CLEARINGHOUSE
FOR MILITARY FAMILY READINESS

Program Evaluation Resources for National Military Family Association:
Rapid Literature Review

Clearinghouse Technical Assistance Team

As of February 1, 2021

PennState

Table of Contents

Clearinghouse for Military Family Readiness at Penn State

Executive Summary

This report was developed for the National Military Family Association (NMFA) in response to a request for validated program measures, evidence-based or evidence-informed program evaluation resources, and suggestions for improvements to NMFA's logic models.

The Technical Assistance (TA) team at the Clearinghouse for Military Family Readiness at Penn State (Clearinghouse) conducted a brief, rapid literature review on the topics of program evaluation and validated program measures. Research that examines these topics were identified by searching peer-reviewed journal articles and grey literature, and an emphasis was placed on research published between 2011 and 2021. Search queries included various combinations of the following terms: program, public health, evaluation, logic models, measures, validated, well-being, resilience, communication, connectedness, Service members, veterans, and youth.

This report provides the following elements:
- Brief overview of two program evaluation frameworks or methods;
- High-level review and suggestions for enhancements to NMFA's logic models;
- List of validated program measures; and
- Additional online resources including measures repositories and evaluation tools.

This rapid literature review provides a preliminary examination of the research. Thus, given the brief timeline, this report is not intended to serve as a comprehensive review of the literature or offer a comprehensive list of validated program measures, and the resources listed are not endorsed by the Clearinghouse. Rather, the resources are offered to assist you in making data-driven decisions.

Program Evaluation Frameworks and Methods

Two program evaluation frameworks or methods that may be useful to the National Military Family Association (NMFA) were identified: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Framework for Program Evaluation in Public Health and the flexicution method of program evaluation. More information on each of these frameworks or methods is provided below.

CDC Framework for Program Evaluation in Public Health

The CDC Framework for Program Evaluation in Public Health was developed to assist public health programs in "remaining accountable and committed to achieving measurable health outcomes" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1999, p. ii).

The framework emphases that stakeholders should be involved in practical ongoing evaluations that are usable, feasible, ethical, and accurate. The six interconnected parts of the Framework for Program Evaluation in Public Health are listed below (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1999).

1. Engage stakeholders in evaluation planning and other steps as needed.
2. Describe the program, including the need for the program, inputs, activities, and expected outcomes. This step involves the development of logic models.
3. Focus the evaluation design to answer the most pressing questions or those highlighted by stakeholders.
4. Gather credible evidence, this includes choosing and gathering information on specific measures or indicators, using credible data sources to answer the evaluation questions, and coordinating logistics for gathering evidence (e.g., identifying when a survey should be administered to answer a specific question).
5. Justify conclusions based on the evidence obtained through the evaluation.
6. Ensure the use of evaluation results and share lessons learned.

For more information on the CDC Framework for Program Evaluation in Public Health, please visit www.cdc.gov/eval/framework/index.htm. The website provides dedicated sub-pages for each of the six interconnected parts, as well as checklists for steps one through three.

Program Evaluation Using the Flexicution Method

The flexicution method of program evaluation uses a two-tier approach of measurement: CORE (i.e., tier one or common elements) and FLEX (i.e., tier two or flexible elements). Using both CORE and FLEX measurements creates continuity in program evaluation by measuring common elements across all programs that fall under an umbrella (e.g., Operation Purple), while allowing evaluators to account for differences in delivery and priority elements of individual programs (Saathoff-Wells et al., 2017). When reviewing this document, and in subsequent evaluation planning, NMFA is encouraged to identify topics, domains, and questions that should be measured across all programs (i.e., CORE measures) and those that can be adjusted to meet the needs of an individual program (i.e., FLEX measures).

Logic Models

A logic model is a graphical depiction of a program that links program inputs and activities to the program's intended achievements (i.e., outputs, outcomes, and impacts). For ease of access, logic models are generally limited to one page. Logic models can also be simplistically thought of as a series of "if/then" statements put into visual form. In other words, if a program has the necessary resources, then it *should* be able to perform a set

of specific activities; if the activities are performed as expected, then specific outputs *should* be achieved; if the expected outputs are achieved, then specific outcomes *should* be achieved. While most programs, and logic models, are more complex than a series of if/then statements it may be useful to initially think of your program this way.

Review of NMFA Logic Models and Suggestions for Enhancements

The TA team reviewed five logic models provided by NMFA that represent three Operation Purple programs (i.e., Operation Purple Family Retreat, Operation Purple Camps, and Operation Purple Healing Adventures), Child Care Relief program, and Spouse Scholarship program. Suggestions for enhancements to the logic models are listed below.

- Turn Operation Purple programs' logic models into one-page visual flowcharts.

    Review the following resources to assist in turning the current Operation Purple program logic models into visual descriptions of your programs. The resources may also be useful for revising the Child Care Relief program and Spouse Scholarship program logic models.

    - **CDC Program Evaluation Framework Checklist for Step 2: Describe the Program.** This checklist defines the typical components of a logic model (i.e., inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, impacts, moderators, and assumptions) and walks through the steps needed to develop a useful logic model. Some of these steps, such as drawing lines to depict logical relationships between activities and outcomes may assist in streamlining NMFA's current logic models. To view the guide, please visit www.cdc.gov/eval/steps/step2/index.htm.
    - **Evaluation Guide: Developing and Using a Logic Model,** CDC Division for Heart Disease and Stroke Prevention**.** This guide offers a general overview of logic models, how to develop them, and how to use them in program evaluation efforts. To view the guide, please visit www.cdc.gov/dhdsp/docs/logic_model.pdf.

- Update logic models to reflect the target audience and purpose.

    Identify the target audience and purpose for the logic models:
    - Will these logic models be used internally to inform evaluation planning?
    - Will these logic models be shared with stakeholders?
    - Who will be reading them and why?

    The level of detail that is included should be defined by the intended audience and purpose. You may want to develop more than one version of each logic model if you have multiple uses for them.

- Consider creating a multi-component logic model.

  Developing a multi-component logic model may assist potential funders and stakeholders in understanding how NMFA's organizational mission and vision align with individual programs. This may also help staff understand how the programs they work on align with other programs to achieve the mission and vision of NMFA.

  A multi-component logic model would encompass all NMFA programs or a group of programs (e.g., Operation Purple programs). This type of logic model shows how the various programs work together to achieve common outcomes and organizational goals (Taylor-Powell & Henert, 2008). A multi-component logic model for NMFA would include one logic model that shows a "birds-eye-view" of the entire program or organization, as well as individual logic models for each program. The overarching logic model would include minimal details on individual programs. The individual program logic models would provide details on each program and link the expected outcomes for each program to the overarching logic model and organizational goals. An example of this type of logic model can be found in the guide below.
  - **Developing a Logic Model: Teaching and Training Guide** (Taylor-Powell & Henert). This guide provides activities with handouts, slides, and other resources to use in creating and using logic models. The section covering multi-component logic models can be viewed on pages 33 – 35. To view the guide, please visit https://peerta.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/public/uploaded_files/Logic%20Model%20Guide.pdf.

- Review and update outcomes as needed.

  Review the short-term and long-term program outcomes for each Operation Purple program's logic model. Short-term outcomes for these programs should represent changes in beliefs, attitudes, knowledge, skills, or behavior with a desired effect (e.g., increase, decrease, maintain) and a target population. Long-term outcomes for these programs should reflect changes in behaviors and conditions with a desired effect and a target population (Clearinghouse for Military Family Readiness, 2017). Updating the outcomes to include a more narrowly defined target population and a desired effect will assist in identifying appropriate indicators and measures to support the intended outcomes. For example, all the short-term outcomes for Operation Purple programs indicate that a change will happen to participants. Clarifying who the participants are (e.g., Service members, spouses, children), will help identify appropriate measures as many program measures are designed for a specific population.

Using Logic Models to Enhance Program Evaluation

Logic models can be used as a guide to help focus the evaluation, determine appropriate evaluation questions, identify indicators to answer the evaluation questions, and identify measurement tools. The next section, *Program Measures*, provides more information on measurement tools that may be useful in the evaluation of Operation Purple programs. In addition, two online resources that outline how to use logic models to plan for program evaluation are provided below.

- **Enhancing Program Performance with Logic Models**, Taylor-Powell, Jones, & Henert. This is a .pdf file of an archived online course from the University of Wisconsin Extension. The course provides an overview of planning and evaluating education and outreach programs. It reviews how to apply logic models to improve programming and be accountable for results, including how to use a logic model to plan, implement, evaluate, and communicate a program's activities and intended results with stakeholders. To view the document, please visit https://fyi.extension.wisc.edu/programdevelopment/files/2016/03/lmcourseall.pdf.

- **Checklist for Selection of High-Performing Indicators,** CDC. This checklist includes practice-based criteria to be considered in the selection of indicators for monitoring and evaluating programs. To view the checklist, please visit https://wmich.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/u350/2014/Indicator_checklist.pdf.

Program Measures

The TA team used the short-term and long-term outcomes listed in the three Operation Purple programs' logic models to identify validated measures that may be of interest to NMFA. These measures can be found in Table 1, *Operation Purple Programs with Suggested Measures for Review*, and Table 2, *Description of Program Measures for Operation Purple Programs*. Table 1 aligns each Operation Purple program (i.e., Operation Purple Family Retreat, Operation Purple Camps, and Operation Purple Healing Adventures), their target audience, short-term outcomes, and long-term outcome as defined by NMFA with suggested measures to review. Table 2 provides the name, source, target population, brief description, reliability, and website for each measure.

Please note that given the brief timeline and the plethora of program measures available, the program measures listed below are not intended to be exhaustive. In addition, the TA team only identified measures for the Operation Purple programs; however, some of the measures identified could potentially be useful across all programs.

Table1

Operation Purple Programs with Suggested Measures for Review

Program Name	Target Audience*	Short-term Outcomes*	Long-term Outcomes*	Measures Topics or Constructs	Name of Measures
Operation Purple Family Retreats	Active-Duty military families who have experienced a deployment or separation within a 15-month window	NTO – 6 Participants have improved sense of well-being. NTO – 1 Participants feel more closely connected to their family. NTO – 2 Participants experience a respite from daily life. NTO – 4 Participants gain exposure to the Outdoors.	Improved Communication/ Well-being - The ability to express emotional and physical needs through verbal and nonverbal means.	well-being connectedness stress deployment resilience	**For Service members or veterans:** 1. Post-deployment Family Functioning Scale (DRRI-2 Section: P) 2. Post-deployment Social Support Scale (DRRI-2 Section: O) 3. Adult Resilience Measure (ARM-R) **For family members:** 1. Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS)* (ages 11+) 2. Child and Youth Resilience Measure (CYRM-R) (child = ages 5-9, youth = ages 10-23) 3. Adult Resilience Measure (ARM-R) (ages 18+) 4. Stirling Children's Well-being Scale* (ages 8-15)

Program Name	Target Audience*	Short-term Outcomes*	Long-term Outcomes*	Measures Topics or Constructs	Name of Measures
Operation Purple Camps	Military children ages 7 - 17	NTO – 6 Participants have improved sense of well-being. NTO – 4 Participants gain exposure to the Outdoors. NTO – 5 Participants feel pride / recognition of their family's military experience. NTO – 3 Participants have built new connections to other participants.	Improved Communication/ Well-being - The ability to express emotional and physical needs through verbal and nonverbal means.	well-being connectedness resilience	1. Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS)* (ages 11+) 2. Child and Youth Resilience Measure (CYRM-R) (child = ages 5-9, youth = ages 10-23) 3. Stirling Children's Well-being Scale* (ages 8-15)
Operation Purple Healing Adventures	Wounded warriors and their families (active duty, retired or medically separated)	NTO – 6 Participants have improved sense of well-being. NTO – 7 Participants gain access to resources that empowers and informs NTO – 2 Participants experience a respite from daily life NTO – 1 Participants Feel more closely connected to their family NTO – 3 Participants have built new connections to other participants		well-being connectedness stress resilience	**For veterans:** 1. Well-Being Inventory (WBI) 2. Adult Resilience Measure (ARM-R) **For family members:** 1. Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS)* (ages 11+) 2. Child and Youth Resilience Measure (CYRM-R) (child = ages 5-9, youth = ages 10-23) 3. Adult Resilience Measure (ARM-R)(ages 18+) 4. Stirling Children's Well-being Scale* (ages 8-15)
*Target population, short-term outcomes, and long-term outcomes are taken directly from information provided by NMFA. Stirling Children's Well-being Scale and Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) were identified by NMFA.					

Table 2

Description of Program Measures for Operation Purple Programs

Construct	Measure Name	Source	Target Population	Brief Description	# of Items	Reliability	Website
Deployment; Relationships	Post-deployment Family Functioning Scale (DRRI-2 Section: P)	Vogt et al. (2013)	Service Members; Veterans	This tool measures the quality of post-deployment family relationships in terms of communication (e.g., getting along well with family members), and closeness among family members (e.g., being affectionate with family members). This tool is not tested for clinical use.	12	0.96	https://www.ptsd.va.gov/professional/assessment/deployment/postdeployment-family.asp
Deployment; Transitioning	Post-deployment Social Support Scale (DRRI-2 Section: O)	Vogt et al. (2013)	Service Members; Veterans	This tool measures the extent to which family, friends, and individuals within the community provide emotional sustenance (e.g., understanding, companionship, a sense of belonging, and positive self-regard such as feeling proud of service), tangible aid such as helping to accomplish tasks, and material assistance or resources such lending the individual money. This tool is not tested for clinical use.	10	0.90	https://www.ptsd.va.gov/professional/assessment/deployment/postdeployment-support.asp
Well-being	Well-Being Inventory (WBI)	Vogt et al. (2019)	Veterans	The WBI is designed to measure veterans' status, functioning, and satisfaction within the four life domains (i.e., vocation, finances, health, and social relationships). Measures within each domain may be extracted from the full inventory and used as separate entities to meet the needs of the assessment.	21 sections; 126 questions total	Cronbach's alphas were satisfactory for each scale, with an average alpha of 0.86.	https://www.ptsd.va.gov/professional/assessment/adult-sr/wbi.asp

Construct	Measure Name	Source	Target Population	Brief Description	# of Items	Reliability	Website
Well-being	Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS)*	Tennant et al. (2007)	Youth (ages 11+); Adults	This tool measures hedonic and eudemonic aspects of mental health. This includes positive affect (i.e., feelings of optimism, cheerfulness, relaxation), satisfying interpersonal relationships, and positive functioning (i.e., energy, clear thinking, self-acceptance, personal development, competence, and autonomy). The measure was not developed for monitoring change at the individual level or in clinical settings.	14 or 7	0.91 (population sample)	https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/sci/med/research/platform/wemwbs/
Well-being	Stirling Children's Well-being Scale*	Liddle and Carter (2015)	Youth (ages 8 - 15)	This measure was developed as a holistic, positively worded measure of emotional and psychological well-being for children aged eight to 15 years.	12	0.85	Not found
Resilience	Child and Youth Resilience Measure (CYRM-R)	Resilience Research Centre (2018)	Children (ages 5-9); Youth (ages 10-23)	This measure looks at social-ecological resilience. There are separate measures for children (ages 5-9) and youth (ages 10-23). The CYRM-R is free for researchers, academics, and front-line staff to use. The authors request users to fill out a short survey, so they know how the tool is being used.	17	Not found	https://cyrm.resilienceresearch.org/

Construct	Measure Name	Source	Target Population	Brief Description	# of Items	Reliability	Website
Resilience	Adult Resilience Measure (ARM-R)	Resilience Research Centre (2018)	Adults (ages 18+)	This measure looks at social-ecological resilience in adults. The ARM-R is free for researchers, academics, and front-line staff to use. The authors request that users fill out a short survey, so they know how the tool is being used.	17	Not found	https://cyrm.resilienceresearch.org/

Online Resources

The TA team identified additional online resources that may be beneficial to NMFA. These resources are grouped into two categories: Measures Repositories and Evaluation Resources. A brief description of each resource along with a website link are provided below.

Measures Repositories

CYFAR Evaluation Instrument Search

- Children, Youth, and Families At-Risk (CYFAR) provides an evaluation instrument search tool. The instruments can be filtered by construct area, target population, reading level and instrument type. Each evaluation instrument fact page contains information about the developers, intended population, cost, and provides a link to the instrument when available.
- https://cyfar.org/search_evaluation_instruments

RAND Online Measure Repository

- The RAND Online Measure Repository (ROMR) is an online searchable database containing a list of 171 measures. The measures can be narrowed down using a keyword search and other sortable criteria such as domains, age, fee, number of items, use with a military population, and more.
- http://smapp.rand.org/innovative-practices/measure-repository/index.php

Statistics Solutions Survey Instruments Directory

- Statistics Solutions offers a directory of survey instruments. Each survey instrument includes a description of the instrument, references, and a link to purchase the instrument directly from the author. The instruments are organized topically (e.g., health, emotional intelligence, child, psychological/personality, career, military).
- https://www.statisticssolutions.com/directory-of-survey-instruments/

University of Miami, School of Nursing and Health Studies, Center of Excellence for Health Disparities Research Measures Library

- The Center of Excellence for Health Disparities Research: El Centro provides a collection of measures with Spanish translations. The instruments are organized topically (e.g., COVID-19, child and adolescent, family, health, social support or relationships, stress or coping)
- https://elcentro.sonhs.miami.edu/research/measures-library/index.html

Evaluation Resources

Introduction to Program Evaluation for Public Health Programs: A Self-Study Guide, CDC

- According to the website, this guide is based on the CDC Framework for Program Evaluation in Public Health. It is intended to assist public, private, and community public health programs plan, design, implement, and use comprehensive evaluations in a practical way.
- https://www.cdc.gov/eval/guide/index.htm

Planning for Program Evaluation, Clearinghouse for Military Family Readiness

- The tools and resources provided on this website are designed to assist professionals in preparing for a program evaluation. A checklist is available to help organizations determine if they are ready to enter the evaluation process and an evaluation planning worksheet is available to assist professionals in preparing for an evaluation. Information on the phases of the evaluation process and available resources to assist professionals in preparing for and conducting an evaluation are also provided.
- https://militaryfamilies.psu.edu/resources/program-implementation-toolkit/, scroll down to the "Planning for Program Evaluation" section.

Additional Assistance

The TA specialists at the Clearinghouse provide support to professionals as they examine and make informed decisions about which programs fit specific situations and are worth the investment. Whether connecting one with the resources and tools to conduct a needs assessment in a specific community, suggesting the best evidence-based program or practice for a certain situation, or developing an evaluation plan, the TA team of experts is a call or email away.

Please visit the Clearinghouse's website at www.militaryfamilies.psu.edu or call 1-877-382-9185 to speak with a TA specialist.

Suggested Citation

Clearinghouse for Military Family Readiness at Penn State. (2021). *Program evaluation resources for National Military Family Association: Rapid literature review*. [Literature Review]. Clearinghouse for Military Family Readiness at Penn State.

References

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1999). Framework for program evaluation in public health. *MMWR*, 48 (11). https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/PDF/rr/rr4811.pdf

Clearinghouse for Military Family Readiness. (2017). *Preparing for a program evaluation*. Clearinghouse for Military Family Readiness at Penn State. https://militaryfamilies.psu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Preparing-for-a-Program-Evaluation-_9-9-17.pdf

Liddle, I., & Carter, G. (2015). Emotional and psychological well-being in children: The development and validation of the Stirling Children's Well-being Scale. *Educational Psychology in Practice,* 31 (2), 174-185. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2015.1008409

Resilience Research Centre. (2018). CYRM and ARM user manual. Resilience Research Centre, Dalhousie University. http://www.resilienceresearch.org/

Saathoff-Wells, T., Karre, J., Davenport, K., Campise, M., & Perkins, D. (2017). Flexicution in program evaluation: Developing a two-tier plan to address diverse priorities across the four services' intensive home visitation programming. *Military Behavioral Health*, *5*(4), 324–334. https://doi.org/10.1080/21635781.2017.1343697

Taylor-Powell, E., & Henert, E. (2008). *Developing a logic model: Teaching and training guide content guide*. Univeristy of Wisconsin-Extension, Cooperative Extension, Program Development and Evaluation. https://peerta.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/public/uploaded_files/Logic%20Model%20Guide.pdf

Tennant, R., Fishwick, R., Platt, S., Joseph, S., & Stewart-Brown, S. (2006). Monitoring positive mental health in Scotland: Validating the Affectometer 2 scale and developing the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale for the UK. Edinburgh, NHS Health Scotland. http://www.healthscotland.scot/media/1719/5776-affectomter-wemwbs-final-report.pdf

Vogt, D., Smith, B., King, L., King, D., Knight, J., & Vasterling, J. (2013). Deployment Risk and Resilience Inventory-2 (DRRI-2): An updated tool for assessing psychosocial risk and resilience factors among Service members and Veterans (PDF). *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 26*, 710-717. https://www.ptsd.va.gov/professional/articles/article-pdf/id87988.pdf

Vogt, D., Taverna, E., Nillni, Y., Tyrell, F., Booth, B., Perkins, D., Copeland, L., Finley, E., Tyrell, F., & Gilman, C. L. (2019). Development and validation of a tool to assess military Veterans' status, functioning, and satisfaction with key aspects of their lives. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being, 11,* 328-349. https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12161