EVALUATION HANDBOOK A SUPPLEMENTARY RESOURCE

To The Federal Initiative To Address HIV and AIDS In Canada Project Evaluation Report Guide

CAAN

CANADIAN ABORIGINAL AIDS NETWORK

Canadian Aboriginal AIDS Network

Evaluation Handbook Supplementary Resource

To The

Federal Initiative To Address HIV/AIDS In Canada

Project Evaluation Report Guide - May 2011

Prepared For: Canadian Aboriginal AIDS Network
6520 Salish Drive,
Vancouver BC, V6N 2C7
Ph: 604.266.7616 Fax: 604.266.7612
Toll Free: 1.888.285.2226
www.caan.ca

ISBN No. 978-1-927110-05-8

Canadian Aboriginal AIDS Network

Evaluation Handbook Supplementary Resource

This Handbook was completed for the Canadian Aboriginal AIDS Network (CAAN). It is a supplementary resource to the Federal Initiative To Address HIV/AIDS In Canada - Project Evaluation Report Guide developed by Public Health Agencies of Canada (PHAC).

November 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements 4
Foreward 5
I. Context 6
II. Aboriginal Realities 7
III. Canadian Aboriginal AIDS Network (CAAN) 8
1. Introduction 9
2. Why Evaluate? 10
3. What is Evaluation? 10
4. What is Program Evaluation? 11
5. Main Purposes of Evaluation 11
6. Evaluation Standards 12
7. Functions of Evaluation 12
8. What Are The Basics Of Evaluating Programs 13
9. Forms of Evaluation 14
10. Who Will Carry Out The Evaluation 14
11. Stakeholders (Community of Practice) 15
12. What Is Involved In Conducting An Evaluation? 15
13. Evaluation Plan 16
14. Quantitative and Qualitative Evaluation Methods 16
15. Methods of Collecting Information 18
16. Overview of Methods to Collect Information 18
17. Sources of Information 19
18. Analysis and Findings 20
19. Reporting and Dissemination 21
20. Communications and Dissemination 22
21. Summary 23
22. Glossary 24

Acknowledgements

This Handbook was made possible by the foresight of the executive of CAAN.

We would like to thank the Board of Directors and staff of CAAN.

Most notable, we would like to acknowledge the APHA's, and program staff whose efforts and activities have been exemplary; for their willingness to share with us their experiences and opinions.

Foreward

An expectation regarding program evaluation by government and private funders are increasing and is unlikely to change. While most recipients of funding, especially through PHAC and FNIH, evaluate their programs and services, many of our communities of practice are facing challenges in conducting program evaluations.

In light of this, CAAN has prepared this basic Handbook on program evaluation as a companion document to the *Public Health Agencies of Canada - Evaluation Report Guide May 2011*. We hope that this companion document will be useful for our members and partners as they contemplate their own program evaluation.

As indicated this Handbook is intended as a guide, rather than a comprehensive resource. CAAN hopes with this Handbook that some of the challenges are removed, and that by using this Handbook our community of practice will feel more able to conduct evaluations and to look at evaluation as a way to highlight their strengths, find resources to shore up program deficits, and learn from their own hard won experience.

I. Context

First Nations and Inuit Populations

Although incidence (new HIV infections among the total population) has gone down in the Canadian population, it appears that HIV rates have been steadily increasing in First Nations and Inuit populations. They are at increased risk for HIV infections for several reasons. Social, economic, and behavioural factors such as poverty, substance use, including injection drug use, sexually transmitted diseases, and limited access to health services, have increased their vulnerability.

Facts on HIV and AIDS in First Nations and Inuit Populations

- Aboriginal people in Canada continue to be over-represented in the HIV epidemic:
- Although they represent only 3.3% of the Canadian population, Aboriginal persons comprised 5-8% of prevalent infections (persons currently living with HIV infection in Canada) and 6-12% of new HIV infections in Canada in 2002;
- Injection drug use continues to be a key mode of HIV transmission in the Aboriginal community;
- HIV/AIDS has a significant impact on Aboriginal women; and
- Aboriginal people are being infected with HIV at a younger age compared to non-Aboriginal persons.

AIDS is now as pre-eminent in the Aboriginal population as it is in the general population.[i]

II. Aboriginal Realities

The Aboriginal peoples of Canada have faced a variety of social, legal, and economic challenges over the last few centuries and these challenges are fundamentally different from those faced by the rest of the Canadian population. To gain a perspective, it is instructive to draw parallels on the… problems of Indigenous Australians, as Altman suggest, they are highly variable:

- some are a function of historical legacy—dispossession, exclusion, marginalisation, racism
- others are a function of a combination of this historical legacy, as well as location and scale, and
- others still are a function of all of the above factors, as well as cultural persistence and resistance of robust customary institutions poorly adapted to economic development...[ii]

These underlying variables are at play within the Canadian Aboriginal populations:

- "According to the 2006 census, approximately 3.8% of Canada's 31.2 million people self-identify as Aboriginal, a term which includes First Nations, Inuit and Métis people.
- Aboriginal peoples represented about 7.5% of all persons living with HIV in Canada at the end of 2005 and approximately 9% of new HIV infections in Canada in 2005.
- Aboriginal peoples comprised 24.4% of reported AIDS cases that noted ethnicity* in 2006.
- In 2006, 50% of reported AIDS cases among Aboriginal peoples were Aboriginal women.
- Among surveillance reports with ethnicity information noted, ***injection drug use*** accounted for ***40% of reported AIDS cases*** associated with Aboriginal peoples over 1979 to 2006 and ***58.8% of HIV-positive test reports*** obtained over 1998 to 2006.

III. Canadian Aboriginal AIDS Network (CAAN)

The Canadian Aboriginal AIDS Network (CAAN) is a national, not-for-profit organization.

Established in 1997, CAAN represents over four hundred member organizations and individuals, a National thirteen member Board of Directors governs CAAN, as well as a four member Executive. CAAN provides a National forum for members to express needs and concerns; ensures access to HIV/AIDS-related services through advocacy; and provides relevant, accurate and up-to-date HIV/AIDS information. The following committees guide the work of CAAN:

- CAAN Voices of Women (VOW)
- National Aboriginal Youth Council on HIV and AIDS (NAYCHA)
- Aboriginal AIDS Awareness Week Steering Committee
- National Aboriginal Task Force on Harm Reduction
- APHA Caucus
- National Toolkit Advisory Committee
- National Research Advisory Committee

CAAN operates out of two offices, [on two separate coasts (one in Vancouver, one in Halifax) and four time zones…. This operational reality creates a number of challenges including 'quick turnaround' or response to an issue is required by one office from the other, maintaining clarity about roles and responsibilities between staff and management of the two offices and communication issues. While some technologies (e.g., Skype, SMS, etc.) are used by CAAN to bridge communication.[iii]

As a key national voice of a collection of individuals, organizations and provincial/territorial associations, CAAN provides leadership, support and advocacy for Aboriginal people living with and affected by HIV/AIDS. CAAN faces the challenges created by HIV/AIDS in a spirit of wholeness and healing that promotes empowerment, inclusion, and honours the cultural traditions, uniqueness and diversity of all First Nations, Inuit and Métis people regardless of where they reside.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this handbook was to produce a basic Handbook designed to support the communities of practice of CAAN to assist in planning their own program evaluation processes. For the purposes of this Handbook, Communities of Practice (CoPs) are groups of people in organizations that form to share what they know, to learn from one another regarding some aspects of their work and to provide a social context for that work. The Handbook has therefore been put together for those identified communities where evaluation activities are required as part of the learning and accountability process.

The Handbook is meant to offer additional information and resources from the Evaluation Guide developed by Public Health Agencies of Canada – May 2011 (included as Appendix I). It is not intended to be a comprehensive resource rather it is meant to supplement the Evaluation Guide developed by Public Health Agencies of Canada – 2011. This booklet was developed to provide managers working with CAAN with a basic guide for the evaluation of projects. It is aimed at those who need to learn more about both what evaluation can do and how an evaluation is carried out by blending the evaluation framework recommended by PHAC and common sense to meet the specific needs of CAAN's community of practice.

In this regard, the Canadian Aboriginal AIDS Network has developed this Handbook to support the communities of practice in approaching evaluation in a more structured way. In addition, CAAN would like to see that evaluation becomes an integral part and occurs over the course of the program management and implementation rather than just at the close of projects.

2. Why Evaluate?

Organizations undertake program evaluation for the following reasons:

- To collect evidence on the effectiveness/impact of a program.
- To be accountable to stakeholders: funders, clients, volunteers, staff, or community.
- To identify ways to improve a program:
    - determining what works, what doesn't work and why
    - assessing needs of target population
    - improving the usefulness of program materials
- To compare programs with other programs.
- To assess the efficiency of a program.

3. What is Evaluation?

The literature suggests that there is no single method of program evaluation, generally or specifically. Understandably so, given that:

> *[t]he results of any particular effort cannot be guaranteed. Each evaluation being a blend of unique ingredients, no standardized recipe can assure the outcome. We have only principles, premises, and utilization-focused processes to guide us, and we have much yet to learn.*[iv]

Evaluation must fit the program or project under review; it is a selection of what should be evaluated and how this will be done. The definition of program evaluation under the guidelines set out by the Treasury Board of Canada, includes:

- The function, which is the formal assessment of programs in terms of their rationale, objectives achievement, impacts and effects, alternatives, and, frequently, future directions;
- The procedure, which, according to generally accepted approaches and methodologies, is the performance of an evaluation assessment or study for a particular program, which defines the program to be evaluated (logic model), identifies the issues to be evaluated, develops and assesses the methodologies and options for addressing these issues, analyzes the impacts and effects, identifies and assesses various alternatives to the program; and sets out future directions based on the evaluation results, and
- The process, which includes developing evaluation frameworks for new or modified programs, undertaking evaluation assessments and evaluation studies, and making decisions and taking actions resulting from the findings and recommendations of the evaluation studies.[v]

While another suggests that:

Evaluation is: …assessing and judging the value of a piece of work, an organisation or a service. Its main purpose is to help an organisation reflect on what it is trying to achieve, assessing how far it is succeeding, and identify required changes.[vi]

Evaluation is a methodological area that is closely related to, but distinguishable from more traditional social research. Evaluation utilizes many of the same methodologies used in traditional social research, but because evaluation takes place within a political and organizational context, it requires group skills, management ability, political dexterity, sensitivity to multiple stakeholders and other skills that social research in general does not rely on as much. Here we introduce the idea of evaluation and some of the major terms and issues in the field.[vii]

Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, and impact.

An evaluation provides information that is credible and useful for decision–making process of both the program and funders. Evaluation also refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of an activity, policy or program.

4. What is Program Evaluation?

As an evaluator you will be planning, organizing, designing, collecting data, analyzing data, and presenting data. Program Evaluation then uses a systematic method for collecting, analyzing, and using information to answer basic questions about a program and to ensure that those answers are supported by evidence.

According to PHAC …***program evaluation is the systematic gathering, analysis and reporting of data*** about a program to assist in decision-making. Evaluation responds to specific management decision-making needs and is all about:

- describing the intended program;
- documenting what was actually implemented;
- describing participant characteristics; and
- demonstrating the impact of the program.[viii]

5. Main Purposes of Evaluation

Program evaluation has been defined as a structured process that assists managers, staff, and directors monitor progress toward program goals, learn from successes and mistakes, make modifications as needed and judge the success of the program in achieving its short term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes.[ix]

The purposes of program evaluations include:

- Demonstrate program effectiveness to funders
- Improve the implementation and effectiveness of programs
- Better manage limited resources
- Document program accomplishments
- Justify current program funding
- Support the need for increased levels of funding
- Satisfy ethical responsibility to clients to demonstrate positive and negative effects of program participation (Short, Hennessy, & Campbell, 1996).
- Document program development and activities to help ensure successful replication. [x]

6. Evaluation Standards

The following program evaluation standards developed by the American Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (AJCSEE) have increasingly been adopted and promoted including the Canadian Evaluation Society.

These standards can be used both as a guide for managing the evaluation process and to assess an existing evaluation. The standards highlight the considerations that must be weighed in formulating an evaluation design. There are 30 standards divided into 4 categories:

- **Utility:** seek to ensure that an evaluation will serve the information needs of intended users.
- **Feasibility:** seek to ensure that an evaluation will be realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal.
- **Propriety:** seek to ensure that an evaluation will be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of those involved in the evaluation, as well as those affected by its results.
- **Accuracy:** seek to ensure that an evaluation will reveal and convey technically adequate information about the features that determine the worth or merit of the program being evaluated.[xi]

7. Functions of Evaluation

Selecting an evaluation type provides direction for your evaluation. It helps keep the evaluation process focused on its main purpose and determines the evaluation questions that should be answered and the data that should be collected. The most common types of evaluation are: formative, process, summative, and outcome.

Evaluations can be distinguished according to their (main) functions:

- Formative Evaluation;
- Process Evaluation
- Summative Evaluation
- Outcome Evaluation

Formative evaluation is an ongoing evaluation that starts early in a project. It assesses the nature of the project, the needs the project addresses, and the progress and implementation of the project.

Process evaluation is used to monitor activities to make sure a project is being implemented and completed as designed and on time. It can be complementary to formative evaluation.

Summative evaluation is an overall assessment of the project's effectiveness and achievements. It reveals whether the project did what it was designed to do. It provides information for future planning and decisions and usually is completed when the project is over. This type of evaluation usually does not directly affect the current project, but it helps stakeholders decide the future of this or similar projects.

Outcome evaluation is a systematic examination of the outcomes (changes, usually benefits) resulting from a set of activities implemented to achieve a stated goal, and a systematic examination of the extent to which those activities actually caused those outcomes to occur. The intent of outcome evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of these activities with respect to the benefits achieved, suggest improvements and possibly provide direction for future activities. [xii]

An outcome evaluation can be undertaken only if (1) there is a clear statement about what changes are expected, (2) (3) appropriate measures are selected for tracking such change, and (3) a mechanism is established to collect reliable data about these outcomes.

8. What Are The Basics Of Evaluating Programs

Program evaluation is not a discrete component of your work that is separate from the "program" that you deliver. It is integral. Evaluation activities occur:

- Before your sessions/programs;
- During your sessions/programs;
- At the end of sessions/programs;
- After a follow-up period.

9. Forms of Evaluation

Evaluations can differ in terms of who is assigned to the evaluation task:

Internal and external evaluation

In an internal evaluation, those carrying out the evaluation (evaluators) belong to the same organization as those implementing the program or project to be evaluated. By contrast, in external evaluations, evaluators belong to an organization (whether public or private) other than the organization responsible for the program or project.

Self-evaluation and outside evaluation

In self-evaluation, those responsible for the program or project are also responsible for its evaluation. This means that the evaluation is conducted by the same people who are also responsible for designing or implementing the evaluation; there own professional work is the subject to evaluation. By contrast, outside evaluation means that those responsible for the evaluation and those responsible for the program or project are different.

An outside evaluation can be either an internal or an external evaluation, while a self-evaluation is always an internal evaluation. While outside evaluation generally requires more funding, in a self-evaluation some objectivity may be lost.

10. Who Will Carry Out The Evaluation

There are many ways to carry out the evaluation. You can take the responsibility yourself, you can give it to other members of the group or you can create an evaluation committee. You can ask everyone involved in the program to give their views at a meeting or you can hire outside experts. [xiii]

Essentially there are four options regarding how an evaluation should be undertaken:

- Internal (i.e., carried out by those who are also implementing the intervention)
- Internally managed, with input from external researchers or organizations brought in specifically for this purpose
- Externally led and internally supported
- Independent external evaluation

All four options have merit, and each has its own strengths and drawbacks. However, for some programs that deserve the expense investment, a case can be made that the most compelling and credible evaluations are those that are externally conducted.[xiv]

11. Stakeholders (Community of Practice)

Most forms of evaluation encourage an evaluation process that involves a representative group of those people who manage, receive services, or otherwise have an interest in a project. This is a stakeholder approach involvement of those people who have a stake in the evaluation findings and the success of the project. Aboriginal People With HIV/AIDS, project staff, funders, clients and community leaders are all potential stakeholders. The identification and use of stakeholders is the cornerstone of the evaluation technique of CAAN. Stakeholders are individuals and groups (both internal and external) who have an interest in the evaluation, that is, they are involved in or affected by the evaluation.

The involvement of stakeholders in your project's evaluation will have many benefits. Overall, the varied points of view and expertise these individuals will bring to the project are likely to be very helpful. While the Project administrators has responsibility and authority for all aspects of the project, stakeholders can be an excellent resource whose advice may prove invaluable in planning evaluation.

12. What Is Involved In Conducting An Evaluation?

You can ensure that your evaluation is conducted in a systematic manner by following a few basic steps.

Step 1: Assemble an evaluation team. Planning and executing an evaluation should be a team effort. Even if you hire an outside evaluator or consultant to help, you and members of your staff must be full partners in the evaluation effort.

Step 2: Prepare for the evaluation. Before you begin, you will need to build a strong foundation. This planning phase includes deciding what to evaluate, building a program model, stating your objectives in measurable terms, and identifying the context for the evaluation.

Step 3: Develop an evaluation plan. An evaluation plan is a blueprint or a map for an evaluation. It details the design and the methods that will be used to conduct the evaluation and analyze the findings.

Step 4: Collect evaluation information. Once you complete an evaluation plan, you are ready to begin collecting information. This task will require selecting or developing information collection procedures and instruments.

Step 5: Analyze your evaluation information. After evaluation information is collected, it must be organized in a way that allows you to analyze it. Information analysis should be conducted at various times during the course of the evaluation to allow you and your staff to obtain ongoing feedback about the program.

Step 6: Prepare the evaluation report. The evaluation report should be a comprehensive document that describes the program and provides the results of the information analysis.[xv]

13. Evaluation Plan

A detailed description of how the evaluation will be implemented that includes the resources available for implementing the plan, what data will be gathered, the research methods to be used to gather the data, a description of the roles and responsibilities of sponsors and evaluators, and a timeline for accomplishing tasks.

Evaluation planning identifies and organizes questions about your program and helps to organize the methods for getting the answers. The logic model that was developed for the program should inform the evaluation plan.

The following should be identified and clearly defined during this stage:

- Description of the roles and responsibilities of sponsors and evaluators
- Stakeholders, whether external or internal (e.g., those who may be involved in the evaluation or be recipients of its results)
    - External stakeholders can include the intervention's target audience, partners involved in developing and delivering the program, community organizations and local groups interested in a given topic, and the media
    - Internal stakeholders can include funders, Board of Directors, or program staff, and members,
- Evaluation methodology, setting the parameters for data collection and appropriate questions
- Timeline for accomplishing tasks
- Terms of reference, outlining key actions at various stages of both the evaluation process and program implementation
- A description of the main elements of the comprehensive evaluation report for the end user[xvi]

14. Quantitative and Qualitative Evaluation Methods

Two different types of data can be collected for any assessment:

- Qualitative data are descriptive and cannot be measured in absolute terms. They can be obtained from respondents' verbal answers to interview questions, focus group discussions, or written commentaries

and responses to open-ended questions.
- Quantitative data are measurable and definable and can be converted into numbers and statistics. They are useful in showing absolute differences in what is being measured, such as percent changed. These data are derived from ratings, rankings, or “yes” and “no” answers to questionnaires.

Both types of data are useful. Where possible, it is often helpful to supplement objective, quantitative measures with more subjective and descriptive qualitative data.

What are Quantitative Data?
- Pieces of information that can be counted mathematically
- Usually gathered by surveys from large numbers of respondents selected randomly
- Secondary data such as census data, government statistics, etc. often included in quantitative evaluations
- Analyzed using statistical methods
- Best used to answer what, when and who questions
- Not well suited to how and why questions

Strengths	Limitations
Findings can be generalized, if selection process well-designed and sample is representative of study population	Related secondary data sometimes not available, or accessing available data is difficult/impossible
Relatively easy to analyze	Difficult to understand context of program activities
Data can be very consistent, precise, reliable	Data may not be robust enough to explain complex issues
Data collection is usually cost efficient	

What are Qualitative Data?
- Usually gathered by observations, interviews or focus groups
- May also be gathered from written documents and through case studies
- Less emphasis on *counting numbers* of people who think or behave in certain ways and more emphasis on *explaining why* people think and behave in certain ways
- Involves smaller numbers of respondents
- Utilizes open-ended questionnaires or protocols
- Best used to answer how and why questions
- Not well suited to what, when and who questions

Strengths	Limitations
Complement and refine quantitative data	Findings usually can not be generalized to the study population or community
Provide more detailed information to explain complex issues	More difficult to analyze; don’t fit neatly in standard categories
Multiple methods for gathering data on sensitive subjects	Data collection is usually time consuming and costly[xvii]

15. Methods of Collecting Information

The most utilized evaluation methods of collecting information are presented as follows:

- Questionnaires
- Interviews
- Document Review
- Observations
- Focus groups

16. Overview of Methods to Collect Information

The following table provides an overview of the major methods used for collecting data during evaluations.[xviii]

Method	Overall Purpose	Advantages	Challenges
questionnaires, surveys, checklists	when need to quickly and/or easily get lots of information from people in a non threatening way	-can complete anonymously -inexpensive to administer -easy to compare and analyze -administer to many people -can get lots of data -many sample questionnaires already exist	-might not get careful feedback -wording can bias client's responses -are impersonal -in surveys, may need sampling expert - doesn't get full story
interviews	when want to fully understand someone's impressions or experiences, or learn more about their answers to questionnaires	-get full range and depth of information -develops relationship with client -can be flexible with client	-can take much time -can be hard to analyze and compare -can be costly -interviewer can bias client's responses
documentation review	when want impression of how program operates without interrupting the program; is from review of applications, finances, memos,	-get comprehensive and historical information -doesn't interrupt program or client's routine in program	-often takes much time -info may be incomplete -need to be quite clear about what looking for

	minutes, etc.	-information already exists -few biases about information	-not flexible means to get data; data restricted to what already exists
observation	to gather accurate information about how a program actually operates, particularly about processes	-view operations of a program as they are actually occurring -can adapt to events as they occur	-can be difficult to interpret seen behaviors -can be complex to categorize observations -can influence behaviors of program participants -can be expensive
focus groups	explore a topic in depth through group discussion, e.g., about reactions to an experience or suggestion, understanding common complaints, etc.; useful in evaluation and marketing	-quickly and reliably get common impressions -can be efficient way to get much range and depth of information in short time - can convey key information about programs	-can be hard to analyze responses -need good facilitator for safety and closure -difficult to schedule 6-8 people together

17. Sources of Information

a)

Internal sources

- original program proposal for funding;
- studies or needs assessments done in support of the program;
- budget and financial statements;
- organizational charts;
- monthly activity forms;
- policy or operations manual;
- log books;
- case records;
- training or orientation guides;
- memos;
- minutes of meetings;
- committee reports;
- annual reports;
- newspaper articles and publicity materials;
- previous studies or evaluation reports; and
- statistics sheets, work reports, time sheets, etc.

b)

External sources

- census data;

- community studies;
- needs assessments/studies done by other agencies;
- local historical society;
- literature and other research in this field of study;
- Government ministries: publications, reports and consultants; and
- funding source(s) of the program under study. [xix]

18. Analysis and Findings

The purpose of the data analysis and interpretation phase is to transform the data collected into credible evidence about the development of the intervention and its performance.

This process usually includes the following steps:

- Organizing the data for analysis (data preparation)
- Describing the data
- Interpreting the data (assessing the findings against the adopted evaluation criteria)

Where quantitative data have been collected, statistical analysis can:

- Help measure the degree of change that has taken place
- Allow an assessment to be made about the consistency of data

Where qualitative data have been collected, interpretation is more difficult.

- Here, it is important to group similar responses into categories and identify common patterns that can help derive meaning from what may seem unrelated and diffuse responses
- This is particularly important when trying to assess the outcomes of focus groups and interviews

It may be helpful to use several of the following 5 evaluation criteria as the basis for organizing and analyzing data:

Relevance: Does the intervention address an existing need? (Were the outcomes achieved aligned to current priorities in prevention? Is the outcome the best one for the target group—e.g., did the program take place in the area or the kind of setting where exposure is the greatest?)
Effectiveness: Did the intervention achieve what it was set out to achieve?
Efficiency: Did the intervention achieve maximum results with given resources?
Results/Impact: Have there been any changes in the target group as a result of the intervention?
Sustainability: Will the outcomes continue after the intervention has ceased?

Particularly in outcomes-based and impact-based evaluations, the focus on impact and sustainability can be further refined by aligning data around the intervention's

Extent: How many of the key stakeholders identified were eventually covered, and to what degree have they absorbed the outcome of the program? Were the optimal groups/people involved in the program?
Duration: Was the project's timing appropriate? Did it last long enough? Was the repetition of the project's components (if done) useful? Were the outcomes sustainable?

19. Reporting and Dissemination

Once the fieldwork and analysis is complete, the findings need to be presented in a clear and coherent report that is suitable for CAAN's community of practice (audience/s), who may include practitioners, managers and policy makers. PHAC has provided the following typical report structure containing the following sections or chapters:

Abstract – a short synopsis that sums up the essence of the evaluation.

Executive Summary – An executive summary is a condensed version of the whole report – the report in miniature. The executive summary contains the most critical and key information in brief form the evaluation. The executive summary must also contain information on conclusions, recommendation, and lessons learned.

Introduction – this section tells what the report is about and gives a high level explanation of what the report contains. It should provide the context for the reader, what they are about to read in the report and why it was written. The purpose of the evaluation is explained, including any specific objectives for the evaluation started.

Project Profile – the project profile section is a description of the key elements of the project – objectives, activities, target population and resources. It is designed to let the reader know what the project was all about and what is being evaluated.

Evaluation Questions – the evaluation question section outlines the key questions that were addressed by the evaluation. The evaluation questions represent the areas of most interest to the intended audience of the evaluation, namely the Project Team and PHAC [and other funders].

Methodology – this section provides a description of each of the evaluation methods used to collect information or data. This section should explain the how the evaluation ensured information was collected in a manner that met standards for evaluation practice (rigorous, independent, provides multiple lines of evidence or different perspectives) and was conducted in a culturally / contextually sensitive manner.

Findings and Analysis – findings are the data and information collected from different sources in the evaluation. Analysis is the work of the evaluator to integrate and synthesize all of the information and data (from all sources), – what does the information and data (from all sources and all methods) say in response to the evaluation questions.

Conclusion – conclusions bring the judgment, interpretation and expertise of the evaluator to bear on what the evidence means for this project and specifically for the evaluation criteria and questions.

Recommendations and lessons Learned – While all evaluations should provide recommendations, not all evaluations elicit lessons learned. Recommendations are proposed or suggested actions that the Project Team, partners and PHAC [other funders] can take on the project as (or if) it continues to operate. Lessons learned are about what was learned more generally, from this project, that can be applied in future, to similar initiatives.

Appendices – sample questionnaires and topic guides from focus groups and interviews can be included as appendices. [xx]

20. Communications and Dissemination

Presenting the evaluation findings in a clear, concise, accessible format and ensuring that they are effectively disseminated to key stakeholders and other interested parties are essential for a number of reasons.

An effective dissemination strategy helps to ensure that the evaluation process remains open and transparent, and prevents cynicism about the process itself and how the findings are used.

Research and evaluation activities rely on the co-operation of key stakeholders, who may become reticent about their continued participation if they are not made aware of the benefits of, and the rationale for, their participation. It is essential, therefore, to identify ways of sharing findings and feedback to ensure that individuals and organizations benefit from the work.

Presenting The Report In Unwritten Formats

Apart from circulating the written Report examples of other formats include:

- Pictures and photographs
- Films
- Symbols
- Oral presentations in community meetings
- Dialogue in community media i.e. community radio, community TV…

- Presenting the results in community theatre or cultural performances

21. Summary

An Effective Evaluation

Here are some basic principles that will guarantee the effectiveness of your evaluation. Make sure that your evaluation is:

- **Useful**
  It should be based on the needs, goals, objectives and decisions of your organization, staff and clients. The evaluation should lead to decision-making and taking actions.mThe evaluator should present the results in such a way that the organization can use them to improve the program under study.

- **Planned**
  To be constructive, the evaluation should be planned from the beginning of the project or program. Both participants and decision makers should be involved from the outset so they have a good understanding of the process and can give you support when needed.

- **Conducted ethically**
  Evaluation techniques should be simple and non-threatening. They should respect individual concerns and needs. Special steps should be taken to protect the confidentiality of the data.

- **Systematic**
  The evaluation should be systematic, even if it is simple.
  It should use a variety of methods to investigate and gather information.
  In this way, it will yield results that are true to reality - your reality.

- **Ongoing**
  Try to get into the habit of continuously gathering information on your program and carrying out an ongoing evaluation. This will help you continue to work toward your initial objectives.[xxi]

22. Glossary

A

Activities. The action steps necessary to produce program outputs.

Activities are what the program/service actually does with the inputs in alignment with its mission**.** Your activities are what your program does with the resources that are the intentional part of the program implementation.

Accuracy
The evaluation uses valid, reliable and relevant information.

B

Benchmark. A measurement or standard that serves as a point of reference by which process performance is measured.

C

Credibility
The evaluation is undertaken by evaluators with appropriate skills and experience, is transparent and inclusive

Cost beneficial
The costs of evaluation are proportional to the budget committed to the development intervention being evaluated and remain within the budgetary limits.

E

External evaluator
An evaluator from outside the team, and often the organization, working on the program.

Evaluation aims
A series of concise statements that outline the purpose of your evaluation and what you aim to achieve.

Evaluation method
A technique used to gather information for your evaluation, for example in-depth interviews or telephone surveys.

Evaluation tool
An evaluation tool is a method you use to gather information in an evaluation, for example an interview schedule.

F

Focus group
A group of people brought together to talk about a particular issue. Questions are designed to encourage participants to discuss their experiences and viewpoints.

Funder
Organization that funds program and services.

G

Generalizability. Used interchangeably with "external validity."

I

Independence
The evaluation is impartial, objective, and independent for the process concerned with policy-making, and the delivery and management of development assistance

Indicator (also Performance Indicator). A particular characteristic used to measure outputs or outcomes; a quantifiable expression used to observe and track the status of a process. An indicator constitutes the observable evidence of accomplishments, changes made, or progress achieved.

K

Key informants
Are people who have some particular or in depth knowledge or experience. Caution should be used as some such sources may be biased

L

Lessons Learned
The transferable learning related to the specific principle that other communities can learn from and employ.

Logic Model
Is a systematic and visual way to present and share your understanding of the relationships among the resources you have to operate your program, the activities you plan, and the changes or results you hope to achieve.

M

Monitoring
Is the routine collection and recording of information about a piece of work or an organization, to keep track of day to day activities and operations. Its purpose is to provide regular feedback on how things are going and help the organization make decisions.

O

Outcome evaluation
Involves looking at the overall effects of your program, especially in relation to whether the program goal has been achieved.

P

Performance indicators
Are measures of inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes, and impacts for development projects, programs, or strategies. When supported with sound data collection, analysis and reporting, indicators enable managers to track progress, demonstrate results, and take corrective action to improve service delivery.

Program

Refers to a collection of activities that are unified with respect to management structure and overall goal.

Project
A one-time effort that produces a specific result.

Propriety
The evaluation is conducted legally, ethically and with due regard for the of those involved in the evaluation, as well as those affected by its results.

Provider
Organizations that provide program or services.

Q

Qualitative Data. Information expressed in the form of words.

Qualitative evaluation research methods
Research methods which look in detail at the nature of responses rather than the number of responses to a given issues. The aim is to increase in-depth understanding of others' experiences and viewpoints.

Quantitative Data. Information expressed in the form of numbers. Measurement gives a procedure for assigning numbers to observations.

Quantitative evaluation research methods
Research methods which record the frequency or number of responses to a given question or issue. This provides the number of people who said or did something.

Questionnaire
A series of questions set down on paper. Responses to the questions are generally recorded on this sheet.

R

Reliability
The quality of a measurement process that would produce similar results on: (1) repeated observations of the same condition or event; or (2) multiple observations of the same condition or event by different observers.

Replication
An outcome effect that occurs when a program is implemented elsewhere.

Resources
Include those aspects of your project, which are available and dedicated or used by the program/service. Sometimes this component is referred to as **Inputs** or **Assets.**

Respondent
The person who responds to the questions, either asked by an interviewer or written down on a self-completion questionnaire.

Response rate
The response rate is the number of people who complete a questionnaire compared with the number of people who are initially approached.

S

Sample
A subset of the people or environments which your program aims to change in some way. Program stakeholders can also form part of a sample. The aim is for your sample to be representative in some way of these people or environments.

Self-Evaluation
An evaluation that is owned, controlled, and often carried out by the project's participants, primarily for their own use, as an integral part of the organization's life.

Stakeholders
Interested parties who have an interest in your evaluation findings; they usually have some influence over how the program is developed, delivered and how it is evaluated. Stakeholders can include program organizers, community groups, managers, purchasers, and key personnel from related organizations as well as program participants.

Structured Interview
An interview in which the questions to be asked, their sequence, and the detailed information to be gathered are all predetermined; used where maximum consistency across interviews and interviewees is needed.

U

Utility
The evaluation meets the information needs of the intended users and therefore is relevant and timely.

Bibliography

[i] First Nations, Inuit and Aboriginal Health, Health Canada URL: www.hc-sc.gc.ca
[ii] Altman, Jon A Paper for the Reconciliation Australia Ltd Workshop 'Banking and Financial Services for Indigenous Australians" Sydney, 8-9 May 2002.
[iii] Wise Practices III Gathering, Overview and Summary Report- 2011. Prepared by J. Ticknor for Canadian
[iv] Utilization-focused Evaluation. Patton, Michael. Publication: Springer eBook. Copyright © 2002, Springer, Netherlands
[v] Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat Policy on Evaluation URL: http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?section=text&id=15024#cha4
[vi] Evaluation Trust 6 Charlotte Street, Bath, BA1 2NE URL: http://www.evaluationtrust.org/evaluation/definitions
[vii] Trochim, William M. The Research Methods Knowledge Base, 2nd Edition. Internet WWW page, at URL: <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/>
[viii] Program Evaluation Tool Kit Nancy Porteous, Barbara Sheldrick and Paula Stewart in 1997 Public Health Agencies of Canada (PHAC)
[ix]TB Evaluation Toolkit: Introduction to Program Evaluation Tuberculosis Evaluation Working Group Division of Tuberculosis Elimination. National Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Department of Health and Human Services Winter, 2006
[x] Program Evaluation 101 Contributed by Robin Puett, MP URL: http://www.musc.edu/vawprevention/research/programeval.shtml
[xi] American Evaluation Association URL: http://www.eval.org/evaluationdocuments/progeval.html
[xii] Prepared For: Alberta Council of Disability Services Nilima Sonpal-Valias The Vocational and Rehabilitation Research Institute P1 Measuring the Difference: An Outcome Evaluation Resource for the Disability Sector Module 1. Outcome Evaluation: Definition and Overview
[xiii] Ibid
xiv International Center for Alcohol Policies (ICAP) A Guide to Evaluating Prevention Programs URL:http://www.icap.org/PolicyTools/Toolkits/EvaluationToolkit/4DataAnalysisandInterpretation/tabid/446/Default.aspx
[xv] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services *Administration for Children and Families* The Manager's Guide to Evaluation, 2nd Edition 2010 URL http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/other_resrch/pm_guide_eval/reports/pmguide/chapter_2_pmguide.
[xvi] Ibid
[xvii] Ibid
[xviii] McNamara, Carter MBA, PhD, Authenticity Consulting LLC. Adapted from the *Field Guide to Nonprofit Program Design, Marketing and Evaluation* URL URL: http://managementhelp.org/evaluation/program-evaluation-guide.htm#anchor1581634
xix Community Action Resources for Inuit, Métis and First Nations: Evaluating 1998 - Health Canada URL:www.hc-sc.gc.ca/fniah-spnia/pubs/services/_adp-apd/evaluating-evaluation/ind
xx Project Evaluation Report Guide – Public Health Agency of Canada, Centre for Communicable Diseases and Infection Control HIV/AIDS Policy, Coordination and Programs Division
xxi Ibid