School of Education

2008

Evaluating community-based programs: challenges and lessons from the front-line

Sallie Newell
Southern Cross University

Anne Graham
Southern Cross University

Judy Cashmore
Southern Cross University

Centre for Children
and Young People

research, education & advocacy

Evaluating Community-Based Programs: Challenges

& Lessons From the Front-Line

Sallie Newell, Anne Graham & Judy Cashmore
Southern Cross University, NSW, Australia
anne.graham@scu.edu.au

Our Focus Today...

1. **Some context** - evaluation 'orthodoxy' & the work of the CCYP

2. **The challenges** in collaborating with a diversity of community based projects in a regional area

3. **Our response** to these challenges

4. **Emerging CCYP 'tailored' approach** for evaluating community-based programs

5. **Feedback** about evaluation processes/approach

Some brief context....

- About the CCYP:

  - **History**: established Feb 2004 – Southern Cross University, Lismore, NSW

  - **Aim**: to enhance the safety, wellbeing & participation of children & young people, particularly in regional & rural areas

  - **Team**: multidisciplinary backgrounds – education, sociology, law, child protection, health, psychology, behavioural science

  - **Key Functions**: Research, Education & Advocacy

  - **Approach**: strong emphasis on inter-disciplinary & cross-sectoral activities,collaboration, 'community engagement'

At the same time...

- Recent increases in community-based child & family programs

- Funding from govt & philanthropic agencies

- Often distributed through non-govt agencies

- Required to evaluate program impact

- Challenge = how to best do this

- *Core interest - what does the community organisation know or do differently as a result of working with us??*

So...

- Opportunity to develop program planning & evaluation support service for community-based programs working with children, young people &/or families:

  - High demand from regional organisations – & few relevant support agencies available

  - Opportunity to deliver against the CCYP's primary aim

    » enhancing the safety, wellbeing & participation of children & young people

  - Opportunity to deliver against CCYP's 3 key functions

    » research, education & advocacy

  - Limited CCYP core funding

Early Evaluation Approaches

- Emphasised experimental methodologies characterised by:
  - Random assignment
  - Strictly-standardised & often theoretically-based interventions
  - Control groups
  - Objective, quantitative outcome-focussed data
  - Externally-controlled process   (McCall & Green, 2004)

- Proved of limited value for community-based programs addressing complex human needs or issues:
  - Standards were not always desirable, practical or even ethical
    (Chatterji, 2007; McCall & Green, 2004)

  - Similar programs achieved varied results & different programs achieved similar results   (Clark, MacIntyre, & Cruickshank, 2007)

Acknowledging Stakeholder Needs...

- **Collaborating organisations:**

  - **Evaluating the effectiveness** of a given program or service over a given period of time
  - **Support with planning** the given program or service to be delivered, based on the current best practice literature
  - **Using the results to seek additional funding** for the program or service
  - Evaluation process that was **least intrusive on their time**

  - *Research suggests* **relational, contextual & trust factors are key** *in determining how evaluation results are received & acted on by program staff (Taut & Alkin, 2003)*

Acknowledging the Stakeholder Needs...

- **Funding bodies:**
  - Wanted **robust & credible results**
  - Wanted to know if **$ well spent**
  - Sometimes involved in evaluation planning, with **expectations about the questions to be answered, the types of methods to be used &/or how the results should be presented**

- **Program participants:**
  - To ensure **best possible service & outcomes** from the program
  - Data collection methods that **maximise the % willing & able to give their feedback**
  - Data collection methods which **least intruded on their time** for receiving services

Acknowledging the Stakeholder Needs of

- **The CCYP:**
  - To **provide more** than is implied in definitions e.g.:
    - *The systematic collection & analysis of information to make judgments, usually about the effectiveness, efficiency and/or appropriateness of an activity* (Australasian Evaluation Society, 2006)

  - To **initiate & develop dialogue** aimed at enhancing organisations' motivation, resources, capacity & confidence to plan & continually evaluate their practices, regarding the:

    - relevance
    - reach
    - acceptability &
    - effectiveness

    of their services.

Challenges Encountered to Date (1)

- **<u>Diversity</u> of collaborating organisations**:
  - 35 projects involving 29 different organisations
  - 79% NGOs but also 5 govt agencies & 1 for-profit
  - 83% local/regional but also 5 state, national or international
  - Various fields/disciplines - education, health, child welfare, family relationships/ support, early childhood care etc.
  - Total of 107 staff involved (0 to 13 per organisation, 1 to 37 per project)

- **Challenges for the CCYP:**
  - Varying levels of organisations' existing relationship & initial engagement with CCYP
  - Understanding the language, values, contexts, etc of the different sectors – sometimes as mediator between collaborating organisations
  - Planning / evaluating programs across varying geographical areas
  - Being inclusive of different staff perspectives, needs, etc
  - Repetition due to staff turnover

Challenges Encountered to Date (2)

- **Diversity Across the Nature of the Collaborations**:
  - **Timeframes**: 1 month to over 5 years – Median = 8 months
  - **Funding**: from $0 to $187,472 – Median = $5,000
  - **Support Types:** 1 to 10 per project – Median = 4
    - from funding applications, needs assessments, eval planning, program planning, ethics approvals, program management, program delivery, data collection, data analysis, report writing
  - **Support Levels**: from very low to very high – 4 to 87 points per project – Median = 32
    - when rated 0-10 points for each support type (from basic advice through to mentoring organisation)

- Challenges for the CCYP:
  - Varying levels of support needed & possible
  - Varying levels of understanding & baseline eval practices
  - Practical difficulties with obtaining ethics approvals
  - Practical difficulties with collecting much external or qualitative data
  - Broad range of skills required to meet diversity of organisations' needs

Challenges Encountered to Date (3)

- **Diversity Across the Project Contexts:**
  - **Settings:**
    - community services, high schools, community settings, early childhood services, primary schools or homes
  - **Location:** 51% based locally but 12 elsewhere in region & 5 in multiple sites
  - **Range:** 63% covered nearby regions but 12 covered broad regions
  - **Intended Beneficiaries:** 1 to 4 per project – Median = 3
    - children &/or young people, families, workers, services or general community members
  - **Intended Outcomes:** 1 to 13 per project – Median = 5
    - **children &/or young people's** social-emotional development/wellbeing, physical development/wellbeing, cognitive development/academic achievement, participation, safety/welfare, relationships with non-family adults, life skills/independence, spirituality, citizenship or rights
    - parents' knowledge, attitudes &/or skills; workers' knowledge, attitudes &/or skills; service delivery &/or accessibility; reducing inequities; family relationships &/or functioning; social capital &/or inclusion; interagency collaboration; & community knowledge, attitudes &/or skills

- **Challenges for the CCYP:**
  - Capturing information across various settings &/or geographical area ranges
  - Assessing reach & impact across various target groups, often within one project
  - Assessing impact across diverse range of outcomes, often within one project
  - Collecting data about sensitive &/or distressing topics

Challenges Encountered to Date (4)

- **Diversity Across the Children & Young People Involved:**

  - **Age-Groups**: 34% targeted 0-5 year olds, 20% 6-18 year olds & various other age-group combinations from 0-25 years
  - **Numbers**: 40% targeted 1,000+ & 17% targeted 11-50 & various sizes in-between
  - **Approaches**: 40% targeted only particular sub-groups, 26% used only universal approaches & 34% used a mixture
  - **Sub-Groups Included**: many projects included high proportions of children, young people or families experiencing 1 or more vulnerability
    - living in rural/regional areas; with low SES; with parental conflict/violence, mental illness or drug/alcohol issues; being Aboriginal or from other CALD backgrounds; or living in out-of-home care

- Challenges for the CCYP:
  - Assessing impact across various age-groups, sometimes within one project
  - Collecting &/or analysing data at both sample & population levels
  - Collecting data from vulnerable groups traditionally less likely to engage in eval activities

Responding to this Diversity Across Projects

- **Overall Challenge** = **Producing rigorous & credible results whilst sufficiently flexible to serve the interests of all project stakeholders**

  - Acknowledging the needs of the various stakeholders, including the CCYP
  - Developing a set of guiding principles which have informed this area of the CCYP's work
  - Acknowledging the fundamental importance of the relationship between the CCYP & the collaborating organisations
  - Revisiting established & emerging evaluation models, theories & approaches
  - Tailoring any support to each project's needs, resources & limitations

Developing some Guiding Principles (1)

- Review of international evaluation standards & principles

  - Heavy emphasis on more methodological aspects:
    - *Utility, Propriety, Feasibility & Accuracy – American Joint Committee Program Evaluation Standards (2007), Swiss Evaluation Society (2000) & German Evaluation Society (2001)*
    - *Usefulness, Independence, Credibility & Transparency – World Bank Development Grant Fund (2003)*
    - *Competence, Integrity & Accountability – Canadian Evaluation Society (2007)*

  - Some highlighted broader aspects:
    - *Pluralism, Independence, Competence, Respecting individuals' integrity, Transparency & Responsibility – French Evaluation Society (2003)*
    - *Systematic enquiry, Competence, Integrity & honesty, Respect for people & Responsibility of general & public welfare – American Evaluation Association (2007)*
    - *Shared & reasonable expectations, Risk assessment & minimisation, Respectful of individuals' rights, privacy, dignity & entitlements & Sufficiently rigorous & appropriate reporting – Australasian Evaluation Society (2006)*
    - *Openness & transparency, Risk assessment & minimisation, Appropriate design & conduct, Accessible reporting, Commitment to integrity of the evaluation, Realistic expectations, Equitable treatment of all groups; Follow appropriate standard ethical practices – UK Evaluation Society (2003)*

  - Most emphasised only the evaluator's roles, responsibilities & required competencies – we considered these **essential but not going far enough…**

- **Further (CCYP) key principles…**
  - **Capacity building** – seeking to improve organisations' knowledge, skills, resources, systems &/or practices in relation to planning, monitoring &/or evaluating their activities
  - **Value adding** – seeking to understand, complement & enhance organisations' current service delivery & performance monitoring
  - **Accessible** – whereby various levels & types of support were provided, including some free basic advisory supports
  - **Inclusiveness** – seeking to incorporate data & feedback from as many of each program's key stakeholders as possible
  - **Participation** – seeking to incorporate feedback directly from children & young people whenever possible
  - **Evidence generating** –applying high quality evaluation methods that built on existing relevant literature

Revisiting Evaluation Models, Theories & Approaches

- **Empowerment Evaluation** best articulated the full breadth & intent of the CCYP principles:
  - *An evaluation approach that aims to increase the probability of achieving program success by (1) **providing program stakeholders with tools** for assessing the planning, implementation & self-evaluation of their program & (2) **mainstreaming evaluation** as part of the planning & management of the program/organization.*
  - Operates around **10 key principles**:
    - Improvement, Community ownership, Inclusion, Democratic participation, Social justice, Community knowledge, Evidence-based strategies, Capacity building, Organisational learning & Accountability
  - Explicit underlying belief that all individuals & organisations are capable of **creating knowledge about, & solutions to, their own experiences,** when provided with the necessary tools & conditions
  - Describes the role of the **evaluator as 'coach'**
  - Acknowledges the **need for varied qualitative & quantitative methodologies** & evaluation techniques - different approaches, or parts of them, will be better suited to particular programs, organisations, participants or evaluation questions

(Fetterman & Wandersman, 2005)

- So what has this meant in terms of our projects....??

Tailoring the Evaluation Tools & Processes (1)

- 25 CCYP projects involved evaluation tools being developed, collected &/or analysed

  – 92% required **development of evaluation tools:**

  – **0 to 8 types** of tools developed per project – Median = 3
    - 60% needed **followup impact or outcome assessment** tools
    - 52% needed **descriptive or baseline assessment** tools
    - 52% needed **client satisfaction** tools
    - 40% needed an **evaluation plan**
    - 40% needed **program management** tools
    - Other types = reflective practice tools, needs assessment tools, databases for use by collaborating organisations & client followup tools

  – **Up to 45 tools** developed per project – Median = 5

Tailoring the Evaluation Tools & Processes (2)

- Projects' required **various data collection methods**:

  - 80% involved **multiple methods** (Range = 1-6, Median = 2)
    - 68% used **paper surveys**
    - 56% used collaborating organisations' **own records**
    - 44% used **face-to-face surveys**
    - 44% used **focus groups**
    - Other methods = telephone surveys, observation & computer-based surveys

- Projects required **various data types**:
  - 48% used **mainly quantitative** data
  - 28% involved **mainly qualitative** data
  - 24% involved a fairly **even mix**

Tailoring the Evaluation Tools & Processes (3)

- Projects required **various data sources**:

  - 72% **from multiple sources** (Range = 1-4, Median = 2)

    - 72% from **collaborating organisations' workers**
    - 56% from the **families** of children &/or young people
    - 56% from **other organisations' workers**
    - 52% from **children &/or young people**

- Projects required **data collected by various groups**:

  - 60% **by only one group** (Range = 1-2, Median = 1)
    - 76% by the **CCYP**
    - 60% by **collaborating organisations**
    - 4% by **children &/or young people**

Tailoring the Evaluation Tools & Processes (4)

- Projects required **various methodological techniques**:

  - 72% included "**post**" data
  - 40% included "**pre**" data
  - 52% included **triangulation** of data collected from different sources
  - 44% included **multiple rounds** or followups
  - 20% included **control or comparison** data

- Projects required **various levels of analysis**:

  - 80% involved only **service user-level** analyses
  - 4% involved only **community-level** analyses
  - 16% involved **both levels** of analyses

Our Approach – Stage 1: Rapport Building & Contracting (1)

- **CCYP staff meet &/or share program plans & other relevant documents with a potential client organisation in order to:**

  - **Make explicit the CCYP's starting presumptions** that the organisation:
    - has a primary focus on service delivery & seek to do their best for their clients
    - has an obligation & is keen to learn about ways to improve their services
    - is likely to be routinely collecting much evaluative information – by recording, reflecting on & revising their activities, with individual clients &/or overall
    - is less likely to be capturing this information in most consistent &/or efficient ways
    - can be supported to develop & implement more consistent & credible data collection & recording systems

  - **Gain an understanding of the client organisation** &/or program values, goals, priorities, previous experiences with evaluation & any existing data collection processes

  - **Negotiate funding & timeframes**, in relation to the type, nature & extent of support the CCYP can offer the client organisation & the inputs that will be required from them

Our Approach – Stage 1:
Rapport Building & Contracting (2)

Strengths

- Clarifies **understanding of the CCYP's approach** to program planning & evaluation.

- Establishes the **client organisation's previous experiences** with & attitudes towards program planning & evaluation.

- Enhances both side's **understanding of their roles, responsibilities, rights & obligations** in relation to the collaborative project.

- Enhances the CCYP's ability to **tailor support** to best meet the client organisation's priorities, values, needs & capacities.

- Provides a foundation for an **open, trusting relationship** between the CCYP & the client organisation.

Challenges

- Can be **time-intensive** for CCYP & client organisations.

- Can be somewhat confronting where there is substantial **discord** between the CCYP's & the client organisation's values.

- Requires an **openness to being critiqued** & continually learning from experiences.

- Requires a **sensitivity** to which boundaries cannot be pushed, which can & how far they can be pushed.

- Can result in the **loss** of some potential contracts.

CCYP Approach – Stage 2:
Evaluation Planning & Initial Tool Development (1)

- **CCYP staff work collaboratively with the client organisation:**
  - To **review any relevant resources, systems & practices** they have been using to plan, monitor &/or evaluate their programs
  - To **assess their needs,** current status & the best ways to strengthen their future planning, monitoring & evaluation
  - **Acknowledges the priority given to service delivery**, usually with a focus on individual-level outcomes
  - Seeks to **develop evaluation tools & processes** that enhance, rather than detract from, the practitioner-client relationship

CCYP Approach – Stage 2:
Evaluation Planning & Initial Tool Development (2)

Strengths

- Optimises the likelihood that proposed planning &/or evaluation tools & processes **will meet the client organisation's needs** in an acceptable way.

- Optimises the ownership or likelihood of **consistently implementing any planning &/or evaluation tools & processes** developed.

- Begins the process of supporting the client organisation to **reflect on & identify strategies for improving** their current planning, implementation &/or evaluation practices.

Challenges

- Can be **time-intensive** for CCYP & client organisations, especially for complex programs.

- Inevitably involves **negotiating a compromise** between the "ideal" evaluation & what can be achieved.

- Can **limit the amount of data** able to be collected.

- Requires tools & systems that can **accommodate variations** in service delivery.

CCYP Approach – Stage 3: Evaluation Implementation & Ongoing Tool Refinement

- CCYP staff:
  - Train & support the organisation's staff to implement the developed client & program monitoring tools & processes
  - Make any necessary modifications – to enhance functionality or to address changing client or program needs

Strengths

- **Continues the process** of enhancing the client organisation's program planning & evaluation capacity.

- Increases the likelihood of **consistent client & service delivery information being captured for ALL clients** – which can rarely be achieved with externally-collected data.

- Models the need to **continually reflect on & identify strategies for improving** program planning, implementation &/or evaluation practices.

- **Reduces the need for full ethical reviews** – as data are collected by & remain the property of the collaborating organisation, as part of their routine service monitoring processes.

- **Reduces the costs** of achieving a quality program evaluation – by limiting the amount of external data collection required.

Challenges

- Can be **time-intensive** for CCYP & client organisations, especially where initial capacity is low &/or there are changes in program staff – in order to limit the gaps &/or inaccuracies in the collected data.

- Can require **skilful question development** & the use of triangulation & other techniques to strengthen confidence in internally-collected, & often subjective, evaluation information.

CCYP Approach – Stage 4: Data Analysis & Reporting (1)

- Client organisation provides the CCYP with the collected client & service delivery data – in a de-identified format

- CCYP staff then work collaboratively with the client organisation

  – To **clean, analyse & interpret these data** - usually happens a number of times during the data collection phase – in order to ensure data are being collected consistently & to allow any necessary modifications to evaluation tools &/or processes

  – To **prepare any required reports** or other documents summarising the findings

CCYP Approach – Stage 4:
Data Analysis & Reporting (2)

Strengths

- Continues the process of **enhancing the client organisation's program planning & evaluation capacity.**

- Increases the likelihood of **consistent client & service delivery information being captured** for all clients.

- Models the need to **continually reflect on & identify strategies for improving** program planning, implementation &/or evaluation practices.

- **Models the need to interpret data critically** & in relation to relevant contextual factors.

- Optimises the client organisation's ownership of & likelihood to **act on the evaluation findings**.

- Provides the client organisation with **ongoing access to up-to-date client & program information** for use in their planning, service review & or reporting.

Challenges

- Can be **time-intensive** for CCYP & client organisations, especially where large amounts of data have been collected.

- Where evaluation findings are **largely positive**, care is needed regarding the best way of **presenting any relevant limitations** – so as to enhance the likelihood of them being taken on board.

- Where evaluation findings are **less positive**, care is needed regarding the best way of **presenting the results & recommendations** – so as to enhance the likelihood of them positively influencing future practices.

Feedback on our Approach?

- May 2008 – phone interviews with 25 clients - quantitative and qualitative questions
- A mix of managers (60%) & front-line workers (40%)

- **Clients' Expectations** from the collaboration:
  - 56% mentioned gaining knowledge
    - » about their program's effectiveness / strengths / weaknesses
  - 40% mentioned methodological approaches
    - » Being rigorous / critical / professional
    - » Being collaborative / consultative
  - 36% mentioned high quality / professional conduct
  - 20% mentioned getting support with particular evaluation tasks
  - 20% mentioned improving outcomes for children &/or young people
  - 0% mentioned learning about evaluation methods or techniques

Feedback (2)

- **Clients' Overall Satisfaction** with what happened:

    - 88% were very / extremely happy / felt their expectations were exceeded

    - 12% were happy / felt their expectations were met / mostly met

    - 12% raised some concerns
        - » distance issues / unclear expectations e.g. of what would be required from organisation, of style of interim report

    - 28% mentioned wanting to continue / expand their relationship with CCYP

Feedback (3)

- Aspects **MOST satisfied** with:
  - 60% mentioned the **approach / relationship** with CCYP staff
    - » Being supportive / encouraging / consultative / inclusive
  - 40% mentioned the evaluation **methods**
    - » Being rigorous / thorough/ critical / high quality / practical
  - 36% mentioned the evaluation **results**
    - » Being positive / informing practice &/or further funding applications
  - 32% mentioned the evaluation **reports &/or tools**
    - » Being high quality / relevant to their project

- Aspects **LEAST satisfied** with:
  - 28% said "**nothing**"
  - 24% **wanted more involvement**
    - » In evaluation planning / tool development / report preparation
  - 24% **wanted improved communication**
    - » Mostly face-to-face – from those based at distance
  - 12% had concerns about each of the following
    - » **Appropriateness** of some evaluation tools
    - » Contents &/or complexity of some **evaluation reports**
    - » Inflexibility / time-consuming nature of **SCU bureaucracy &/or Ethics Committee**

Feedback (4)

- Ratings of **CCYP professionalism** (1 – 10 scale):
  - Mean 8.8 for **professionalism of CCYP staff**
    - » Range = 6½-10, Median = 9, 60% rated 9-10, 4% rated <7
  - Mean 8.8 for **overall quality of work**
    - » Range = 6-10, Median = 9, 59% rated 9-10, 5% rated <7
  - Mean 8.6 for **meeting agreed deadlines**
    - » Range = 6½-10, Median = 9, 48% rated 9-10, 4% rated <7
  - Mean 8.4 for **flexibility to changes in their needs**
    - » Range = 4-10, Median = 8½, 48% rated 9-10, 5% rated <7
  - Mean 8.2 for **keeping them updated**
    - » Range = 6-10, Median = 8, 35% rated 9-10, 9% rated <7
  - Mean 8.1 for **availability of CCYP staff**
    - » Range = 4-10, Median = 8, 38% rated 9-10, 13% rated <7
  - Mean 8.0 for **understanding their needs**
    - » Range = 4-10, Median = 8, 32% rated 9-10, 8% rated <7
  - Mean 8.4 **across 7 items**
    - » Range = 6.6-9.9, Median = 8.3, 32% rated 9-10, 8% rated <7

Feedback (5)

- Ratings of **impact of CCYP collaboration** (0 – 3 scale, none - lots):
  - Mean 2.2 for **learnings about what programs doing well**
    - » Range = 1-3, Median = 2, 32% rated 3, 0% rated 0
  - Mean 2.1 for **learnings about evaluating programs**
    - » Range = 1-3, Median = 2, 36% rated 3, 0% rated 0
  - Mean 2.1 for **learnings about what programs could do better**
    - » Range = 1-3, Median = 2, 20% rated 3, 0% rated 0
  - Mean 1.9 for **made changes in data collected**
    - » Range = 1-3, Median = 2, 35% rated 3, 0% rated 0
  - Mean 1.8 for **made changes in how data used**
    - » Range = 0-3, Median = 2, 33% rated 3, 13% rated 0
  - Mean 1.8 for **made changes in program delivery**
    - » Range = 0-3, Median = 2, 31% rated 3, 6% rated 0
  - Mean 1.6 for **learnings about planning programs**
    - » Range = 0-3, Median = 2, 14% rated 3, 14% rated 0
  - Mean 1.9 **across 7 items**
    - » Range = 0.7-2.9, Median = 2, 29% rated > 2, 8% rated < 1

Feedback (6)

- Ratings of **outcomes of CCYP collaboration** (0 – 3 scale, none - lots):
  - Mean 2.0 for **change in benefits for clients**
    » Range = 0-3, Median = 2, 27% rated 3, 7% rated 0
  - Mean 1.9 for **change in amount of interaction with other services**
    » Range = 1-3, Median = 2, 27% rated 3, 0% rated 0
  - Mean 1.9 for **change in worker satisfaction with programs**
    » Range = 1-3, Median = 2, 25% rated 3, 0% rated 0
  - Mean 1.7 for **change in awareness about other relevant services**
    » Range = 0-3, Median = 2, 20% rated 3, 10% rated 0
  - Mean 1.6 for **change in client satisfaction with programs**
    » Range = 1-3, Median = 2, 7% rated 3, 0% rated 0
  - Mean 1.3 for **change in who accesses programs**
    » Range = 0-3, Median = 2, 9% rated 3, 36% rated 0
  - Mean 1.2 for **change in who plans / reviews programs**
    » Range = 0-3, Median = 1, 8% rated 3, 38% rated 0
  - Mean 1.6 **across 7 items**
    » Range = 0.5-2.4, Median = 1.6, 22% rated > 2, 11% rated < 1

Summary / Conclusions (1)

- **Community-based organisations** are providing services

  – **they need to know what they are delivering (process eval) & what they are achieving (outcome eval)**

  – so they can reflect on how they may be able to improve either aspect

- **Program participants** are receiving services

  – **they need to express their views/perspectives/needs & think about the strengths & weaknesses of the services being received**

  – so they can reflect on & communicate how they may be able to do it better

- **Funders** are distributing $$ for programs & services

  – **they need to know & be able to demonstrate (to the public, their Board, etc) what their funds are achieving**

  – so they can reflect on how they may be able to improve either aspect

Summary / Conclusions (2)

- **Research & evaluation community** (through groups based in Unis, Govt Depts, etc)
  - have an obligation to share their expertise, to reflect on how they may be able to improve their methods and/or processes to make them more easily & widely shared & to be more inclusive of groups &/or individuals who've been less engaged by existing eval methods

- This will be **best achieved when we all work together**
  - To accept and share responsibility for developing/ designing eval processes capable of capturing, without diminishing, what is actually being delivered & achieved in such community-based programs & of guiding their ongoing improvement &/or evolution

- This paper overviews one attempt to do this!

Centre for Children and Young People

research, education & advocacy

Thank you

AIFS conference
Melbourne July 2008