

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

Publication details

Newell S, Graham A & Cashmore J 2008, 'Evaluating community-based programs: challenges and lessons from the front-line', paper presented to 10th Australian Institute of Family Studies Conference, Melbourne, July.

ePublications@SCU is an electronic repository administered by Southern Cross University Library. Its goal is to capture and preserve the intellectual output of Southern Cross University authors and researchers, and to increase visibility and impact through open access to researchers around the world. For further information please contact epubs@scu.edu.au.

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)

- **Diversity 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