

## GLOSSARY

The FaMLE Cross-Site Glossary provides definitions of terms commonly used to describe research and evaluation, with an emphasis on concepts relevant to healthy marriage or responsible fatherhood programs and the funding announcement from the Administration for Children and Families. Bolded terms are defined in the glossary. The references cited in this glossary may also serve as resources for further information on these key terms and ideas.

Term	References
<p><b>Activities. Services</b> offered by the program, including those performed under each “allowable” or “authorized” activity, as defined in legislation and grant announcements. Examples include <b>curriculum</b>-based group-level workshops, case management, individual-level services, couple-level services, referrals to outside resources, and parent-child activities facilitated by the program.</p>	<p>National Healthy Marriage Resource Center. “Administration for Children and Families Healthy Marriage Initiative, 2002–2009: An Introductory Guide.” Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (p. 10)</p>
<p><b>Baseline equivalence.</b> Similarity of <b>program group</b> and <b>control group</b> (or <b>comparison group</b>) at the beginning of a study. To detect effects of the program, the program and control/comparison groups must have similar characteristics at the beginning—that is, the baseline—so that any subsequent differences can be attributed to the program. Baseline equivalence may be determined in different ways, depending on the design of the <b>evaluation</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In <b>experimental designs, random assignment</b> creates groups that are equivalent on all characteristics, on average. (Researchers can demonstrate that random assignment created equivalent groups by comparing the averages on selected variables between the program and control groups.)</li> <li>• In <b>quasi-experimental designs</b>, baseline equivalence may be demonstrated by comparing the averages on selected variables between the program and comparison groups, though differences in other (unmeasured) variables may still exist.</li> </ul> <p>Baseline equivalence is not established in <b>non-experimental designs</b> or <b>descriptive studies</b> because control/comparison groups are not used.</p>	<p>“What Works Clearinghouse glossary.” Available at <a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/glossary.aspx">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/glossary.aspx</a>. Accessed July 2, 2014.</p>
<p><b>Bias.</b> The distortion of results due to over- or under-representing certain types of respondents, timing the data collection poorly, or wording questions in a way that encourages or discourages certain responses, or other factors.</p>	<p>Developed for FaMLE Cross-Site project.</p>

Term	References
<p><b>Comparison group.</b> A group of people who do not receive the same <b>services</b> as the <b>program group</b> and who are thought to be similar to the program group in their characteristics at baseline. A comparison group typically is formed using non-random or <b>quasi-experimental</b> methods. (The term “<b>control group</b>” is reserved for a group of people who are <b>randomly assigned</b> not to receive services.) The more similar a comparison group is to the program group on baseline characteristics, the more likely it is that any difference in <b>outcomes</b> between the two groups can be attributed to the program.</p>	<p>U.S. Government Accountability Office. “Designing Evaluations.” Washington, DC: U.S. Government Accountability Office, March 1991.</p>
<p><b>Confounding factor.</b> Some aspect of the study design, other than the <b>services</b> provided, that aligns with the <b>program group</b> and/or <b>comparison group</b>. A confounding factor makes it impossible to know whether observed differences were caused by the program. One example is a systematic difference in the way data are collected from people in the program group versus comparison group. For example, program group members may be surveyed by a case manager, while control group members may be surveyed by a research assistant. Participants may report information differently to someone they know, like their case manager, than to someone they do not know, like a research assistant. A confounding factor prevents a study from distinguishing program effects from other potential influences or factors.</p>	<p>“What Works Clearinghouse glossary.” Available at <a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/glossary.aspx">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/glossary.aspx</a>. Accessed July 2, 2014.</p>
<p><b>Construct.</b> A broadly defined area of change targeted by a program. A construct can be an issue or idea that a program wants to address and/or change, such as father involvement. Constructs are the higher-level ideas that are operationalized into <b>measures</b> and <b>measurement tools</b>.</p>	<p>Dew, Dennis. “Construct.” In <i>Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods</i>, edited by Paul J. Lavrakas. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2008. (Further refined for the FaMLE Cross-Site project.)</p>
<p><b>Control group.</b> A group of people who agree to participate in an <b>evaluation</b> of program <b>impacts</b> and are <b>randomly assigned</b> not to receive program <b>services</b>. The control group can usually participate in other services available in their communities. (The term “<b>comparison group</b>” is generally used if the group not receiving services is formed non-randomly with <b>quasi-experimental</b> methods.)</p>	<p>Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman, and Mark W. Lipsey. <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1999. (pp. 257–258, 442)</p>
<p><b>Cross-site study.</b> An <b>evaluation</b> that combines results across multiple programs to assess patterns in program design, implementation, <b>outputs</b>, <b>outcomes</b>, and/or <b>impacts</b>.</p>	<p>Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman, and Mark W. Lipsey. <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1999. (p. 267) (Further refined for the FaMLE Cross-Site project.)</p>

Term	References
<p><b>Curriculum.</b> A program or course of study that focuses on specific topics and includes planned sessions, projects, <b>activities</b>, and other learning opportunities. A curriculum generally includes all of the planned learning experiences over a certain period of time for a specific group of participants. This information typically is documented in a manual or other written material. A curriculum may be provided as one aspect of a larger <b>intervention</b> (and an intervention, in turn, is part of a larger <b>program model</b>).</p>	<p>Glatthorn, Allan A., Floyd Boschee, Bruce M. Whitehead, and Bonni F. Boschee. <i>Curriculum Leadership: Strategies for Development and Implementation</i>. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2012. (pp. 357–358)</p>
<p><b>Descriptive study.</b> A <b>research</b> design that documents <b>outputs</b> or <b>outcomes</b> in a <b>program group</b> but does not include a <b>control</b> or <b>comparison group</b>. It may focus on changes in participant outcomes from the beginning of a program to its end (or later), but cannot provide evidence of the impact of a program. (See also <b>non-experimental design</b>.)</p>	<p>Patton, Michael Quinn. <i>Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods</i>. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2002. (p. 23) (Further refined for the FaMLE Cross-Site project.)</p>
<p><b>Evaluation.</b> A systematic collection of information about the <b>activities</b>, characteristics, or <b>outcomes</b> of programs. There are several types of evaluations, including <b>impact</b> evaluations, which aim to understand program effectiveness; and implementation evaluations, which document program operations.</p>	<p>Patton, Michael Quinn. <i>Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods</i>. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2002. (p. 10)</p>
<p><b>Experimental design.</b> A <b>research</b> design in which the <b>program</b> and <b>control groups</b> are created with <b>random assignment</b>. This is one of the strongest research designs because, if well executed, the differences in <b>outcomes</b> between the program and control groups at follow-up can be attributed to the program. Experiments can rule out factors other than the program that may cause change in the <b>outputs</b> or outcomes of participants.</p>	<p>Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman, and Mark W. Lipsey. <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1999.</p>
<p><b>Fidelity.</b> The extent to which the delivery of program <b>activities</b> adheres to the program’s intended design. For example, this may refer to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the program as delivered followed the <b>program model’s</b> intended staffing structure or format for delivering <b>services</b>;</li> <li>• The extent to which a <b>curriculum</b> is delivered in the way it was intended by the curriculum developer.</li> </ul>	<p>Mowbray, C., M. Holter, G. Teague, and D. Bybee. “Fidelity Criteria: Development, Measurement, and Validation.” <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>, vol. 24, no. 3, fall 2003, pp. 315–340.</p>
<p><b>Goals.</b> Statements that broadly reflect the major change expected as a result of the program. Goals are usually general and abstract, and are transformed into specific <b>objectives</b> for programming and evaluative purposes.</p>	<p>Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman, and Mark W. Lipsey. <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1999. (pp. 78, 94)</p>

Term	References
<p><b>Impact.</b> A change in the well-being of individuals, households, or communities caused by a particular project, program, or policy. Measuring an impact requires the use of program and <b>control/comparison groups</b>. In contrast, changes that are measured for a group before and after program participation may be related to the program or caused by other factors, such as changes because of the passage of time.</p>	<p>The World Bank. “Impact Evaluation: Overview.” Available at <a href="http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTPOVERTY/EXTISPMA/0,,menuPK:384339~pagePK:162100~piPK:159310~theSitePK:384329,00.html">http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTPOVERTY/EXTISPMA/0,,menuPK:384339~pagePK:162100~piPK:159310~theSitePK:384329,00.html</a>. Accessed June 23, 2014.</p>
<p><b>Impact study.</b> A study intended to measure and analyze the effectiveness of a program in achieving its <b>goals</b>, using an <b>experimental</b> or <b>quasi-experimental design</b>. Impact studies are designed to distinguish between the effects of the program’s <b>activities</b> and other factors that may lead to change.</p>	<p>Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman, and Mark W. Lipsey. <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1999. (pp. 234–235)</p>
<p><b>Inputs.</b> Resources, including financial, technical, and staffing, used to implement program <b>activities</b>. Inputs may include resource constraints faced by the program.</p>	<p>McDavid, James C., Irene Huse, and Laura R.L. Hawthorn. <i>Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement: An Introduction to Practice</i>. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2013. (p. 20)</p> <p>Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman, and Mark W. Lipsey. <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1999. (p. 111)</p>
<p><b>Intervention.</b> The combination of all of the <b>services</b> and <b>activities</b> offered by a program, which together are intended to lead to a specific set of <b>outputs</b> and participant <b>outcomes</b>. Services and activities could include, for example, <b>curriculum</b>-led workshops, individual- or couple-level activities, and case management. The term intervention differs from <b>program model</b>; a model also includes the strategies used to implement the intervention.</p>	<p>Tucker, Jeffrey G. “Intervention.” In <i>Encyclopedia of Evaluation</i>, edited by Sandra Mathison. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2005. (Further refined for the FaMLE Cross-Site project.)</p>
<p><b>Measure.</b> A <b>construct</b> that has been quantified or operationalized by providing a concrete and specific definition by which observations of the construct should be categorized. For example, the construct of father involvement can be operationalized into different measures, such as frequency or quality of father-child contact.</p>	<p>Lewis-Beck, Michael G., Alan Bryman, and Tim Futing Liao. “Measure.” In <i>The Sage Encyclopedia of Social Science Methods</i>, edited by Michael G. Lewis-Beck, Alan Bryman, and Tim Futing Liao. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2004. (Further refined for the FaMLE Cross-Site project.)</p>

Term	References
<p><b>Measurement tool.</b> A data collection instrument, such as a set of specific questions to be asked of program participants. A measurement tool is used to collect data to assess a specific <b>measure</b> or set of measures. Ideally, the measurement tool already will have demonstrated <b>validity</b> and <b>reliability</b> in prior <b>research</b> with the intended population.</p>	<p>Tucker, Eric. “Towards a More Rigorous Scientific Approach to Social Measurement: Considering a Grounded Indicator Approach to Developing Measurement Tools.” In <i>The SAGE Handbook of Measurement</i>, edited by Geoffrey Walford, Eric Tucker, and Madhu Viswanathan. London: SAGE Publications Ltd., 2010. (Further refined for the FaMLE Cross-Site project.)</p>
<p><b>Mission.</b> An organization’s or program’s statement of purpose. A mission statement generally reflects the unique reason for the organization’s or program’s existence.</p>	<p>Bryson, John M. and Farnum K. Alston. <i>Creating and Implementing Your Strategic Plan: A Workbook for Public and Nonprofit Organizations</i>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1996. As cited in Council on Education for Public Health. “Outcomes Assessment for School and Program Effectiveness: Linking Planning and Evaluation to Mission, Goals and Objectives.” Washington, DC: Council on Education for Public Health, 2011. (p. 1)</p>
<p><b>Non-experimental design.</b> A <b>research</b> design that includes a <b>program group</b>, which receives program <b>services</b>, but does not have a <b>control</b> or <b>comparison group</b>. Examples include studies that measure participant behavior before program participation (pre-test) and after participation (post-test). Because of the lack of a control or comparison group, this design cannot determine whether observed <b>outcomes</b> were caused by the program or by other factors, such as natural change over time or effects of the broader economy.</p>	<p>Measurement, Learning and Evaluation Project for the Urban Reproductive Health Initiative. “Types of Evaluation Designs.” Available at <a href="https://www.urbanreproductivehealth.org/toolkits/measuring-success/types-evaluation-designs#Non-experimental">https://www.urbanreproductivehealth.org/toolkits/measuring-success/types-evaluation-designs#Non-experimental</a>. Accessed December 10, 2013.</p>
<p><b>Objectives.</b> Statements that reflect the program’s specific desired achievements. Objectives should be measurable criteria of program accomplishments. Objectives are often derived from a program’s <b>goals</b> and measured by key <b>outcomes</b> for the program.</p>	<p>Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman, and Mark W. Lipsey. <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1999. (pp. 78, 94)</p>

Term	References
<p><b>Outcomes.</b> Indicators or <b>measures</b> of characteristics in the target population. Examples include participant behavior, attitudes, beliefs, and values. Changes in outcomes for those who participate in <b>services</b> are presumed to result from the program.</p>	<p>Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman, and Mark W. Lipsey. <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1999. (p. 220)</p>
<p><b>Outputs.</b> Indicators or <b>measures</b> of program operations, including, for example, the number of workshops offered, the receipt of <b>services</b> by program participants, and the number of participants who completed a workshop.</p>	<p>Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman, and Mark W. Lipsey. <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1999. (pp. 201–202)</p>
<p><b>Performance measure.</b> A type of <b>measure</b> that a grantee must report to the federal government as part of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993 (and the subsequent GPRA Modernization Act of 2010). Performance measures generally are related to program <b>activities</b>, particularly with regard to aspects of <b>service delivery (outputs)</b> and the achievement of desired results (<b>outcomes</b>). Performance measurement is intended to monitor how well a program is performing, according to the fulfillment of expected outputs and outcomes of service delivery.</p>	<p>Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman, and Mark W. Lipsey. <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1999. (pp. 190, 201) (Further refined for the FaMLE Cross-Site project.)</p>
<p><b>Program group.</b> A group of people who agree to participate in an <b>evaluation</b> and are assigned (randomly or non-randomly) to receive the program’s <b>services</b>. Also called the “treatment group” or “<b>intervention</b> group.”</p>	<p>Cramer, Duncan and Dennis Howitt. “Treatment Group or Condition.” In <i>The SAGE Dictionary of Statistics</i>, edited by Duncan Cramer and Dennis Howitt. London: SAGE Publications Ltd., 2004. (Further refined for the FaMLE Cross-Site project.)</p>
<p><b>Program model.</b> Includes the <b>intervention</b>—that is, both the <b>services</b> and <b>activities</b>—that an organization intends to offer, as well as the plan for recruitment, service delivery, retention, staffing, and other operations.</p>	<p>Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman, and Mark W. Lipsey. <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1999. (pp. 446–447)</p>
<p><b>Quasi-experimental design.</b> A <b>research</b> design in which <b>program</b> and <b>comparison groups</b> are formed by a method other than <b>random assignment</b>. For example, program group members may live in an area that can receive <b>services</b> and comparison group members may live in an area without those services. The more similar a comparison group is to the program group on baseline characteristics, the more likely that any difference in <b>outcomes</b> between the two groups can be attributed to the program.</p>	<p>Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman, and Mark W. Lipsey. <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1999. (pp. 234, 263)</p>

Term	References
<p><b>Randomization/random assignment.</b> A method to form <b>program</b> and <b>control groups</b> randomly (that is, by chance). Random assignment creates groups that are the same, on average, on all measured and unmeasured characteristics at the beginning of a study. If randomization is done correctly, later differences in <b>outcomes</b> between the program/treatment and control groups can be attributed to the program. Steps should be taken to ensure that random assignment is indeed random—by using a computer program that generates random numbers, for example. In addition, once a person is randomly assigned, he or she should not be reassigned for any reason. For example, if someone is randomly assigned to the program group but never receives <b>services</b>, he or she should still be analyzed as part of the program group.</p>	<p>Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman, and Mark W. Lipsey. <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1999. (pp. 234, 275)</p>
<p><b>Reliability.</b> An indication of the consistency of results for a <b>measure</b> or <b>measurement tool</b> under different conditions. If a measure has high reliability, it yields consistent results. For example, if the same person answered a set of interview questions in the same way at different times, those questions would have high reliability.</p>	<p>University of North Texas Center for Learning and Development. “Assessment – Reliability and Validity.” Available at <a href="http://web.unthsc.edu/info/200160/center_for_learning_and_development/2256/assessment-reliability_and_validity">http://web.unthsc.edu/info/200160/center_for_learning_and_development/2256/assessment-reliability_and_validity</a>. Accessed January 28, 2014.</p>
<p><b>Research.</b> Experimental or non-experimental work conducted to gain new knowledge related to phenomena and observable facts.</p>	<p>The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. <i>Frascati Manual: Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development</i>. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Publishing, 2002. (p. 30)</p>
<p><b>Services. Activities</b> offered by the program, such as <b>curriculum</b>-based group-level workshops, case management, individual- and couple-level services, referrals to outside resources, and parent-child activities facilitated by the program.</p>	<p>Tucker, Jeffrey G. “Services.” In <i>Encyclopedia of Evaluation</i>, edited by Sandra Mathison. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2005. (Further refined for the FaMLE Cross-Site project.)</p>

Term	References
<p><b>Social Desirability.</b> The tendency to give socially acceptable responses even if they are not accurate</p>	<p>Lewis-Beck, Michael G., Alan Bryman, and Tim Futing Liao. In <i>The Sage Encyclopedia of Social Science Methods</i>, edited by Michael G. Lewis-Beck, Alan Bryman, and Tim Futing Liao. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2004. (Further refined for the FaMLE Cross-Site project.)</p>
<p><b>Validity.</b> The extent to which a <b>measure</b> is related to the underlying <b>construct</b>. Validity demonstrates the degree to which a measure accurately reflects the true value of the construct.</p>	<p>Groves, Robert M., Floyd J. Fowler, Jr., and Mick P. Couper. <i>Survey Methodology</i>. Hoboken: John Wiley &amp; Sons, 2004. (p. 50)</p>
<p><b>Vision.</b> A broad statement of the desired results of the program. Statements of vision often refer to <b>goals</b> or expected or desired future <b>outcomes</b>.</p>	<p>The Pell Institute and Pathways to College Network Evaluation Toolkit. “Using a Logic Model.” Available at <a href="http://toolkit.pellinstitute.org/evaluation-guide/plan-budget/using-a-logic-model">http://toolkit.pellinstitute.org/evaluation-guide/plan-budget/using-a-logic-model</a>. Accessed December 10, 2013.</p>