

## Sub-Evaluation #3: Evaluating the Effectiveness of PHIG Training & Technical Assistance (TTA)

### Purpose

This sub-evaluation aims to examine whether and how Training and Technical Assistance (TTA) provided to recipients as part of the Public Health Infrastructure Grant (PHIG) optimizes recipients' implementation of PHIG strategies and activities (*directly responding to national evaluation question 5\**). This includes assessing recipient changes in knowledge, skills, application, and grant progress after participation in responsive (recipient-initiated) and proactive (national partner-initiated) TTA activities and services. These efforts will assess the effectiveness of TTA in contributing to PHIG recipient grant progress and outcomes (*responding to national evaluation questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\**). This may include assessing recipient learning, application, quality improvement efforts, and capacity building related to public health workforce, foundational capabilities, and data modernization.

### Sub-Evaluation Questions of Interest

These questions represent compiled interests of PHIG evaluation users that have been discussed to date as relevant to this topic. Each of these questions responds to one or more national evaluation questions as indicated with an asterisk\* throughout this abstract. A table of these questions can be found on page 2. **In an evaluation plan summary matrix (described in the RFP), applicants must select, modify, and/or develop evaluation questions (should include themes from each of the below categories A-D) and include potential evaluation approaches for each question.** Selected subcontractors will work in collaboration with the NET and the EAG to finalize evaluation questions and areas of exploration as part of Phase I.

#### A. Process, Planning, and Implementation (*national evaluation question 5\**)

1. How do previous and emerging learnings from the TTA process evaluation (implementation of this sub-evaluation is ongoing) inform the exploration of TTA outcomes? What factors should be examined further?

#### B. Outcomes (*national evaluation questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\**)

1. TTA outcomes: How did TTA affect recipients (both responsive and proactive)? Specifically:
  - To what extent did specific TTA offerings achieve their intended effect on recipients?
  - What were the most and least effective strategies/modalities for providing TTA to recipients?
  - To what extent do TTA recipients apply/implement what they learned through TTA?
  - To what extent is the TTA optimizing recipients' ability to strengthen public health infrastructure?
  - Was the TTA model more effective in delivering specific types/topics of TTA compared to others?
2. Grant strategy outcomes: How and to what extent did TTA activities (both responsive and proactive) affect health departments' capacity to recruit, retain, train, support, and sustain staff? How did it affect their foundational capabilities, including the capacity to deliver community-specific services? Do trends in accreditation data indicate any changes in recipients' capacity to deliver foundational capabilities? How did TTA advance data modernization?
3. Regional Hub Model: What role did the regional hub model play in provision of TTA to recipients (both through fulfilling responsive requests and promoting proactive opportunities)? What were the benefits of the hub model? What were its limitations? To what extent did it contribute to the overall TTA model's effectiveness and, in turn, provision of effective TTA?

### C. Context (*national evaluation questions 6, 7\**)

1. Differences related to recipient characteristics: How do recipients' governance structures and differing local and state policies affect TTA engagement and outcomes? What differences, if any, exist in terms of strategies, successes, and challenges between recipients who are states, locals, and territories and freely associated states (TFAS)? To what extent was TTA accessible and available to all recipients? To what extent did the TTA contribute to improvements in public health infrastructure across recipients regardless of location, recipient type, etc.?
2. Partnerships & community engagement: How does TTA delivered to recipients, and their implementation of the TTA received, affect recipients' efforts to engage in strategic partnerships with governmental and non-governmental organizations? What about recipients' responsiveness to community needs and the delivery and distribution of community-specific services?

### D. Sustainability (*national evaluation question 7\**)

1. How has TTA improved the capacity of recipients to replicate and/or conduct PHIG-funded strategies and activities in the future? Can effective strategies be sustained? Are there promising practices that could be adopted and/or adapted by other TTA providers and/or health departments?

## Use of Findings

This sub-evaluation will seek to assess outcomes resulting from PHIG TTA services provided to recipient health departments. Findings will help determine the extent to which TTA has contributed to increased efficiency and effectiveness in recipients' learning and capacity within public health infrastructure and, in turn, will indicate the extent to which TTA has affected PHIG recipient progress (*responding to national evaluation questions 5 and 6\**). Furthermore, assessing TTA outcomes has the potential to demonstrate the value of large-scale TTA programs and inform future TTA models, adding to the evidence based on effective strategies and lessons learned for maximizing and sustaining TTA impact in public health settings (*responding to national evaluation question 7\**).

*National Evaluation Questions		Informed by which questions in this abstract?
1	What activities are PHIG recipients and national partners implementing to address intended grant outcomes?	A1
2	How does the grant contribute to strengthening the public health workforce?	B1, B2
3	How does the grant contribute to strengthening public health Foundational Capabilities?	B1, B2
4	How does the grant contribute to strengthening data modernization and systems?	B1, B2
5	<b>How do national partner activities affect PHIG recipients? (primary focus)</b>	<b>A1 B1, B2, B3</b>
6	What progress have recipients made toward achieving the long-term outcomes of the grant?	B1, B2 C1, C2
7	What are lessons learned from the grant? What are the implications for the future of public health?	C2 D1