potential audience?
- How will the answers to this evaluation help move the field or policy forward?
- What are the interests in the evaluation of the policy and the policy itself?



Evaluation Designs

- *Experimental (or randomized) designs* try to ensure the initial equivalence of one or more control groups to a treatment group by administratively creating the groups through random assignment, thereby ensuring their mathematical equivalence.
- *Quasi-experimental designs* are study structures that use comparison groups to draw causal inferences but do not use randomization to create the treatment and control groups. The treatment group is usually given. The control group is selected to match the treatment group as closely as possible so that inferences on the incremental impacts of the program can be made.
- *Non-experimental/observational designs* include, but are not limited to, time-series analysis, cross-sectional surveys, and case studies. Non-experimental designs can provide valuable information but do not include a comparison group and are not able to provide evidence of a causal link between a policy and any outcomes.
- *Mixed methods evaluation* is a design for collecting, analyzing, and mixing both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or series of studies to understand an evaluation problem. (Adapted from Creswell and Plano Clark.)

Step 4: Gathering Credible Evidence

Considerations for Policy Evaluation

Step 4 of the CDC Evaluation Framework involves compiling information that stakeholders perceive as trustworthy and relevant for answering their questions. The **data sources** and types of evidence used in policy evaluation may differ from program evaluation. Policy evaluation often requires data collection on a much larger scale and scope than program evaluation.

In addition, the amount of time required to realistically expect to see change in each of the indicators can be much longer, which must be factored in the evaluation timeline. Outcomes may be more difficult to measure with surveillance data as there are often delays in availability with secondary or administrative data. Administrative and surveillance data may not include all of the individuals who were exposed to the policy.

Furthermore, data may not be available at the level that is needed. For example, you may be able to find data at the state level but not at the level of a local community or school district where the policy may have been enacted and implemented.



Data Sources

Some examples of data sources are listed below.

Legislative or Policy Databases and Documents	<p>Legislative or policy databases are a key tool in comparing policies across jurisdictions (including international, national, state and local). These databases contain detailed information about policies including content, context, and other relevant variables. This can make the task of compiling and comparing policies much easier. For example, the Congress.gov site provides federal legislative information with several search options. In addition, the National Conference of State Legislatures maintains a searchable database of state laws and regulations. Links are provided on the course Resources page.</p> <p>Additional sources of legislative or policy information include legal documents, regulations, amendments, and court rulings.</p> <p>More examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Chronic Disease State Policy Tracking System http://apps.nccd.cdc.gov/CDPHPPolicySearch/Default.aspx• ASTHO State Health Policy Tracker http://www.astho.org/state-legislative-tracking/
Surveillance Databases	<p>There are many existing surveillance datasets that can provide information on short- and long-term health outcomes. For example, CDC maintains the Epi Info™ software suite, which enables analysis of epidemiology and biostatistics surveillance data. This program is used worldwide for the rapid assessment of disease outbreaks, development of surveillance systems, and other uses.</p> <p>Links to the Epi Info site and more information about public health surveillance are provided on the course Resources page.</p> <p>More examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• WISQARS™ (Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System) http://www.cdc.gov/injury/wisqars/index.html• CDC WONDER (Wide-ranging Online Data for Epidemiologic Research) http://wonder.cdc.gov/Welcome.html



CDC Introduction to Policy Evaluation Web-Based Course

Administrative Databases	<p>Entities such as hospitals, schools, and police departments also collect administrative data on a regular basis that can be instrumental in evaluating a policy.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• State of Washington Comprehensive Hospital Abstract Reporting System (CHARS) http://www.doh.wa.gov/DataandStatisticalReports/HealthcareinWashington/HospitalandPatientData/HospitalDischargeDataCHARS.aspx• New York Statewide Planning and Research Cooperative System (SPARCS) http://www.health.ny.gov/statistics/sparcs/operations/overview.htm
Interviews or Focus Groups	<p>This can include structured or semi-structured interviews of key stakeholders or focus groups conducted with a number of stakeholders at once.</p> <p>As an example, the Public Health Informatics Institute conducted structured telephone interviews with a variety of stakeholder groups to gather information related to childhood obesity. They followed up with in-depth meetings and discussions with representatives from the Arkansas Department of Health, which had been measuring the BMI of all school children, and the Santa Cruz, California Department of Health, which had been collecting data about the health of local Hispanic children. To read about their findings, consult the link on the Resources page.</p> <p>More examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Child and Family Services Review Stakeholder Interview Guide http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/assets/stakeholder.pdf• New Jersey Coordinated School Health Student Focus Group Toolkit http://www.state.nj.us/education/students/safety/health/csh/focus.pdf
Stakeholder Surveys	<p>Stakeholder surveys can collect quantitative and/or qualitative data and be conducted in a number of different methods (paper, online, telephone, etc.).</p> <p>The National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) collects data on a broad range of health topics through personal household interviews (via the U.S. Census Bureau). Survey results have been instrumental in providing data to track health status, health care access, and progress toward achieving national health objectives.</p> <p>More examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chis/Pages/default.aspx• Wisconsin Falls Prevention Activities Survey http://www.dhs.wisconsin.gov/health/Injuryprevention/fallprevention/pdffiles/WI%20falls%20survey%20full%20report.pdf



Step 4: Gathering Credible Evidence

Types of Data Sources and Collection Methods

Data sources may be classified as primary vs. secondary, and data collection methods yield quantitative vs. qualitative information.

Some examples of primary and secondary data sources and quantitative and qualitative information are shown in the table below.

	Primary Data	Secondary Data
Quantitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questionnaires/surveys ▪ Measurement through direct observation ▪ Media tracking ▪ Tracking, registry included in policy language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing research ▪ Existing surveillance systems ▪ Geographic Information Systems (GIS) research
Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Content analysis of the policy, revisions, etc. ▪ Key informant interviews ▪ Focus groups ▪ Case studies ▪ Observations ▪ Media tracking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Secondary analysis of primary qualitative data sets ▪ Retrospective review of charts/case notes ▪ Literature review ▪ Environmental scan

Primary vs. Secondary

Primary data is new information you collect, while secondary data refers to existing sources (e.g., literature review, environmental scan, etc.). Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the data in the system will help shape the analysis and determine any additional data that may need to be collected to perform the evaluation.

Although using secondary data may save resources, there are some unique challenges when working with existing datasets. Because there is a lack of control over the data (what is collected, when, by whom, and how frequently), the dataset may not contain all of the desired variables or individuals to adequately carry out the evaluation. One technique for expanding the amount of pre-existing data available is data linkage. Linking data from two or more datasets can provide a much better picture of the various circumstances surrounding an injury event than just one dataset.

Quantitative vs. Qualitative

Quantitative data is numeric and can be analyzed to measure policy outcomes, whether they are short-term, intermediate, or long-term, intended or unintended. For example, some evaluation designs require collection of population level data at multiple points throughout a long time-period. The term “qualitative data” refers to



information that is not numerical and describes attributes or properties of an object or activity. Qualitative information is useful because it can provide detailed information about how a policy was implemented or provide insight as to why certain things happened during implementation.

Step 4: Gathering Credible Evidence

Selecting Outcomes, Indicators, and Measures

Before you can understand what evidence you will need, you need to determine which outcomes you will measure—guided by the purpose, intended use, and users of the evaluation. The team should also identify the indicators and measures used to assess progress toward selected outcomes. Be sure to select indicators that will realistically be impacted by the policy within the evaluation timeframe.

Try to balance subjective measures with additional objective or output measures, and keep in mind the context and content of the evaluation.

Sample Indicators and Measures

Indicators are specific, observable, and measurable variables that show the progress a policy is making toward achieving a specified outcome. Measures are the methods by which you will observe the indicators.

Indicators and measures may pertain to either the activities of the policy effort (known as process indicators) or the intended outcomes (known as outcome indicators).

Sample Indicators	Sample Measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of organizations with written policies• Number of citations issued• Effectiveness of training materials• Awareness of policy• Survey of compliance with core components• Increased rates of physical activity• Change in community norms• Decreases in morbidity and mortality• Costs saved	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Media tracking• Public involvement activity logs• Surveys of attitudes and priorities• Legislative process tracking



Context and Content

Consider the following questions when selecting methods and sources for an evaluation:

Context	Content
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ How much time is there until results are needed?▪ How many resources (monetary and human) can be devoted to the evaluation?▪ Are there special ethical considerations that need to be taken into account?▪ What is the level of rigor and accuracy demanded of the results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ How sensitive is the issue being addressed by the evaluation or question?▪ If a behavioral outcome is involved: Is this something we can observe? Can we observe without influencing behavior?▪ Are there issues of confidentiality or anonymity to consider?▪ Are we seeking a point in time estimate or are we trying to more fully understand the activity or outcome?▪ Are there readily available and accurate secondary data?

Audio Transcript

Policy Evaluation Expert: Some outcomes are easier to measure than others. For example, outcomes such as motor vehicle crashes are easy to define and have a clear indicator and data source. Outcomes that involve changes in attitudes or individual-level behaviors are harder to measure and may rely on self-report, observation, or proxy measures.

Step 5: Justifying Conclusions

Considerations for Policy Evaluation

Listed below are some considerations for justifying conclusions during policy evaluation.

- Present analysis results in a way that is meaningful and understandable to stakeholders
- Compare results from different data and methods.
- Reconcile inconsistencies between the analyses of various components/methods.
- Interpret results within the context of the evaluation questions, policy goals, and the policy logic model.
- Consider findings relative to evaluations of other phases of the policy.
- Compare results with other evaluations or research studies (with consideration of any critical differences in context or content).
- Consider alternative explanations for the findings.
- Consider the influence of external factors such as environmental changes or changes in other policies.
- Perform follow-up statistical analyses or conduct review of data as necessary.



Step 6: Ensuring Use of Findings and Sharing Lessons Learned

Considerations for Policy Evaluation

A consideration for this step of policy evaluation is to ensure that policymakers and other stakeholders have the best available evidence to inform their decision-making process. In addition to policymakers, findings may need to be shared with colleagues, partners, and the general public.

Suggestions for Communicating with Policymakers

Keep in mind that policymakers are often inundated with reports, leaving them little time for analysis and interpretation. Depending on the purpose of the evaluation, here are several suggestions to communicate findings with policymakers:

- Frame data in relation to local context.
- Provide real-life illustrations to help policy makers relate to the findings.
- Illustrate statistical data in clear, simple charts and graphs.
- If results are mixed or complicated, present them accurately while striving for clear and succinct communication of the major findings.
- Cost-benefit analyses can be a critical component for demonstrating the economic value of a policy.
- Base information presented on evaluation findings rather than on value-based recommendations or suggestions.

Suggestions for Communicating with Colleagues

When planning and drafting a formal evaluation report for use by other researchers, evaluators, policy peers, academicians, and leading experts, it is important to do the following:

- Communicate all components in a clear, succinct format, without bias.
- Provide background information, relevant historical data, and purpose of the evaluation.
- Include a comprehensive description of the policy being evaluated.
- Describe the context of the policy—demographics, timeline, and resources.
- Outline data collection methods, type of data collected, and analysis process.
- Summarize information about choices made and procedures used during design election and implementation.
- Clarify how to use and interpret data, including limitations.



Suggestions for Communicating with Partners

Because policymakers rely on information and advice from many sources, it is important to include partners and other stakeholders in dissemination efforts. Use the following considerations when communicating with partners:

- Focus on fostering collaborative efforts and partnerships.
- Provide evaluation results and evidence to assist partners in framing policy issues.
- Use partners to disseminate evaluation findings through multiple channels at appropriate times.
- Encourage partners to build capacity to do policy evaluation.
- Use consistent, targeted messaging via print and electronic media, social marketing tools, the press, and various other communications methods.
- Communicate and disseminate information to partners based on specific needs and in easy-to-understand formats that can be replicated for other audiences.
- Frame information to meet the needs of different audiences, to increase the likelihood that evaluation results will be used and communicated effectively.

Suggestions for Communicating with the Public

Like other audiences mentioned, messaging and media surround the general public. These considerations may help reach target audience members and effectively communicate your message:

- Prepare concise communications that are easy to read, such as using short, familiar words and avoiding jargon.
- Use simple graphics as an effective means of communicating with the general public.
- Develop a short list of key meaningful messages to focus on communicating.
- Break down your target audience into subpopulations so that you can tailor messages more narrowly if you think that may be helpful.
- Develop a dissemination plan to ensure that materials reach your target audiences.
- Pretest materials with target audience members when possible and use feedback from participants to revise materials as necessary.

Step 6: Ensuring Use of Findings and Sharing Lessons Learned

Reporting and Presenting Findings

Reporting on both evaluation procedures and results starts with the fundamental principles of communication and understanding:

- Know your audience.
- Identify objectives of communication.
- Consider the best frame for your message to meet the communication objectives.
- Consider the method(s) you will use to deliver your message.



When presenting evaluation results, it is essential that you convey the information in an objective and unbiased manner. This approach can be especially helpful when presenting information that may contradict existing practice or popular opinion. Consider any restrictions on involvement in the policy development process and ensure that you do not violate them when developing communication objectives and materials.

You may view a checklist of items to consider when developing evaluation reports here:
<http://www.cdc.gov/eval/steps/reportschecklist.pdf>.

The CDC Evaluation Framework Applied Within and Across the Domains of the Policy Process

As stated earlier, the evaluation steps might require different considerations in each of the policy process domains. For each of the domains, the tables below present an overview of the purpose, possible stakeholders, uses, evaluation questions, and methodology considerations.



Evaluation Within the Problem Identification Domain

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
	<p>"I'd like for my family to eat more fruits and vegetables, but the stores around here don't stock much produce, and what they do have is so expensive! We just can't afford to buy healthier food."</p> <p>—Maria, rural community member</p> <p><i><Photo of an overweight Hispanic woman.></i></p>
<p>Policy Evaluation Expert: Maria's assessment of her family's situation is just one example of a larger problem. According to studies conducted by CDC, many low-income people have difficulty accessing the necessary foods for maintaining a healthful diet.</p>	<p>Many low-income people have difficulty accessing the necessary foods for maintaining a healthful diet.</p> <p><i><Photo of grocery store aisle with no fresh produce available.></i></p>
<p>Let's consider how an evaluation of the Problem Identification domain for this example could be carried out.</p>	<p><i><Graphic of the policy process with the Problem Identification domain highlighted.></i></p>
<p>The purpose is to evaluate the process of identifying the context and cause(s) of the issue and the extent that it lends itself to potential policy solution(s) and prioritized action.</p>	<p>Purpose</p> <p>To evaluate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The process of identifying the context and cause(s) of the issue. ▪ The extent that it lends itself to potential policy solution(s) and prioritized action.

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
<p>The evaluation considers which stakeholders were involved and how they were engaged. Stakeholders during Problem Identification may include policymakers, health department staff, and community planning groups.</p>	<p>Stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Policymakers▪ Health Department Staff▪ Community Planning Groups
<p>The evaluation also considers uses, such as understanding and documenting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The process by which stakeholders addressed the issue.▪ The needs and resources of the target community as it relates to the issue.▪ How possible theories of change related to addressing the problem were identified.	<p>Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Process by which stakeholders addressed the issue.▪ Needs and resources of the target community.▪ How possible theories of change were identified.
<p>Several evaluation questions may be asked, such as questions about the type of data collected and analyzed, the nature and causes of the problem, identification of gaps in the data, definition of the problem, and stakeholder engagement.</p>	<p>Evaluation Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ What data were collected and analyzed?▪ Was the data collection comprehensive enough to provide an accurate picture of the problem and the context?▪ Were the nature and causes of the problem included such as frequency, scope, and severity?▪ Were gaps in data identified?▪ Was the problem defined in a way to lend itself to policy solution(s) or actions?▪ Were the right stakeholders engaged in the definition of the problem, data collection, and analyses to ensure a comprehensive assessment?

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
Methodology considerations may include qualitative data, such as interviews with stakeholders involved in the needs assessment, or environmental scan strategies. Evaluators also look for documentation of the problem identification process, such as discussions around problem identification.	<p>Methodology Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Qualitative data▪ Documentation of problem identification process
To read about the example used for this domain, consult these documents, linked on the Resources page.	<p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Availability, Affordability, and Accessibility of a Healthful Diet in a Low-Income Community▪ Healthier Food Retail: Beginning the Assessment Process in Your State or Community

Evaluation Within the Policy Analysis Domain

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
	<p>"I can't wait for the Atlanta BeltLine project to be completed. Having a bike trail that runs right by my neighborhood will make it easier to stay fit."</p> <p>—John, Atlanta resident</p> <p><i><Photo of a fit male on a bicycle></i></p>
<p>Policy Evaluation Expert: Decision makers must rely on more than anecdotal evidence when spending millions of dollars on projects and policies to impact public health.</p> <p>Let's consider how an evaluation of the Policy Analysis domain for the Atlanta BeltLine project could be carried out.</p>	<p><i><Graphic of the policy process, with the Policy Analysis domain highlighted.></i></p>
<p>The purpose of the evaluation is to understand the process of policy development, including analysis of policy options, contextual support/opposition, and potential public health, and economic and fiscal impact(s).</p>	<p>Purpose</p> <p>To understand</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The process of policy development. ▪ Analysis of the policy options. ▪ Contextual support/opposition. ▪ Potential public health, economic, and fiscal impact(s).
<p>Evaluators consider how stakeholders, such as policymakers, health department staff, and community planning groups, were engaged.</p>	<p>Stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policymakers ▪ Health Department Staff ▪ Community Planning Groups

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
They consider uses, such as understanding of several factors.	<p>Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ How policy options and related pros and cons were identified.▪ How the most appropriate policy option was selected.▪ How key strategies—and potential challenges—to enacting selected policy were identified.
They also ask several questions during the evaluation, such as questions about the theory of change used, how policy options were examined, what factors the analysis considered, how policy options and priorities were assessed, whether implementation requirements were outlined, unintended outcomes were considered, and stakeholders were engaged.	<p>Evaluation Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Was an evidence-based theory of change used?▪ How were the policy options examined?▪ Did the analysis of policy encompass the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Political feasibility?○ Public health impacts?○ Economic and fiscal impacts?○ Resources necessary for enactment?▪ How were policy options assessed and priorities assessed?▪ Were requirements for implementation outlined in the policy?▪ Were negative or positive unintended outcomes considered?▪ Were the stakeholders engaged so that the identification and prioritization of policy options reflect the economic and political realities of the context?

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
<p>The evaluator may want to consider which analytic tools and methods were used during Policy Analysis. For example, to anticipate and influence the Atlanta BeltLine's effect on health determinants, a health impact assessment (HIA) was conducted. An HIA is a useful tool that can provide decision makers with recommendations for maximizing positive health impacts and mitigating potentially negative health impacts.</p>	<p><<i>Photo of joggers on a trail.</i>></p>
<p>Evaluators of the Policy Analysis domain will consider how the HIA was conducted, as well as other tools and methods that may have been used, such as a review of literature, legislation, and case studies or interviews, as well as an environmental scan of potential facilitators for, and barriers to, implementation, such as engaged stakeholders, political support or opposition, level of policy change required, and resources required. Evaluators may also review other data, such as analytic reports and meeting notes.</p>	<p>Methodology Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health Impact Assessment (HIA). ▪ Literature review (published and nonpublished) to identify possible policy strategies to address issue. ▪ Legislative review to identify communities in which policy has been implemented. ▪ Case studies or interviews to understand how a similar approach has been implemented in other communities. ▪ Environmental scan of potential facilitators for and barriers to implementation of policy options. ▪ Analytic reports, meeting notes, and other data.
<p>To read about the example used for this domain and for more information, consult these documents, linked on the Resources page.</p>	<p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health Impact Assessment of the Atlanta Beltline ▪ Case Studies of HIAs ▪ HIA Resources ▪ Choosing Effective Policies and Programs ▪ Selecting and Implementing Evidence-Informed Health Policies ▪ Economic Evaluation of Public Health Laws and Their Enforcement

Evaluation Within the Strategy and Policy Development Domain

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
	<p>"I found out my mother was taking painkillers prescribed by two different doctors. She didn't realize how dangerous it was."</p> <p>—Antonio, son of Sophia</p> <p><i><Photo of a middle-aged man and an elderly woman.></i></p>
<p>Policy Evaluation Expert: Most states have enacted prescription drug monitoring programs aimed at preventing the situation Antonio described.</p>	<p><i><Photo of prescription drugs.></i></p>
<p>For states considering such a program, or changes to their existing programs, let's consider how an evaluation of the Strategy and Policy Development domain could be carried out.</p>	<p><i><Graphic of the policy process with the Strategy and Policy Development domain highlighted.></i></p>
<p>The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the policy and the adoption and implementation strategies in the specific settings and jurisdictions.</p>	<p>Purpose To assess, in the specific settings and jurisdictions, the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy ▪ Adoption strategies ▪ Implementation strategies
<p>Evaluators consider how stakeholders were engaged.</p>	<p>Stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policymakers ▪ Health Department Staff ▪ Community Planning Groups

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
<p>When the focus is on development of a policy, the aim is to understand how a particular policy strategy was selected, advocated for, and subsequently enacted. This evaluation can be used in many ways.</p>	<p>Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Evaluating activities, such as in education and communication.▪ Fostering partnerships.▪ Recommending general policy strategies.▪ Describing the process of development.▪ Looking at whether the activities were “successful.”
<p>Evaluators also ask several questions, such as questions about the activities that took place, changes in content of the policy, barriers to and facilitators for enactment, clarity of goals and objectives, articulation of an evidence-based theory of change, and consistency with model policies.</p>	<p>Evaluation Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ What were key activities taking place during the development phase? Which of these activities are critical in achieving the outcomes?▪ Were there any key changes in the policy content originally proposed and the final policy content?▪ What are the key barriers to and facilitators for the enactment of this policy?▪ Does the policy clearly state the goals or objectives?▪ Does the policy clearly articulate a theory of change that is supported by evidence?▪ Are the components of the policy consistent with “model” policies?

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
<p>Evaluation of the Strategy and Policy Development domain typically relies heavily on qualitative methodologies. As one example, Harvard Family Research Project developed the Bellwether Methodology, in which evaluators interview influential thought leaders in the public and private sector ("bellwethers") to gauge the visibility and momentum of a policy issue.</p>	<p>Methodology Considerations</p> <p>Heavy use of qualitative methodologies, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Bellwether methodology▪ Media tracking▪ Policy tracking▪ Public polling
<p>To read about the example used for this domain and for more information, consult these documents, linked on the Resources page.</p>	<p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Prescription Drug Monitoring Program Fact Sheet from the Office of National Drug Control Policy▪ Evaluating an Issue's Position on the Policy Agenda: The Bellwether Methodology

Evaluation Within the Policy Enactment Domain

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
	<p>"It's amazing to think about how far we've come in this country through immunizations. My grandmother contracted polio when she was a child, and she was never the same after that. My father nearly died when he was a boy because of complications from measles. Thanks to vaccines, I don't worry about my daughter being exposed to those diseases at school."</p> <p>—Naomi, mother of a kindergarten student</p> <p><i><Photo of a woman and a kindergarten-aged girl.></i></p>
<p>Since the first school vaccination requirement was enacted in Massachusetts in 1855 to prevent smallpox transmission, school immunization laws have played a key role in the control of vaccine-preventable diseases in the U.S.</p>	<p><i><Photo of a school child from the nineteenth century.></i></p>
<p>Now, all 50 states have some form of vaccination requirements, not only for schools, but also for child care centers. To understand the effectiveness of these requirements, evaluators can study how they have been enacted across the states.</p>	<p><i><Photo of a preschool student.></i></p>
<p>The purpose of evaluating the Policy Enactment domain is to assess the process of policy adoption/enactment (including laws, regulations, procedures, administrative actions, incentives, or voluntary practices).</p>	<p><i><Graphic of the policy process, with the Policy Enactment domain highlighted.></i></p>
<p>Evaluators consider how stakeholders, such as policymakers, state health departments, community groups, and implementers (in this case, child care providers) were engaged throughout the process.</p>	<p>Stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policymakers ▪ Health Department Staff ▪ Community Planning Groups ▪ Implementers

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
<p>Evaluating the content of a policy can improve future efforts and provide important context necessary for interpretation of implementation and impact evaluation results. It can also help to identify whether the actual content clearly articulates the requirements of the policy and is based on a theory of change with sufficient evidence.</p>	<p>Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improve future efforts ▪ Provide important context ▪ Identify whether the content articulates policy requirements ▪ Identify whether the content is based on a theory of change with sufficient evidence
<p>Evaluators will ask several questions about the adoption and enactment of the policy, including questions about the content of the policy as adopted or enacted, consistency with the evidence base, the barriers to, or facilitators for, adoption or enactment, the uniformity of the adoption or enactment and factors responsible, stakeholder engagement, and clarity and feasibility of implementation requirements.</p>	<p>Evaluation Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Was the policy adopted/enacted? ▪ What was the content of the policy adopted/enacted language? ▪ Was the enactment consistent with the best available evidence/findings of the policy analysis? ▪ What were the barriers to or facilitators for enactment? ▪ Was adoption/enactment uniform? What were the factors responsible? ▪ Were stakeholders engaged so the evaluation of enactment will include barriers and facilitators especially where enactment is not uniform? ▪ Are the requirements for implementation clearly stated in the policy? Are these requirements feasible given the resources and capacity of the stakeholders who will be implementing the policy?

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
<p>In this example, evaluators could review the state laws, regulations, and rules dealing with vaccination requirements for enrollment and attendance in childcare facilities and schools and compare them to evidence of vaccine-preventable disease occurrences in these states.</p> <p>Even simple policies can be deceptively complicated. Evaluators often measure policies in yes/no terms, which ignores many important complexities within each of the policies.</p> <p>Articulating the relevant dimensions and components of the policy being evaluated is a critical step in content evaluation. When comparing the content of different policies, construct a table, chart or spreadsheet to describe the components of the policies. Then look for different categories or components occurring across the policies.</p>	<p>Methodology Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Compare the policy language as enacted to criteria based on evidence.▪ Be careful not to oversimplify the evaluation.▪ Compare similar policies to identify key similarities and differences.▪ Describe the components of policies and look for different categories or components occurring across different policies. <p><i><Photo of a person reviewing documents.></i></p>
To read about the example used for this domain and for more information, consult these resources, linked on the Resources page.	<p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ CDC Vaccination Coverage and Surveillance: School and Childcare Vaccination Surveys▪ Vaccination Mandates: The Public Health Imperative and Individual Rights

Evaluation Within the Policy Implementation Domain

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
	<p>"My son loves to play football, and I enjoy watching his games. But I've seen athletes in the news with brain trauma from multiple concussions, and I have to admit, it worries me. I'm glad my state has a Return to Play law."</p> <p>—Desmond, father of a middle school football player</p> <p><i><Photo of a man with his son, holding a football.></i></p>
Between 2009 and 2012, at least 43 states and the District of Columbia passed laws requiring removal and clearance for Return to Play among youth athletes. But how effectively have these laws been implemented?	<i><Photo of an American football team.></i>
The National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (NCIPC) conducted a case study evaluation comparing implementation efforts in two states, Washington and Massachusetts.	<i><Graphic showing the outlines of the states of Washington and Massachusetts.></i>
The purpose of policy evaluation for the Policy Implementation domain is to understand how the policy was translated into practice.	<i><Graphic of the policy process with the Policy Implementation domain highlighted.></i>
In this example, evaluators conducted in-depth interviews with a variety of stakeholders, including policymakers, state health departments, community groups, and implementers (such as school coaches, regional athletic directors, and interscholastic athletic associations) were involved in implementation.	<p>Stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policymakers ▪ State Health Departments ▪ Community Groups ▪ Implementers

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
<p>Evaluating implementation can identify critical differences between planned and actual implementation as well as barriers, facilitators and successes.</p> <p>Depending on the circumstances of policy implementation, it may be possible to compare the implementation of different intensities or variations of a policy.</p> <p>Implementation evaluation results can be used to improve the implementation process and inform future policy development.</p> <p>Having a thorough implementation evaluation can inform the development of the impact evaluation plan and assist with interpretation of impact evaluation results.</p>	<p>Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify critical differences between planned and actual implementation. ▪ Identify barriers, facilitators, and successes. ▪ Compare the implementation of different intensities or variations of a policy. ▪ Improve the implementation process. ▪ Inform future policy development. ▪ Inform the development of the impact evaluation plan. ▪ Assist with interpretation of impact evaluation results.
<p>As with other policy process domains, evaluators ask many questions to find out how clearly the policy identified implementation steps, whether standards, indicators, and measures were identified, whether the anticipated outputs resulted, what inputs and resources were required and used, whether the policy was implemented according to requirements, in a uniform manner, and what barriers to, and facilitators for, implementation existed.</p>	<p>Evaluation Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Did the policy clearly identify the critical implementation steps? ▪ Were implementation standards and indicators/measures identified in the legislation/policy? ▪ Did the activities result in the anticipated outputs? ▪ What inputs and resources were used to implement the policy? What inputs or resources were required, but not available? ▪ Was the policy implemented according to the policy requirements? ▪ Was implementation uniform? What were the factors responsible? ▪ Were there barriers or facilitators contributing to success of implementation?

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
<p>Evaluation of policy implementation often relies on non-experimental descriptive or exploratory designs such as case studies and cross-sectional designs.</p> <p>Typically, the focus of the design is on accurately describing implementation rather than “proving” any specific hypothesis or demonstrating relationships between variables.</p> <p>The evaluation design may also include exploration of differences in implementation in different contexts or for different variations of the policy.</p> <p>To make comparisons between implementing jurisdictions, a cross-sectional design may be used or multiple case studies may be conducted. Be sure key contextual differences between the jurisdictions are identified and measured.</p> <p>If a policy has a range of different components or “levels” of implementation, qualitative and quantitative data may be collected on the differences between the jurisdictions. This information can be valuable in comparing the relative effectiveness of the various components.</p>	<p>Methodology Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Relies on non-experimental descriptive or exploratory designs.▪ Focuses on accurately describing implementation rather than proving a hypothesis.▪ May include exploration of differences in implementation.▪ May use a cross-sectional design or multiple case studies.▪ May use qualitative or quantitative data.
To read about the example used for this domain and for more information, consult these resources, linked on the Resources page.	<p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Implementing Return to Play: Learning from the Experiences of Early Implementers▪ Interactive Youth Sports TBI Laws Map from LawAtlasSM

Evaluation of Policy Impact

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
	<p>"My grandparents bought a mobile infant walker for our baby when he was born. I know they're made to safer standards now, but I was still afraid to use it. I exchanged it for a stationary activity center. He just loves it, and I feel better knowing he can't get into places he shouldn't."</p> <p>—Clarice, new mother</p> <p><i><Photo of a young woman holding a baby.></i></p>
<p>Clarice made a smart choice; in fact, the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) recommends a ban on the manufacture and sale of mobile infant walkers because of their association with injuries and deaths.</p> <p>The revised American Society for Testing and Materials F977 voluntary infant walker standard, implemented in 1997, requires that walkers be too wide to fit through a standard 36-inch doorway or to incorporate features to stop the walker at the edge of a step.</p> <p>Has this policy been effective at reducing injuries to infants?</p>	<p><i><Photos of a stationary infant activity center and a mobile infant walker.></i></p>
	<p>Stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policymakers ▪ State Health Departments ▪ Community Groups ▪ Implementers

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
<p>Evaluation to determine policy impact involves identifying the occurrence and variation of intended and unintended outcomes.</p> <p>Evaluating the outcomes of an evaluation aims to determine whether the intended changes have occurred; whether those changes can be attributed to the policy; and oftentimes the economic impact/cost-benefit of these changes.</p>	<p>Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Identifying intended and unintended outcomes▪ Determining whether changes can be attributed to the policy▪ Assessing the economic impact and cost benefit of the changes
<p>As with evaluation within the policy process domains, evaluators ask many questions to find out about stakeholder engagement, whether the anticipated outcomes resulted, whether any unintended outcomes resulted, how factors influenced impacts and implementation, and what the economic impact of the policy was.</p>	<p>Evaluation Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Were stakeholders engaged in the selection of outcome measures of success and their collection?▪ Did the activities result in the anticipated outcomes?▪ Is the policy achieving its intended outcomes? Was there a change in the outcomes of interest?▪ Were there positive or negative unintended outcomes?▪ Did contextual factors influence the level of impact? What external factors influenced the implementation?▪ What was the economic impact of the policy (cost-effectiveness or cost-benefit)?

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
<p>Evaluation of policy impact may focus on short-term, intermediate, and long-term health outcomes such as knowledge, attitudes, and especially health behavior.</p> <p>While determining if changes have occurred is relatively straightforward, attributing changes to the policy presents some challenges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You may have difficulty isolating the effects of the policy from the influence of other interventions and external factors. • A considerable amount of time may pass before a change in indicators is evident. • It may be difficult to identify appropriate comparison groups. • The necessary data may not be available. 	<p>Methodology Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May focus on short-term, intermediate, and long-term health outcomes ▪ Attributing change to policy can be challenging for several reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Difficulty in isolating the effects of the policy ○ Time delays ○ Identification of comparison groups ○ Lack of data
<p>Many factors may affect evaluators' ability to make the case for a causal relationship between the policy and observed changes in outcomes. These factors include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature of the relationship between the policy and the impacts • Expected magnitude of change in impact • Expected length of time to see evidence of the policy effects • Nature and extent of external influences, including other interventions, on health outcomes • Availability of data • Extent of implementation • Availability of adequate comparison groups 	<p>Methodology Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nature of the relationship between policy and impacts. ▪ Expected magnitude of change. ▪ Expected length of time to see evidence of policy effects. ▪ Nature and extent of external influences on health outcomes. ▪ Availability of data. ▪ Extent of implementation. ▪ Availability of adequate comparison groups. <p><i><Photo of a person reviewing documents.></i></p>

Audio Transcript	Visual Display
<p>Although randomized, experimental design is sometimes considered the “gold standard” for conducting an impact evaluation, there are quasi-experimental designs that can be used for impact evaluations also.</p>	<p>Methodology Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Randomized, experimental design is considered the “gold standard.” ▪ Quasi-experimental designs may be used.
<p>Non-experimental designs are unable to clearly link the impacts to the policy because they are unable to rule out alternative explanations for the impacts. These types of designs are most appropriate when it is impossible or impractical to compare changes over time or to use a comparison group. Two potential non-experimental designs for impact evaluation include cross-sectional and case study.</p>	<p>Methodology Considerations</p> <p>Non-experimental designs may be appropriate in some cases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cross-sectional ▪ Case study
<p>Economic evaluation methods compare the costs of the policy to the resulting benefits. These methods are used in conjunction with the designs described above because they are dependent upon understanding the amount and types of changes that occurred as a result of the program.</p>	<p>Methodology Considerations</p> <p>Economic evaluation methods may be used in conjunction with other methods.</p>
<p>In the example we began with, of injuries from mobile infant walkers, evaluators conducted a retrospective analysis of data from the National Electronic Injury Surveillance System maintained by the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.</p>	<p><i><Photos of a stationary infant activity center and a mobile infant walker.></i></p>
<p>The evaluators found that between 1990 and 2001—after implementation of the revised standard for mobile infant walkers—injuries associated with infant walkers decreased by 76%—from 20,900 injuries in 1990 to 5,100 in 2001.</p>	<p><i><Chart showing a decline in injuries from 1990 to 2001.></i></p>
<p>To read about the example used for this topic and for more information, consult this document, linked on the Resources page.</p>	<p>Resource</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Success in the Prevention of Infant Walker-Related Injuries: An Analysis of National Data, 1990-2001

Lesson Summary

This lesson presented an approach that highlights the nuances of policy evaluation and how the steps in the CDC Evaluation Framework can be used for evaluating policy.

Now that you have completed this lesson, you should be able to:

- Describe how to apply the CDC Evaluation Framework throughout the domains of the policy process.
- Identify key questions to ask throughout the domains of the policy process.

The next lesson will examine some common challenges to conducting policy evaluation and presents some methods for overcoming them.

