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Appendix 1 Literature Review – Poster

Evaluation that empowers – A review of evaluation approaches that empower community organisations

Lesley Greenaway MSc, University of Dundee, June 2010

Introduction

• How are individuals, organisations and communities empowered through participation in evaluation?
• Can evaluation be a tool for recognising the voices of individuals, organisations and communities? And what are they saying?
• What is the role and influence of the researcher within these participative approaches?

A changing context for evaluation

In the UK, evaluation is becoming a core area of skills development and interest in the public, voluntary and community sectors. Government agencies and funders are keen to learn about the outcomes and impact that their initiatives have on policy areas and target groups. Essentially they want to know: what difference does it make?

This question has more often been answered by trying to find ways to measure the value of activities that constitute the voluntary sector. A recent report by the Charities Evaluation Services (2008) highlights this focus on performance, but suggests the potential of a second focus: ‘... evaluation for learning and development’ to enable organisations and communities to gain value from their monitoring and evaluation at different levels of practice.

This shift takes us into the softer and qualitative territory of capturing experiences, understanding change and generating learning through evaluation. This also confronts us directly with the challenge of how to evaluate the complex and messy world of experience.

My research aim is to develop approaches to evaluation that validate and recognise experiences in ways that are relevant for individuals, for the organisations and for funders.

This perspective on evaluation involves an exploration of meaning and value of individual and group experience where:
• learning, discovery and development are a priority; and
• the roles of the evaluator and the evaluated become intertwined and mutually recognised for what they add to the evaluation mix.

Key Themes

Empowerment as a fundamental theme within community development is most strongly represented in the work of Friere and his exploration of power as individuals and communities become conscious and influential in their own destiny.

Empowerment through evaluation is evident in evaluation as a vehicle for the expression of voice, and capacity building of individuals, organisations and communities to engage with issues that are important to them.

Whose voices?

The voice of the powerless – Different voices have different goals. The voice of the powerless or those less likely to be heard, for example: those living in poverty influencing policy and decision makers; children and young people contributing to issues that affect them; mental health service users seeking to improve local health provision. There is evidence that where these groups become participants in the processes of evaluation they find a platform for their voice and they increase their skills. But there are difficulties where expectations may be raised, and where there is a danger of tokenism when the agenda of more powerful partners is leading.

The voices of practitioners and organisations – Less defined are the voices of practitioners and organisations. The practitioner’s voice has an important role influencing practice, policy development and decision making. Organisations develop their voice to become acknowledged as leaders in their field and to be influential in decision making. Practitioners and organisations are both engaged with the processes of development and change.

The researcher’s voice – Another distinct voice within a paradigm of empowerment is that of the researcher, because they are more likely to take on dual roles where they are seen by participants as active contributor and as objective overseer.

Evaluation that empowers

Bradley Cousins (1998) describes two strands of participative evaluation:
• Practical Participative Evaluation which is linked with the practical function and application of evaluation, a goal for practitioners and organisations; and
• Transformational Participative Evaluation which is linked with the social action and power relations associated with the voice of the powerless. These dimensions provide a useful framework for viewing models of evaluation: how they express different voices; and how they support capacity building.

Evaluation participants’ vision for evaluation that empowers: Evaluation is lean, robust, challenging and ...
... supports what’s going on and allows you to move forward.
... we can see the wood and the trees. We can see where we are trying to go and why we are doing it.
... there are multiple destinations, the evaluation process can be all things to all people and be of value to ourselves.

Future Research Questions

Future empirical research will flow from the literature review to include a study of:

The role of internal evaluation and continuing evaluation cycles for organisations: The Transformation Team – a study of evaluation in action in an interfaith community development organisation in Glasgow.

• Who are the stakeholder voices within the Transformation Team evaluation model and how are they expressed?
• What are the evaluation journeys for these different stakeholders?
• What is the role of relationships within internal evaluation projects? and in particular what is the role of an external facilitator and evaluator?
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## Appendix 3 Study 2 – Template 1 Indicators Map v2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Year 1 2006-07</th>
<th>Year 3 2008-09</th>
<th>Year 5 2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the purposes of evaluation? E.g. accountability, fundraising,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social change, learning and development, influencing policy, marketing,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the organisation aim to achieve accountability? E.g. through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>results, feedback from/to stakeholders, dialogue, other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is evaluation used in the organisation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who or what drives evaluation decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are stakeholders involved in the evaluation process? (see also Template 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whose voices are evident within the evaluation? Whose voice is loudest?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the organisation share evaluation results with stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is evaluation led and supported within the organisation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is evaluation capacity developed within organisation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the organisation critically reflect on its practices and services to inform organisational change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of the external evaluator? E.g. objective technician,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitator, trainer, supporter, critical friend etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4 Study 2 – Template 2 Stakeholder involvement map v2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Organisation Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service users</td>
<td>Organisation staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>Committee/Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners/staff</td>
<td>Internal Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders/Partners</td>
<td>External Evaluator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Which stakeholders are involved in which decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study years</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Service users</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>Practitioners/staff</th>
<th>Funders/Partners</th>
<th>Organisation Managers</th>
<th>Organisation staff</th>
<th>Committee/Board</th>
<th>Internal Evaluator</th>
<th>External Evaluator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Activities

- Agreeing evaluation aims
- Planning evaluation questions
- Designing evaluation methods
- Gathering evaluation data
- Responding to evaluation questions
- Analysing data
- Identifying key findings
- Report writing
- Planning future action
- Sharing and disseminating results and learning

*Evident and explicit* | *Not evident* | *Evident but implicit* | *Not applicable*
Appendix 5 Study 2 – Sample Documentary Analysis Data using Template 1

Template 1 Indicators Map (v2)

Documents Reviewed:
Year 1 Staff case study - Engagement and progression of local community activist/volunteer - Against the odds!
Year 3 Staff case study - Faithful Purpose Volunteering Strategy
Year 5 Staff case study - Dear Green Garden Place
A sample of 1 case study has been analysed for each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Year 1 2006-07</th>
<th>Year 3 2008-09</th>
<th>Year 5 2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the purposes of evaluation? E.g. accountability, fundraising, social change, learning and development, influencing policy, marketing, other</td>
<td>To record the story of an individual supported by the organisation and to highlight progression and change over time.</td>
<td>Accountability. Case study reports on quantitative and qualitative results of the volunteering project for the year 2008-09. There is evidence of the organisation identifying learning from the evaluation and areas for development.</td>
<td>To demonstrate the impact of this project on the lives of its users, and to explore the connection between the organisation's inputs and the beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the organisation aim to achieve accountability? E.g. through results, feedback from/to stakeholders, dialogue, other</td>
<td>By reflecting a detailed account of what can happen for individuals, and how they can find ways to move on. CS linked to org outcomes.</td>
<td>Results and feedback from stakeholders. Linking project outputs to outcomes.</td>
<td>Results. Through feedback from users, and linking to organisation impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is evaluation used in the organisation?</td>
<td>To learn about individual experience.</td>
<td>Case study is part of wider evaluation and is used to illustrate results/achievement of aims using quantitative data and feedback from one group of stakeholders. To learn from aspect of organisation practice.</td>
<td>To inform the organisation of the impact it is having on project users. To critically learn from organisation practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who or what drives evaluation decisions?</td>
<td>Lead staff working with the individual.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are stakeholders involved in the evaluation process? (see also Template 2)</td>
<td>With permission from the individual, a series of interviews were carried out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whose voices are evident within the evaluation? Whose voice is loudest?</td>
<td>Individual's story is captured and represented by staff member using CS guidance/template. The organisation's and the volunteers. Volunteers' voice is the loudest. The organisation's and the project users. Both voices equally strong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the organisation share evaluation results with stakeholders?</td>
<td>Permission to do the case study was gained from individual. Important aspect of individual CS is protecting the confidentiality and anonymity of the individual. CS shared internally with staff for learning purposes. Unclear from case study, but implicit in wider reporting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is evaluation led and supported within the organisation?</td>
<td>Lead staff supported by manager and external evaluator, based on CS guidance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is evaluation capacity developed within organisation?</td>
<td>CS guidance helps to develop a focussed and reflective approach to writing stories.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the organisation critically reflect on its practices and services to inform organisational change?</td>
<td>Staff team share findings and use to identify lessons for future developments. CST used by staff to structure critical reflection on evaluation findings, and sharing in team meetings with peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of the external evaluator? E.g. objective technician, facilitator, trainer, supporter, critical friend etc.</td>
<td>Supporting and guiding the CS process. Objective technician and facilitator of CST. Role in reporting final summary (implicit). Objective technician and facilitator of CST. Role in reporting final summary (implicit).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 6 Study 2 – Sample Documentary Analysis Data using Template 2

**Documents reviewed:**

- Year 1 Staff case study - Engagement and progression of local community activist/volunteer - Against the odds!
- Year 3 Staff case study - Faithful Purpose Volunteering Strategy
- Year 5 Staff case study - Dear Green Garden

### Which stakeholders are involved in which decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service users</td>
<td>Service users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners/staff</td>
<td>Practitioners/staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders/Partners</td>
<td>Funders/Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Managers</td>
<td>Organisation Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation staff</td>
<td>Organisation staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee/Board</td>
<td>Committee/Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Evaluator</td>
<td>Internal Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Evaluator</td>
<td>External Evaluator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Study years:

- Year 1
- Year 3
- Year 5

### Topics:

- Agreeing evaluation aims
- Planning evaluation questions
- Designing evaluation methods
- Gathering evaluation data
- Responding to evaluation questions
- Analysing data
- Identifying key findings
- Report writing
- Planning future action
- Sharing and disseminating results and learning

### Evidence:

- Evident and explicit
- Not evident
Appendix 7 Study 2 – Data collation table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETE Theoretical Model and Indicators</th>
<th>Evaluation Project in Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The evaluation-minded organisation ...</strong></td>
<td>Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1</strong> ... has a clearly defined purpose or purposes for evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions related to indicator: What are the purposes of evaluation? E.g. accountability, learning and improvement, influencing policy, marketing, other? How is evaluation used in the organisation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 2</strong> ... provides clear leadership and direction to support the evaluation purpose/s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions related to indicator: Who or what drives evaluation decisions? How is evaluation led/support within the organisation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 3</strong> ... is accountable to its stakeholders(^1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions related to indicator: How does the organisation aim to achieve accountability? E.g. through results, feedback from/to stakeholders, through dialogue, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 4</strong> ... involves stakeholders in the evaluation process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions related to indicator: How are stakeholders involved in the evaluation process? Which stakeholders are involved with which evaluation decisions? (ref Template 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 5</strong> ... uses evaluation as a way to strengthen stakeholder voices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions related to indicator: Whose voices are evident within an evaluation? Whose voice is loudest?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 6</strong> ... shares the findings from evaluations with its stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions related to indicator: How does the organisation share evaluation results with stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 7</strong> ... prioritises and supports evaluation as a key organisational skill area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions related to indicator: How is evaluation capacity developed and sustained within the organisation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 8</strong> ... supports reflective practice as a tool for informing organisational change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions related to indicator: How does the organisation critically reflect on practices/services to inform organisational change?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 9</strong> ... recognises the importance of an external element in the evaluation process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions related to indicator: What is the role of external evaluator? E.g. technician, facilitator, trainer,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Stakeholders can be external and internal to the organisation, and can include: service users, volunteers, practitioners, partners, funders, managers, staff, and boards and committees.
Appendix 8 Study 2 – Data analysis – second stage results

Key questions:
- How do evaluation practices match the ETE indicators?
- How participatory are these practices for different stakeholders?
- What is the story of specific the evaluation project – the case study?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETE Theoretical Model and Indicators</th>
<th>Evaluation Project in Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The evaluation-minded organisation...</strong></td>
<td><strong>Plans</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Indicator 1** | A clear range of purposes are planned for, developed and maintained:  
- Accountability and reporting to funders including quantitative measures.  
- Showing or providing evidence of impact of work for user groups.  
- For feedback and promotion of work to stakeholder groups including funders and service users.  
- As a way to have more strategic influence.  
- For learning and improvement.  
Evaluation is used as a way to: engage with different stakeholders; as a source of organisational learning and development; and to measure results and performance. | Process documents highlight the following evaluation purposes:  
- Accountability and reporting to funders including quantitative measures.  
- To learn from examples of organisational practice in action (case studies).  
- Staff learning and skills development.  
- A wider application of evaluation to team/organisation review questions: what do we do? Why? What next? | Reports highlights following purposes:  
- Accountability to main funder.  
This is based on specific indicators: activities; financial spending; match funding; target and type of service users; equal opps and geographical characteristics; good practice evidence of impact; partnership working; community engagement; service user feedback; monitoring and evaluation.  
- Reporting of results and achievements.  
- To engage with and learn directly from stakeholders (local people, communities and partners).  
- To create a set of case studies that reflect practice, impact and the voice of local participants.  
For example: An individual’s progress and change over time through support from the organisation. Results of a volunteering project and which identifies learning and future development. Impact on lives of users and connection between the organisation’s inputs and beneficiaries. |
**Indicator 2**

*Indicates the clear leadership and direction to support the evaluation purpose/s.*

**Questions related to indicator:**
- Who or what drives evaluation decisions?
- How is evaluation led and supported within the organisation?

| Initially there are clear links made between the evaluation project and the principles and values of the organisation namely: participation, inclusion and empowerment. Other driving factors included: the need to report to funders and achieving organisation outcomes and results. Over time other driving factors relating to implementation have become important including limited budget and staff resources. By year 5 there was an expectation of a greater role for an internal Evaluation Officer; reduced demands on staff team; and reduced external evaluator role (and costs). The evaluation project has been lead | Three organisation outcomes are used to drive gathering of evidence and results for reporting to funders and other stakeholders re performance. This implies funders are a key driver for evaluation decisions. An Outcomes and Indicators Templates or Evaluation Framework provides a tool to guide evidence collection. Individual staff lead implementation of case study work based on decisions made by team. A case study template and guidance notes provides a tool for staff to plan and develop specific practice exemplars as agreed within the team. Staff worked together as a team to devise the original evaluation framework and review progress each year. There is a critical awareness of the need to meet the | The requirement to report to funders. Results and achievements of organisational outcomes and indicators. This is linked to the need to sustain organisation funding. The organisation desire to know what impact it is having, and its aspiration to engage directly with local stakeholders. Managers/staff drive and shape decisions about evaluation process. E.g. organisation has developed an evaluation framework and a range of tools for collecting quantitative and qualitative evidence. Decisions about the services are made by org/managers/staff and are informed by evaluation findings. Success indicator of org highlighted in funding report as ‘leadership by senior management that supports a creative and dynamic approach’ (p20). |

Evaluation is used for:
- Assessing strengths and challenges.
- To gain an in depth view and feedback on how services work for the people they are designed for.
- Results of the evaluation are used to inform the development of services.
- Evaluation used as a vehicle for engaging with stakeholders.
- Case studies used to illustrate and critically learn from an aspect of practice.
- Reporting to main funder on results. Report is opportunity for org to provide evidence and examples of achievements and good practice. Securing future funding is a strong motivator for producing a competent report.
and supported continuously by the project co-ordinator. The lead implementation role was delegated to a senior staff member in year 3. The evaluation process has been facilitated and supported by an external evaluator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 3</th>
<th>... is accountable to its stakeholders².</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions related to indicator: How does the organisation aim to achieve accountability? E.g. through results, feedback from/to stakeholders, through dialogue, etc.</td>
<td>There is an emphasis on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Competent and robust reporting to funders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inclusion of and feedback to different stakeholder groups e.g. services users, communities and strategic partners.</td>
<td>Accountability is achieved by developing organisational competence in monitoring and evaluation. Staff aim for high quality reporting within the organisation and externally to funders. The importance of engagement with people, communities and partners is fundamental to the work of the organisation: “local feedback from local stakeholders is important for credibility”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Quantitative and qualitative evidence is collected to show results linked to outcomes. Each year evidence sources are consolidated to ensure ‘best’ data is collected.</td>
<td>Through articulating results and achievements in relation to funders’ requirements and organisation outcomes and indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Case studies are explicitly used to highlight voice of participants through their feedback and involvement in practice issues.</td>
<td>Competent reporting of results and achievements are supported with examples of services and projects delivered by team (p2-3). Community engagement across different groups with an emphasis on equalities (P6) is an important principle and measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 4</th>
<th>... involves stakeholders in the</th>
<th>Stakeholders are involved in gathering and contributing to evidence through questionnaires, stakeholder surveys, event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is an aspiration that different stakeholder groups are involved in different evaluation activities. The</td>
<td>Through use of a stakeholder survey annually. In year 1, SHs involved at 2 levels – as respondents to evaluation questions and as part of a small community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Stakeholders can be external and internal to the organisation, and can include: service users, volunteers, practitioners, partners, funders, managers, staff, and boards and committees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 5</th>
<th>... uses evaluation as a way to strengthen stakeholder voices.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions related to indicator:</td>
<td>Whose voices are evident within an evaluation? Whose voice is loudest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is an emphasis on reflecting the ‘voice’ of service users in the form of individual participants and communities that the project supports. But it is difficult to define and reflect ‘community’ voice represented in feedback from a sample of individuals. Other voices include the organisation and staff, but these are implicit voices used to convey particular messages and/or learning through for example the staff case studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voice of people and communities are fundamental in shaping support that meets local needs. Organisation/staff voice is seen as facilitating the process of giving voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes Template provides a framework for organisational reporting or voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Study Template provides a framework for highlighting the voice of the ‘people’ in the practice context of the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predominantly the voice of individuals, communities and projects using the organisation’s services. This is especially evident within the case studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Also evident is the voice of the organisation as it records and reports its results and achievements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report to funders is written through the voice of the organisation and highlights the important role of individuals, communities and strategic partners, having a voice in a) highlighting issues and concerns and needs and b) providing feedback to organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 6</td>
<td>... shares the findings from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is an expectation of informal feedback to stakeholders, and formal feedback to funders through official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Feedback and consultation with local people to help inform and shape the work to fit with local needs and aspirations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A wider stakeholder event was used for wider dissemination of evaluation findings and for further consultation about future priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 7</td>
<td>... prioritises and supports evaluation as a key organisational skill area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions related to indicator: How is evaluation capacity developed and sustained within the organisation?</td>
<td>There is an emphasis on the involvement of staff in hands on evaluation practice. Their role is developed through workshops and skills development in for example how to gather stakeholder feedback, and developing case studies as exemplars of their work. By yr3, a member of staff is given role of Evaluation Officer to lead process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the Outcomes Template there is implied sharing/reporting to funders and committee. Staff highlight the importance of competent reporting to funders “Evaluation process is recognised as robust and trustworthy”. The case study process has developed over time to include explicit sharing within the staff team and highlighting ways to disseminate findings to wider audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an implicit assumption that results are shared with stakeholders and reported to funders. This is explicit in the funders report where the organisation is responding directly to funders questions. An aspect of the case study that limits sharing is the need to protect the confidentiality of individuals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 8</th>
<th>... supports reflective practice as a tool for informing organisational change.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions related to indicator: How does the organisation critically reflect on its practices and services to inform organisational change?</td>
<td>Organisation plans regular (annual) review sessions to learn from evaluation feedback and to improve practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular staff review activities asking critical questions and reviewing against targets. “Analysing distance or journey travelled towards targets and expectations”. Evaluation recommendations inform follow up actions. Strategic reviews of organisation used to revisit vision, mission and values, and to inform future planning. Participants included from wider stakeholder groups e.g. members of parent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External assessment of achievements, results strengths and gaps re outcomes is based on monitoring and evaluation evidence collected over year. User feedback from stakeholders and evaluation used to inform learning and future organisational developments. Case study used by staff to critically reflect on findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 9

... recognises the importance of an external element in the evaluation process.

| Questions related to indicator: | Provides technical support and guidance and facilitates evaluation process through yearly cycles.

“... seen as bringing credibility to evaluation process, someone from outside the organisation who is able to give different insights, see development patterns, and ask questions of the organisation. Has an explicit role in preparing reports.” | External assessor of evaluation evidence and reporting on achievements, strengths and gaps.

To facilitate, guide and support the staff in planned evaluation processes e.g. structuring case study.

Objective technician – guided by staff to carry out stakeholder survey, assess findings and complete reports. |
Appendix 9 Study 2 Focus group topic guide

Working Title of Research: Exploring and refining a model for Evaluation based on evaluation practice in action.

1 Introduction
Background to the study, the model, indicators, and methodology, Overview of session, Recording and permissions

2 Main Topics and Questions

Topic 1 About the Evaluation Model and Indicators
How relevant is the model and Indicators, and is there shared meaning and understanding? How well does the Model work for organisations?

Topic 2 Participation and evaluation
What does participation mean to you? How is this meaning of participation applied to evaluation in this organisation? Is participation the same as involvement?

Topic 3 Leadership of Evaluation
What are the leadership roles of the different evaluation players in the organisation?

Topic 4 The external evaluator role
Is externality or the external evaluator role the same throughout an evaluation project? Or, Is it a changing role? If so, what is the nature of the change? How else could externality be achieved?

Topic 5 The Role of planing, processes and reporting and dissemination
What are formal and informal evaluation processes at different stages? How are these processes maintained over time? How are these processes passed on when new staff join the team?

Topic 6: Sustainability of Evaluation Practice in Organisations
What has happened (evaluation-wise) during the past year? How might this evaluation model be useful to this organisation in the future? What would you highlight as the most important habits of the evaluation-minded organisation?

3 Conclusion
Finally, thinking about all of our discussions. If you were asked to guide another organisation in its approach to evaluation:

- What would you highlight as the most important habits of the evaluation-minded organisation?
Appendix 10 Study 2 Participant information sheet

Working Title of Research: Exploring and refining a model for evaluation based on evaluation practice in action.

INVITATION TO TAKE PART IN A RESEARCH STUDY – The Transformation Team and its staff are being asked to take part in a research study, which aims to explore, test and refine a model for evaluation, against the evaluation experience and practices in your evaluation project. The research is being carried out by Lesley Greenaway as part of her Doctoral studies, under the supervision of Professor Divya Jindal-Snape and Dr Gaye Manwaring.

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH STUDY – This study will enable theory and practice to interact by exploring how a theoretical model of evaluation informs practice, and how practice informs the theoretical model. In this way a refined model will be developed that is based on theory and practice. Key questions that the study will explore are:

- How do evaluation practices match the proposed theoretical model?
- How participatory are these practices for different stakeholders?

The study will examine the experiences of one evaluation project (the Transformation Team) as a case study, drawing on data from pre-existing documents and from discussion with staff. Participation in this research might benefit other organisations involved in developing evaluation projects in the future.

TIME COMMITMENT – The study will involve a discussion session with staff which will last approximately 2 hours. An audio recording of the discussion will be made for transcription purposes. This will be stored securely and deleted on completion of the research.

ACCESS TO ORGANISATION DOCUMENTS – Access to organisation documents will be negotiated with you in advance. The final decision about which documents to include in the study will be made by you. Documents that you supply for this study will be stored securely and will be deleted on completion of the study. All documents will be treated with confidence and only used for the purposes of the study.

TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION – You may decide to stop being a part of the research study at any time without explanation and without negative consequence.

RISKS – There are no known risks for you in this study.

COST, REIMBURSEMENT AND COMPENSATION – Your participation in this study is voluntary. Lesley Greenaway (the researcher) will provide a feedback session on the findings of this study when it is completed.

CONFIDENTIALITY/ANONYMITY – The data collected will not contain any personal information about individual staff taking part, and no one will link the data provided to any individual. Any published results from this study will not link information to individual participants, and your organisation will not be named as the participating case study. The case study will be presented in a generic way to preserve the anonymity of the organisation and the confidentiality of the staff participants.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THIS RESEARCH STUDY – Please contact Lesley Greenaway at L.Z.Greenaway@dundee.ac.uk
Appendix 11 Study 2 Participant consent form

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Working Title of Research: Exploring and refining a model for evaluation based on evaluation practice in action.

This research study aims to explore, test and refine a model and indicators for evaluation against the evaluation experience and practices in your evaluation project. It will enable theory and practice to interact by exploring how the theoretical model informs practice, and how practice informs the theoretical model. In this way a refined model will be developed that is based on theory and practice.

Key questions that the study will explore are:
- How do evaluation practices match the proposed theoretical model?
- How participatory are these practices for different stakeholders?

The study will examine the experiences of the Transformation Team evaluation project as a case study, drawing on data from pre-existing documents and from discussion with staff to track their evaluation journey over 5 years. Participation in this research might benefit other organisations involved in developing evaluation projects in the future.

By signing below you are agreeing that you have read and understood the Participant Information Sheet and that you agree to take part in this research study.

I agree to the audio recording of the discussion. YES/NO (please delete as appropriate)

_________________________________
Printed name of participant

_________________________________  ________________ _
Participant’s signature     Date

__Lesley Greenaway ________________
Printed name of person obtaining consent

_________________________________
Signature of person obtaining consent
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School of Psychology

University of Dundee Research Ethics Committee

Lesley Greenaway,
School of Education, Social Work and Community
Education, University of Dundee,
Nethergate,
Dundee,
DD1 4HN.

7 December 2011

Dear Ms Greenaway,

Application Number: UREC 11056

Title: Exploring and refining a model and indicators for evaluation that
empowers based on evaluation practice in action.

Your application has been reviewed by the University Research Ethics Committee,
and there are no ethical concerns with the proposed research. I am pleased to
confirm that the above application has now been approved.

You submitted the following documents:

1. Ethics Application Module 2 studies
2. Microsoft Outlook - Memo Style
3. Consent form
4. Draft Interview Questions
5. Participant Information Sheet v3

Yours sincerely,

Dr Peter Willatts
Chair, University of Dundee Research Ethics Committee
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EVALUATION THAT EMPOWERS – A MODEL FOR GENERATING EVALUATION-MINDED ORGANISATIONS

Lesley Greenaway MSc, University of Dundee, August 2013

BACKGROUND AND AIMS
This research grew out of a concern that the dominant discourse in the UK was shaping how evaluation is defined and practised. It is a discourse that values performance, results and accountability (Ellis, 2008). In this study, ‘Evaluation that Empowers’ (EtE) tells a different story about evaluation and recognises other voices in the evaluation mix. This study aims to explore, design, test and refine the EtE model against evaluation experience and practices in organisations.

CASE STUDY – THE ORGANISATION’S STORY
The organisation ... works in partnership with local people and communities ... supports them to gain the skills and confidence to carry out local projects ... is committed to developing evaluation and to find out what difference they make. Key factors influencing evaluation design:
- Multiple funders, lots of targets, demands for impact
- Competitive funding environment
- Small staff team
- A desire and value base for involving their stakeholders

Staff reflections
“At the start it (doing evaluation) felt – oh no, gut wrenching, more to do, wearisome, but it started to feel ok, this is worthwhile, to feeling confident and felt comfortable to do it on our own. We have confidence in the process and in our skills.”

“We can see the wood and the trees. We can see where we are trying to go and why we are doing it.”

“It’s the way of asking us questions and not giving answers – it’s been hugely beneficial for us because it gets us thinking about it for ourselves.”

Post script – What happened next?
1. They reviewed existing evaluation tools
2. They participated in an external audit
3. They secured further funding
4. They surveyed groups to assess the value of current resources and services.
5. They embedded evaluative thinking strategically and on a day to day level.

But ... the organisation is very fragile, needing to constantly balance the needs of individuals and communities within the external policy and funding environment.

FINDINGS 1 – DEFINING EVALUATION-MINDEDNESS
Evaluation-minded is used to convey a deep and sustainable shift in organisational practice. The EtE model provides a framework to guide evaluation practices that are:

Participatory where stakeholders contribute to important evaluative decisions and activities
Empowering when increased evaluation skills and confidence lead to ownership, independence and increased capacity
Sustainable when processes of critical review are continually used to inform change and decision making
Embedded when evaluative thinking becomes part of the day to day practices of an organisation.

FINDINGS 2 – ETE THEMES AND INDICATORS

*Example: Theme – Externality. Indicators – external element in evaluation process, such as external evaluator, developing peer review, using a critical friend.

References
Appendix 14 Study 3 – Summary of expert interview

Topic A Discussion about current evaluation practice and policy trends in Scotland:

○ From your experience, what are the current evaluation trends in Scotland?

Higher level policy initiatives: The Christie Commission, reform of public services, focus on prevention and assets based approaches provide a context for public sector and government officials to think differently about evaluation. It validates the concept of self-evaluation, especially relevant for the voluntary sector, as consistent with an assets based approach where people do things for themselves and generate their own evidence.

Also, evaluating prevention is difficult. Governments are looking for answers to difficult questions especially about which and how different preventative measures work. Some of these answers lie in the practices of voluntary sector organisations (VSOs) in the field.

There has also been a shift from large scale programme level evaluations commissioned during the Labour Government era, towards a more mixed approach where evaluations are focussed and gather evidence from different sources.

Also, SM suggests that VSOs are more comfortable with the language of outcomes, evaluating against outcomes and talking about the difference they are making.

○ What policy drivers are influencing evaluation practice for organisations at an operational level?

For most VSOs Evaluation is still driven by funders' demands and their language of outcomes and impact. Some parts of the voluntary sector are more contract oriented but this too relates to outcomes.

Regulation is also seen as a driver, but this is more related to quality standards in terms of for example the Care Commission or HMI. This aspect does however get people thinking more seriously about the voice of service users.

A positive driver is that organisations are seeing the benefit of doing evaluation e.g. learning more about their organisation. “More organisations are seeing how to embed evaluation in their day to day practice and use it as a tool for staff development.” A caveat to this is that ESS works with the willing (3-400 organisations a year) which may not be representative of VSOs in Scotland. But it is a substantial group and feedback from other agencies suggest a significant shift in organisational evaluation practices.

○ What challenges do these organisations/individuals face?

The continuing challenge of skills development – clarifying what to evaluate, but also data storage and analysis skills.

The difference between analysis and reporting – “once you have a good analysis of what you have done and the difference you have made, how do you explain and report it in 200 words?”
The internal climate of an organisation towards evaluation, and its commitment and willingness to act on the findings.

SM suggests that this can be more challenging within larger organisations where leadership at the top of the organisation may have different priorities from the practical evaluation activity on the ground.

SM did describe an example where a large organisation had embraced evaluation in a strong and developmental way – Young Scot. He felt that key factors in their success were an internal champions’ group lead by a senior manager who could influence organisational decisions and who could prioritise evaluation. Also, their evaluation initiative was very timely as they were developing a new strategic plan and also new project management systems.

In smaller organisations, SM commented that establishing evaluation was easier in that it is about evaluation action on the ground, but that it relies on the people who ‘get it’ and the knowledge that one person holds. Their challenge is what happens when that person leaves?

○ **What are the strengths of the sector to tackle these challenges?**

The skill of understanding and getting it (evaluation) on the ground is a real strength. Also a lot of people who come to work in the voluntary sector come with participatory skills that are about working with people, and the youth work sector for example are very creative in how they work.

○ **What are the current skills/expertise gaps**

Analysis and reporting and understanding what the people you are reporting to are looking for whether they are a funder or policy maker.

There is also a lack of confidence on the part of organisations when it comes to relating to funders and ensuring that they are being asked the right questions and for the right data.
Appendix 15Study 4a – The EtE Conversation Toolkit (v1)

Enclosed in flap in back cover.
Appendix 16 Study 4a Focus group participants email communication

Dear

XXX passed me your details as someone who may be willing to help with my research by participating in a focus group.

My research study is called - Evaluation that empowers (EtE), and explores a framework for developing evaluation-mindedness. This is defined as the capacity for an organisation to create a deep and sustainable change in how it thinks about and embeds evaluation practices into its day to day actions. The EtE ‘toolkit’ has been developed from my previous research – a literature review and a case study. I am now trying to establish: how well the model works in different organisational settings; what are its limitations? and what revisions would make the model more universally relevant? The research is being carried out as part of my doctoral studies at the University of Dundee, under the supervision of Professor Divya Jindal-Snape and Dr Gaye Manwaring.

The focus group will involve: general group discussion, review of online materials, and trying out an evaluative conversation activity.

Attached is a more detailed Participant Information Sheet.

The focus group will involve approx. 6 people, will last about 2 hours and will include light refreshments.

I am suggesting two possible dates:

Thursday 6 February OR Friday 7 February 2014 10.30-12.30

Please could you let me know if you are interested in being involved and if these dates are suitable or get in touch if you have any questions.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

L

Lesley Greenaway MSc

Evaluation and Professional Development Services
- developing customised evaluation projects
- building individual and organisational evaluation capacity

Visit my website at www.evaluationservices.co.uk
Appendix 17 Study 4a Focus group topic guide

Focus Group – Topic Guide

The purpose of the focus group is:

a. To collect participant views on current practice and policy issues for evaluation
b. To pilot test and evaluate the draft EtE Toolkit
c. To ascertain the potential usefulness of the EtE Toolkit in their settings.

• Introduction to research topic, background and aims, informed consent. (10 mins)
  Participant introduction – what are your experiences and interests in evaluation?

1. Discussion about their views on current evaluation practice and policy issues: (20 mins)
   o From your experience, what are the current evaluation trends in Scotland?
   o What policy drivers are influencing evaluation practice?
   o What challenges do you /your organisations face?
   o What are the strengths to tackle these challenges?
   o What are the current skills/expertise gaps?

2. EtE website: (30 mins)
   a. Introduce the EtE website
   b. Participants work individually/in pairs to explore the website and discuss:
      i. What did you like?
      ii. What didn’t you like?
      iii. What changes would you suggest?
   c. Whole group feedback – record points

3. Evaluative conversation (30 mins)
   a. Introduce conversation tool.
   b. Whole group explore a sample of questions.
   c. Discuss and record:
      i. What worked?
      ii. What didn’t work?
      iii. What changes would you suggest?

4. Whole group discussion: (20 mins)
   a. Are the ideas promoted within the model meaningful?
   b. Which individuals/groups/organisations are they relevant to?
   c. What are the limitations?

• What next? (10 mins)
   o Next stages in research
   o Would you like to be kept informed?
   o Thanks
Appendix 18 Study 4a Participant information sheet

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET (FOCUS GROUP)

Working Title: Research and development of Evaluation that Empowers (ETE) toolkit

You are invited to take part in a research study which aims to develop and pilot a ‘toolkit’ of materials to support the Evaluation that Empowers (ETE) Model. The ‘toolkit’ will be developed by building on the findings from previous research – literature review and an initial empirical study. The overall questions that the study will explore are:

- How well does the model work in different organisational settings?
- Are the ideas promoted within the model meaningful in these settings?
- What are the limitations?
- Are there revisions that need to be made to make the model more universally relevant?
- How does the ETE model and tool align with current evaluation theory, policy and practice?
- What next?

The research is being carried out by Lesley Greenaway as part of her Doctoral studies, under the supervision of Professor Divya Jindal-Snape and Dr Gaye Manwaring. Participation in this research may contribute to understanding and evaluation practices for organisations and professionals in the future.

WHAT’S INVOLVED FOR YOU AS A PARTICIPANT IN THE FOCUS GROUP

The study will involve a focus group that will last approximately 2 hours.

The aim of the focus group is

a) To pilot test and evaluate the draft ETE Toolkit,
b) To collect participant views on current practice and policy issues for evaluation, and
c) To ascertain the potential usefulness of the ETE Toolkit in their settings.

An audio recording of the discussion will be made for transcription purposes. This will be stored securely and deleted on completion of the research.

TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION

You may decide to stop being a part of the research study at any time without explanation and without negative consequence. There are no known risks for you in this study.

COST, REIMBURSEMENT AND COMPENSATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary. Lesley Greenaway (the researcher) will provide feedback on the findings of this study when it is completed.

CONFIDENTIALITY/ANONYMITY

The data collected will not contain any personal information about the individuals taking part. The study will be presented in a generic way to preserve the anonymity of organisations and the confidentiality of participants. Any published results from the study will acknowledge the contribution of your organisation.

FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THIS RESEARCH STUDY
Lesley Greenaway will be glad to answer your questions about this study at any time. You may contact her at L.Z.Greenaway@dundee.ac.uk School Of Education, Social Work and Community Education, University of Dundee, Dundee DD1 4HN

Appendix 19 Study 4a Participant consent form

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Working Title: Research and development of Evaluation that Empowers (ETE) toolkit

This research study aims to develop and pilot a ‘toolkit’ of materials to support the Evaluation that Empowers (ETE) Model. The ‘toolkit’ will be developed by building on the findings from previous research – literature review and an initial empirical study. The overall questions that the study will explore are:

- How well does the model work in different organisational settings?
- Are the ideas promoted within the model meaningful in these settings?
- What are the limitations?
- Are there revisions that need to be made to make the model more universally relevant?
- How does the ETE model and tool align with current evaluation theory, policy and practice?
- What next?

The research is being carried out by Lesley Greenaway as part of her Doctoral studies, under the supervision of Professor Divya Jindal-Snape and Dr Gaye Manwaring.

By signing below you are agreeing that you have read and understood the Participant Information Sheet, that you are aware that you can withdraw from this study at any time, and that you agree to take part in this research study.

I agree to the audio recording of the discussion, and I understand that any recordings made will be stored securely and destroyed on completion of the research.

YES/NO (please delete as appropriate)

_________________________________
Printed name of participant

_________________________________  ________________ _
Participant’s signature     Date

__Lesley Greenaway _________________

Printed name of person obtaining consent
Appendix 20 Study 4a Acknowledgement of ethics approval

From: Astrid Schloerscheidt
Sent: 21 August 2013 10:03
To: Lesley Greenaway
Cc: Astrid Schloerscheidt; Elizabeth Evans
Subject: Re: UREC 13099 - approved

Dear Lesley,

Apologies for the delay in getting back to you and many thanks for making the requested amendments. Your study is approved.

Best,

Astrid
Dr. Astrid Schloerscheidt
Chair, University of Dundee Research Ethics Committee

On 9 Aug 2013, at 10:03, Lesley Greenaway wrote:

Dear Astrid

I have made the changes to my UREC application as you have requested. Attached is the revised protocol which includes amended text (in red) and copy of email invitation to participate.
I hope this is satisfactory and I look forward to hearing from you further.

Lesley Greenaway

From: Astrid Schloerscheidt
Sent: 06 August 2013 19:32
To: Lesley Greenaway
Cc: Astrid Schloerscheidt
Subject: UREC 13099

Dear Lesley,

I have now had a chance to review your ethics application. There are no ethical concerns regarding your study. However, I would need to obtain a little more detail on the recruitment of the focus group participants.

How will you contact the potential participants? If it is by email, I would need to see the content of this email. Also, could you please provide information on how the participants can indicate interest to participate. Could you please add this information to the study protocol.

You can send the amended document to me directly by email. I should then hopefully be in a position to approve your study soonest. Best regards,
Astrid, Dr. Astrid Schloerscheidt, Chair, University of Dundee Research Ethics Committee, Ethics Application REVISED - Lesley Greenaway.doc>

The University of Dundee is a registered Scottish Charity, No: SC015096

**Appendix 21 Study 4a – The EtE Conversation Toolkit (v2)**

Included in flap of back cover.
Appendix 22 Study 4b Email invitation to participate

Working title: Evaluation that Empowers (ETE) in action

Dear ……
I would like to invite your organisation to take part in a research study which aims to pilot the Evaluation that Empowers (EtE) Model and tools. The purposes of the pilot are:
- To explore how well the model and tools work in different organisational settings.
- To identify the different impacts the EtE model has on organisational and individual evaluation practice from the perspective of each of the pilot organisations.
- To understand how EtE contributes to current evaluation discourse.

This research study is being carried out as part of my doctoral studies at the University of Dundee, under the supervision of Professor Divya Jindal-Snape and Dr Gaye Manwaring.

What is EtE?
EtE is a framework for creating evaluation-mindedness, where evaluation practices and thinking become normal day to day actions for organisations. This culture shift enables organisations to apply processes of critical review, to embrace change in an open and collaborative way, and to develop better services. The EtE framework is designed to guide evaluation practices that are: participatory, empowering, sustainable and embedded.

You can find out more about EtE by visiting www.evaluationthatempowers.com

What will the study involve?
Organisations will be asked to complete a critical review of evaluation practice using the EtE diagnostic discussion tool (a 2 hour structured conversation). This tool helps the organisation to identify actions for improving evaluation practice. The pilot study will follow the use of the EtE tools and resulting change actions over a period of about 3-4 months.

Each organisation will need to identify a key contact person who is the main point of contact with the researcher. This needs to be someone who can facilitate the diagnostic discussion and can support ongoing evaluation actions within the organisation.

During the pilot period there are three planned contact points with the researcher: at the start to introduce the process, after the diagnostic discussion, and at the end of the pilot period to review actions and results from using EtE. Each contact point will involve an interview (1 hour) with the identified contact person and at the end of the pilot period a focus group for other staff/volunteers involved (2 hours) will be planned.

What are the benefits to me/my organisation from participating in this study?
This is an opportunity for free access to evaluation resources to critically review and improve your current evaluation practice. At the end of the study you will receive a case study report reflecting your organisation’s participation and results from using EtE.

Please contact me if you have any questions and/or to confirm your interest to participate. I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely
Lesley Greenaway
Appendix 23 Study 4b Participant information sheet

Working Title: Evaluation that Empowers (ETE) in action

Research Information Sheet
Your organisation is invited to take part in a research study which aims to pilot the Evaluation that Empowers (EtE) Model and tools. The purposes of the pilot are:
- To explore how well the model and tools work in different organisational settings.
- To identify the different impacts the EtE model has on organisational and individual evaluation practice from the perspective of each of the pilot organisations.
- To understand how EtE contributes to current evaluation discourse.

The research is being carried out by Lesley Greenaway as part of her Doctoral studies, under the supervision of Professor Divya Jindal-Snape and Dr Gaye Manwaring. Participation in this research may contribute to understanding and evaluation practices for organisations and professionals in the future.

What is EtE?
EtE is a framework for creating evaluation-mindedness, where evaluative practices and thinking become normal day to day actions for organisations. This culture shift enables organisations to apply processes of critical review, to embrace change in an open and collaborative way, and to develop better services. The EtE framework is designed to guide evaluation practices that are: participatory, empowering, sustainable and embedded.

You can find out more about EtE by visiting www.evaluationthatempowers.com

What’s involved for you/your organisation as a participant in this study?
Organisations will be asked to complete a critical review of evaluation practice using the EtE diagnostic discussion tool. This tool helps the organisation to identify actions for improving evaluation practice. The pilot study will follow the use of the EtE tools and resulting change actions over a period of about 3-4 months.

Each organisation will need to identify a key contact person who is the main point of contact with the researcher. This needs to be someone who can facilitate the diagnostic discussion and can support ongoing evaluation actions within the organisation.

During the pilot period there are three planned contact points with the researcher: at the start to introduce the process, after the diagnostic discussion, and at the end of the pilot period to review actions and results from using EtE. Each contact point will involve an interview with the identified contact person and at the end of the pilot period a focus group will be planned.

An audio recording of the discussions will be made for transcription purposes. This will be stored securely and deleted on completion of the research.

Time Frame
I am aiming to complete the practical data gathering for this project by December. An outline timetable is as follows:
June/July Engage participating organisation/s and hold first contact meeting.
August/Sept  Organisation completes the EtE conversation and hold second contact meeting.
Sept/Oct/Nov  Organisation works on identified actions
Nov/Dec  Final contact meeting 3 and focus group.

**Termination of participation**
You may decide to stop being a part of the research study at any time without explanation and without negative consequence. There are no known risks for you in this study.

**Cost, reimbursement and compensation**
Your participation in this study is voluntary. This is an opportunity for free access to evaluation resources to critically review and improve your current practice. At the end of the study the researcher (Lesley Greenaway) will provide feedback on the findings and you will receive a case study report reflecting your organisation’s participation and results from using EtE.

**Confidentiality**
The data collected will not contain any personal information about the individuals taking part. On completion of the study, the researcher will check the content of the reported data with you, and you will have an opportunity to comment and/or make any factual corrections. You will be asked to confirm that you are happy with how you/your organisation are represented prior to using the data collected. Any published results from this study will acknowledge your organisation as contributing to this study.

**Further information about this research study**
Lesley Greenaway will be glad to answer your questions about this study. You may contact her at [L.Z.Greenaway@dundee.ac.uk](mailto:L.Z.Greenaway@dundee.ac.uk) School Of Education, Social Work and Community Education, University of Dundee, Dundee DD1 4HN
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Informed Consent – Organisation

Working Title: Evaluation that Empowers (EtE) in action
This research study aims to pilot the Evaluation that Empowers (EtE) Model and tools. The purposes of the pilot are:
- To explore how well the model and tools work in different organisational settings.
- To identify the different impacts the EtE model has on organisational and individual evaluation practice from the perspective of each of the pilot organisations.
- To understand how EtE contributes to current evaluation discourse.

What is EtE?
EtE is a framework for creating evaluation-mindedness, where evaluative practices and thinking become normal day to day actions for organisations. This culture shift enables organisations to apply processes of critical review, to embrace change in an open and collaborative way, and to develop better services. The EtE framework is designed to guide evaluation practices that are: participatory, empowering, sustainable and embedded.

You can find out more about EtE by visiting www.evaluationthatempowers.com

The research is being carried out by Lesley Greenaway as part of her Doctoral studies, under the supervision of Professor Divya Jindal-Snape and Dr Gaye Manwaring.

By signing below you are agreeing that you have read and understood the Participant Information Sheet, that you are aware that you can withdraw from this study at any time, and that you agree to take part in this research study.

Consent
I/we agree to the audio recording of the discussion, and understand that any recordings made will be stored securely and destroyed on completion of the research.  YES NO

I/we agree to participate in this research study and to meet the requirements as described. The identified contact person for this organisation is:

Name of organisation ______________________________

_________________________________ ________________ _

Authorised signature Date

Printed name of person obtaining consent ___Lesley Greenaway ____
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The purpose of this introduction is:
- to introduce the pilot process,
- to record initial organisation information,
- to introduce the EtE website and tools
- to respond to any questions.

• Introduction to research topic and pilot process (LG)

• Organisation information:
  - What does your organisation do? What are it’s aims and objectives?
  - What is the size of your organisation? E.g. no’s of employees, volunteers, members/users/customers as appropriate.
  - What is your organisations experience of evaluation?
  - What is your experience of evaluation?
  - What motivates you/your organisation to be involved with this pilot study?

• Introduction to the EtE website and tools
  - Introduce diagnostic conversation tool and ‘how to facilitate’ guide.
  - How do you envisage the EtE conversation being used in your organisation?
  - How to record your conversation.
  - Any questions?

• Future planning: Agree a date for the next contact meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What does your organisation do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are it’s aims and objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the size of your organisation? E.g. no’s of employees, volunteers, members/users/customers as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is your organisation’s experience of evaluation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What motivates you/your organisation to be involved with this pilot study?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your focus/department/grouping for this project?

Lesley Greenaway
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you envisage the diagnostic conversation being used in your organisation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What questions did they raise?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My notes from meeting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any variables that I need to be aware of?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The purpose of this interview is:
- to review the EtE conversation,
- to record any change actions resulting from the discussion
- to agree a timetable for the organisation’s activities and a completion date when the researcher will return for the final contact interview and focus group.

Please bring any completed materials along with you e.g. a completed Self-assessment record, notes of the meeting, action plan, etc.

- Update on the results of the EtE conversation

Firstly, tell me about the conversation:
- How did you organise the discussion?
- Who was involved?
- What was interesting?
- What was challenging?
- Were there any surprises?

Consider the completed self-assessment record
- Which of the EtE themes became the focus of the discussion?
- Was there a consensus?
- Did you identify any areas for improvement?
- How are you planning to take forward any actions or ideas from the conversation?
- Is there a completed Action Plan?

- Review of how the EtE conversation tool worked for organisation
  - Did using EtE make a difference for your group?
    - This could mean:
      There was more efficient discussion
      There was more effective discussion
      There was more energy in the group
      There was more participation
      People in the group felt more empowered
      High quality data was generated
      There was a culture shock or change
      There was a conflict that was resolved/ not resolved
      There was a growing evaluation-mindedness
      Other
  - Why did you feel that EtE made the difference that it did?
  - Why do you think it worked as well as it did? OR why do you think it didn’t work?

- What next?
  - Agree a date for the final contact meeting.
  - Agree a date for the focus group.
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The purpose of this interview is to reflect on what has happened (evaluatively) for individuals and the organisation/group following the EtE conversation and any resulting actions.

Specifically:
- What has happened (evaluation-wise) since we last met?
- What has been the progress with the evaluation change actions that you planned?
- What have you achieved?
- What have been the challenges?
- How has the EtE process influenced these results?

More generally:
- What difference has it made to your evaluation practice?
- What difference has it made to the organisation’s evaluation practice?
- What next for evaluation in this organisation?

As a result of this pilot, to what extent do you feel that your group/organisation is:
- More motivated to learn through evaluation
- More motivated to learn from evaluation
- More able to apply processes of critical review
- More able to respond to changing needs and contexts
- More able to develop informed and better services

Would you use EtE again and/or recommend it to other organisations and Why?

What makes EtE distinct?
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The purpose of the focus group is to review from the perspective of a wider group of participants involved: what difference did EtE make and how well did it work?

- **Introductions**
  - How have you been involved with the EtE pilot?
  - The EtE conversation/ actions resulting from that conversation/other

- **Progress and achievements**
  - What has been the progress with the evaluation change actions that you planned?
  - What have you achieved?
  - What have been the challenges?
  - How has being involved with the EtE process influenced these results?

- **How the EtE conversation tool worked for individuals/organisation**
  - Did using EtE make a difference for your group?
  - This could mean:
    - There was more efficient discussion
    - There was more effective discussion
    - There was more energy in the group
    - There was more participation
    - People in the group felt more empowered
    - High quality data was generated
    - There was a culture shock or change
    - There was a conflict that was resolved/ not resolved
    - There was a growing evaluation-mindedness/Other
  - Why did you feel that EtE made the difference that it did?
  - Why do you think it worked as well as it did? OR why do you think it didn’t work?

- **Evaluation practice**
  - Did EtE help you/your organisation to focus on evaluation improvements?
  - What difference/improvements has it made to your evaluation practice?
  - What difference/improvements has it made to the organisation’s evaluation practice?
  - What next for evaluation in this organisation?
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- S1 is the Acting Team Manager and focus of analysis
- S2 in bold is the interviewer
- S3 is the Manager

Context – this is a review of what happened as a result of one team carrying out a self-directed critical review of their evaluation practices using my research tool Evaluation that Empowers (EtE) which they are field testing as part of my research.
This sample text is based on their responses to question 1: Tell me about the EtE conversation – How did you organise the discussion, who was involved, what was interesting, what was challenging, and were there any surprises?

S1: As a result of that initial chat, other things have happened.
S2: Okay, right.
S1: That’s going to now lead to be able to able to action plan. Does that make sense?
S2: Yes, no, that’s...
S3: No, I think that makes sense.
S1: I’ve probably done stuff that should have been in the action plan but just because the way I’ve been doing, I’ve not done it as an actual... I’ve done paperwork, I can give you copies and things about what’s been happening, but it was a result of outcomes from the conversation that I took and what went on and... I don’t know if you want me telling you what that’s about.
S2: So just say a bit about how...
S1: When we did the conversation, me and A were facilitating, I didn’t actually know the staff because we came together as the student advice centre as one and my role as acting manager, I had literally just started that, actually, so it was a great opportunity for me to find out what people’s knowledge really was of evaluation, because that gave me a good starting point and it was very different, people’s involvement previously had been very different across the three campuses and it let me see where people were and what I thought was a very clear structure and our clear goals and things wasn’t there. It wasn’t there, and there were some things after that, just interactions, a member of staff that wasn’t actually at the meeting because they were on holiday, and it became very clear that some people didn’t really still realise really what their role was, what their purpose was. They therefore didn’t feel they could actually part in evaluation, they weren’t able to evaluate but also didn’t understand what evaluation was, only really knew themselves about what they maybe wanted to do to get some qualifications and things to do with herself, very much from a CPD rather than as a unit.

I mean, I found it excellent because at that stage of me taking on that role, it gave me great insight into the three teams, and it made me realise not everyone’s on the same mindset. Not everyone’s actually even aware of our actual aims, our purpose, our role. A lot of that is also because a manager had been off sick as well, so there’d been a wee period of time since we all came together that that hadn’t really been able to be put through. So from that, I’ve done other things to try and get that going, a kind of overview of the service, the expectations of the service, annual plan of work and things, and that’s steadily getting people starting to understand. I’m just ready to set up one-to-ones with every member of staff to discuss that and to look at what their role is and know that...
they’re doing CPD and things, and I think we’re at a stage better now that I can start to work towards, right, here’s the absolute...
S2: You’ve got everyone up to a level playing field.
S1: Yes, because at that stage it wasn’t.
S2: And keeping it moving helps that, doesn’t it, because it doesn’t allow it to get stuck. Can I just ask you what themes, what started to come out as the main themes that people got really hooked on for your group? Was there anything that popped up? I mean, the themes were purposes, externality, context, learning, dissemination, leadership or evolvement.
S1: For the student advice, I think one of the key things for me was initially some people seemed quite not going to speak at all, and this means nothing to me, but as we started to facilitate to draw that out, I think that was fear and what it made them realise was...it took loads to say but I think the main things that came out were that there needed to be improved planning, even of what our service was going to be, what the model was, because for one campus in particular, it was quite a shift, and that’s what came out. I think it was making them understand how they fitted into it, so the shift maybe wasn’t as much as they thought and that’s sort of what I’ve taken on to do, and the external, it was about the view was mixed there. People realised, oh, we work with them or we work with them as well, but we work with them, and it was realising do we evaluate it, should we be maybe getting more with them about what we do for them and what they can do for us, and do it more formally and evaluate so we can work on improving it. I think people talking, folk then became quite engaged in that.
S2: Right, so they did find that it was relevant to them and they had lots to say?
S1: Yes.
S2: Oh, that’s good. Okay, so sticking with the conversation, what did you find, what was interesting about it? What did you find interesting?
S3: I think when we started, people not being sure of what it was we were doing and why we were doing it, and when we put the first couple of challenge questions out, I was having to kick it off by saying, well, this could mean, or what about…but once we got maybe four or five into it, they started contributing themselves and they could see cross-references or things where we seemed to be saying the same thing again.
S2: What do you mean? Can you give me an example?
S3: Well, with the different kinds of high level areas, it was difficult to get them started off at first. We asked everybody to say, to put on a poster what they thought evaluation was and we had a person...
S1: We had a couple of members of staff went...
S3: I don’t know, and that’s fine, don’t put anything on your poster. We’ll start it off, and then they were like, oh right, okay. There was one person that primarily thought it was from a CPD point of view but then I think with the discussions they kind of thought, oh right, okay...
S1: And I think what came out of it for a few folk, when I was sitting observing it, was at one point right near the beginning, I felt there was a slight defensiveness and a fear, really, and I sort of said, well, if that’s how you feel, that’s all right to say. There’s not a right and a wrong here, and somebody had said something like it means nothing to me and I said that’s fine, write that, because we were all writing things down and I just looked up and went write that down then. And they were like... I said but that’s how you feel right now, so write that down.
S3: It’s not a test.
S1: So when they wrote that down and it went up, I think they actually thought, right, I’m allowed to almost say that. I think, just as you’re saying, I think they realised this isn’t a test. We can actually maybe say something and talk. We’re not being...
S4: I think some of them were of the mind that it was checking what they were doing rather than evaluating what you were doing, so they were a bit defensive at the beginning.
S1: Because at first I thought, oh, I don’t know if they’re going to say anything, then over the half hour, at the end of it people were like we’ve done, oh, but I’ve done, you know? And for me, that was great because I could then see and I had just started and what I realised was people do know the stuff, they do have these connections, they just haven’t thought about it in this sense, and because of what’s being going on with the merger, there’s just a bit of uncertainty and that’s why I’ve been doing other bits and pieces but it’s all come from that meeting. Does that make sense?
S2: Yes, that’s good. That sounds like it was very productive.
S1: It was.
S2: Because it got out on the table some reality.
S1: It got everyone together.
S2: In an open and easy way from which you could then move on so it sounds great. Was it challenging? Was the conversation challenging at all?
S3: I think trying to get it started.
S1: It was challenging to get it started. There was a wee…can I ask what you mean by challenging? People challenging each other type…?
S2: No, I mean challenging in the sense of making people think or critical conversation?
S1: I thought some bits were quite challenging, very much towards the beginning and then pulling it in, that’s obviously where getting Louise and yourselves were great because then people could go a wee bit, starting to…pull it back, going from one extreme to the other almost. Because then they get very personal, it’s not about you again, get back to it’s about the service, the unit and us collectively and you within that, but you’ve now gone off on a wee tangent a wee bit so let’s pull you back.
S1: I think some people were starting to looking at some things they’d done before, which was natural when you’ve merged, some things they’ve done before that they weren’t going to do again simply because it’s no longer in their remit because there’s been a change and I think they found that challenging and that’s where, I keep saying, but that’s like there needs to be a move on but to see how they’ve still got the skill and the connection, because it was a bit like we’re not doing that anymore so how can we… And you’re like no, but that’s okay. You bring the expertise and it’s now how you evaluate just generally and looking at what we’re going to be doing. I think it helped, I think they started to understand…I know I’m not explaining it very well but it was just I think it points…people were really, really into it and then all of a sudden it would just go down a wee tangent again of…but we wouldn’t have done that before, and then…
S3: I think they maybe found it more difficult out of them all, that particular…to see where it fits in, oh, but we won’t be doing that anymore so who is going to tell the students about this type thing.
S1: I think they found hard at points without clear, well, what are we going to be doing...
S2: Yes, something concrete...
S1: Because in a way we think everything we’ve done before won’t be getting done which actually now isn’t the case, but that’s how it felt at the time, but it was great because it allowed people to view that, to voice that as well, and it allowed me to like, I hear this, so that I can then try and do something about that, and then we can begin hopefully good self-evaluation. Do you know what I’m saying? So there’s been a wee… I think if everyone had gone…if it had been three student advice centres working the same model and we’d merged together, yes, we’re going to have to work as a big team, but we’d all been doing exactly the same, there would be much more concrete action plan. I definitely didn’t have that, but it was great for trying to get that to come together in a quicker way as well and a
more targeted, productive way and I think people were able to voice aloud that and let us get together in an area as well that at that time of year is normally very, very difficult and might never have yet happened.

S2: I suppose what I’m interested in is was the conversation a soft, easy conversation or was it making them think and causing them to critically reflect on what they were doing?

S3: No, there was critical reflection.

S1: Oh, I think the student advice staff were pushed... I think some of them were pushed quite to a mental limit on that, to be honest, and did it excellent, but I think for them personally, they were having to really... really critically, very much so, do you agree?

S4: Because some of them hadn’t been involved in evaluation.
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S1: Looking more broadly about evaluation, what difference do you think getting involved in this little project has helped in your own personal evaluation practise? This is you as a person.

S2: For me getting involved in this ... well for me, I'll be absolutely upfront, it’s been absolutely invaluable for me that that project came along, partly because ... well mainly at that time, because as well I had been just given this role, and I think I said before, it gave me an opportunity to get people together. It made me look at the whole team at that time. It was a real impetus for me to start finding my own structure of what I wanted to do and how I was evaluating us, if that makes sense, evaluating the actual team to get moving on it. It also has made me realise more about self-evaluation, you know. Although I always did it I was never in charge of it, of making ... I’d never actually thought about the responsibility of helping other people. Does that make sense?

S2: I was a participant in an evaluation but not leading it in any way. Had this not came along I’m no longer doing that role so I wouldn’t be the lead on the college things, so I probably still wouldn’t have the same mindset, but it’s also made me realise that I’ve also got to do more training on evaluative writing and evaluate ... because I wasn’t the person previously that -

S2: So it’s made me realise ... I think it’s also made me realise by doing this ... because doing that ... getting put into that role quite suddenly through huge change and I’ve also changed campus, having spent many, many years in another one and a new team and everything, I think what it did ... I think it helps you focus and I think it ... on what the small ... in chunks and what you should be looking at and how ... about improving and taking away the fear of this major ... you know that thing we tell everyone, it doesn’t mean you’re wrong, it just means you’re looking at how to improve. It means that you’re looking at how to develop things. It makes you ... it came at the right time for me this project because I had to start thinking like that and if it hadn’t came I don’t know if we’ve have ever really got properly together. I don’t know if there would have been a baseline to work from to say right, that’s opened this up and by saying to other people don’t be frightened, you’re telling yourself as well.

S2: I don’t know if this is making sense.

S2: Do you know what I’m saying?

S1: I mean it’s a long ... and it’s a long journey this learning journey.

S1: It doesn’t happen quickly.

S1: But you do need little triggers along the way to give you a bit of impetus otherwise you don’t know what you don’t know, or you don’t know where to get to where you want to go.
S2: It’s about inputting systems and things and people. I think it’s made me realise that if you look at evaluation and what it is about, instead of it dictating things, you can still implement something that you’ve got the idea about, but it’s also about ... as soon as you start putting evaluation in it allows other expertise input, it allows opinion and it also helps you as well and makes you more open to, it’s okay to change things and it’s okay to say you can still lead something, but you can still have other input in through evaluation, that makes it better. But that doesn’t mean to say you’re weak.

S2: And I think by this coming along, literally like I think two weeks after I was given this, out of the blue, because it was all because of the circumstance of it, it was really good because I also only knew if I’d (inaudible 36:40) time that I was managing. So it was like, you’re still going for another couple of weeks, you’re still going for the ... but that went into months. So it was a very uncertain time for me. So having that at that time, I think back now, I think it made me put a plan together. It gave me like, I’ve got a plan. It gave me a bit of structure, that that’s not set in stone forever more, we’ll need to look at it, but people need something to look at to have an opinion on evaluating it. So it was a real project.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research objective:</th>
<th>Case study 1 – Health Organisation</th>
<th>Case study 2 – Further Education Organisation</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usability of the EtE tools</strong></td>
<td>+ Relevant themes</td>
<td>+ Relevant themes and questions</td>
<td>+ Useful tool for Acting Team Manager to develop role and engage with new team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The EtE PROCESS – what worked well?</strong></td>
<td>+ Scoring, discussions, assessing strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td>+ Useful for introducing new staff and integrating others with different experiences of evaluation.</td>
<td>+ The value of the EtE process as a structured and focused way for new Acting Team Manager to observe and learn about the new team, especially their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Questions helped to focus discussion and get people thinking</td>
<td>+ Very positive, enjoyable, interesting and engaging.</td>
<td>+ Also opportunity to build own confidence in new role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Led to focused, structured and in-depth critical discussion</td>
<td>+ Everyone participating in a focused and critical conversation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Challenging in a good way – it raised issues</td>
<td>+ Cards and questions opened up discussion more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Led to safe, open participation in group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The EtE PROCESS – what aspects need to be reviewed?</strong></td>
<td>- Getting started with the process</td>
<td>- Getting started – participants not having a shared understanding about evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Language e.g. stakeholders, externality</td>
<td>- Potential overlap or duplication of questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Role of facilitation</td>
<td>- Need for facilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Transferring ownership from pilot group to wider group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How organisations used the EtE tools to make changes to their evaluation practices.</strong></td>
<td><strong>ACTIONS from using EtE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Starting point: college merger 1 year on, consolidate team approach to self-evaluation.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Starting point: team member appointed as Acting Team Manager for ‘new’ merged Student Advice Team.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Starting point for organisation – change, new plans</td>
<td>• ‘New’ team have shared awareness of role of team, and different experiences of evaluation.</td>
<td>• Cautious and uncertain but also keen to make a good start – an activist wanting to make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased awareness about what group was doing, but disappointed that group are not sharing information, getting feedback on the impact they are having.</td>
<td>• Focused discussion and got</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from evaluation (getting feedback, learning from feedback).
- Actions planned to pilot a diary of involvement with group members.
- Progress on diary was slow
- Other issues have emerged: they did not meet frequently enough, difficulties transferring pilot ideas to larger group, and need for higher level strategic support.

them thinking about who they work with, and what kind of feedback did they get from different stakeholders.
- Focused on theme of externality, stakeholder feedback and dissemination, especially sharing examples of good news stories.
- Also highlighted an issue for the college re. the links between support services and the teaching faculties.
- Challenges that have limited progress include staff gaps and integrating new staff.
- A series of meetings with faculty teams are now planned, and cross campus team meetings are used for ongoing self-evaluation activity.

• Acting Team Manager did produce an action plan for the team – plan was seen as more valid because it was informed by the team conversation (greater ownership).

3. How the EtE model changes, or contributes to, the evaluation discourse in these organisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The <strong>IMPACT</strong> from using EtE</th>
<th>Increased awareness of evaluation and importance in group’s work.</th>
<th>Awareness of appreciating what you are doing well, or doing it right, as well as looking at issues.</th>
<th>Started out very negative but turned into a positive experience as people’s understanding and confidence grew through the discussion.</th>
<th>Staff member adopts new role in evaluation – moves from participant to being responsible for supporting others.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial focus on evaluation practice led group into wider organisational themes like meeting structure and strategic plans.</td>
<td>Better communication across the team</td>
<td>Team needed to work on a shared plan for the service as the foundation for informing any self-evaluation.</td>
<td>Realisation of need for clear service plans and shared understanding across team as a base line before developing self-evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Links made between evaluation and other quality processes e.g. IIV and Participation Standards.</td>
<td>Shifting attitudes towards evaluation – increased participation and contribution to self-evaluation process.</td>
<td>For this team establishing clear guiding organisational practices was important before self-evaluation could progress.</td>
<td>Realisation of the value of participation and open communication amongst team members to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group have plans to widen the use of the EtE tool as an annual planning activity.</td>
<td>A feeling that staff meetings in general have become more open and discursive following the EtE</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Developing the EtE Model and Toolkit in the future | IMPROVING the EtE Tools | conversation.  
- Staff felt empowered about evaluation. | take place.  
- Realisation of the wider impact of change on individuals and teams and the need for management of change strategies.  
- An adapted version of the EtE conversation is being adopted for supporting self-evaluation across the college. | generate confidence and ownership of the plans. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Develop introductory section to help participants understand the process as quickly as possible.  
- Review language used in themes and questions e.g. externality, or provide explanations.  
- Review the section on who should participate re. pros and cons of pilot v whole group  
- Review section about facilitation | Explore potential role of EtE as an engagement tool for mixed experienced teams to extend their evaluation practice. | Review the introductory information to check understanding about evaluation and establishing the starting point for the group.  
- Review themes and questions to check for unhelpful overlap.  
- Emphasis of facilitation especially at the start of the process. | Explore potential role of EtE as a professional development tool. |