



**CAPTURE**

Canadian platform to increase usage of real-world evidence

Plateforme canadienne pour accroître l'usage de données probantes du monde réel

# **ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON EVALUATION CAPACITY BUILDING**

**RECIPROCAL CONSULTING**

**KIM VAN DER WOERD, PH.D.**

**KYLEE SWIFT**

**BILLIE JOE ROGERS**

**SAMANTHA TSURUDA**

**2011**

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
About the Annotated Bibliography.....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
Articles about Building Evaluation Capacity .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Adrien, M. et al. (2008). Bridging the gap: The role of monitoring and evaluation in evidence-based policy making. <i>Evaluation Working Paper</i> , 12, 1-223. ....	3
Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research. (2010). <i>Healthy Moms, Babies, and Children: Improving the Health of Aboriginal Populations in Canada</i> . Edmonton, AB: McNeil, D.A., Rikhy, S., Siever, J., Johnston, A., & Tough, S. ....	4
Arnold, M.E. (2006). Developing Evaluation Capacity in Extension 4-H Field Faculty: A framework for success. <i>Journal of Evaluation</i> , 27, 257- 269. ....	5
Huffman, D., Thomas, K., & Lawrenz, F. (2008). A Collaborative Immersion Approach to Evaluation Capacity Building. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i> , 29, 358 – 368.....	6
McDonald, B., Rogers, P., & Kefford, B. (2003). Teaching People to Fish? Building the Evaluation Capability of Public Sector Organizations. <i>Evaluation</i> , 9, 9-31.....	8
Nu'man, J., King, W., Bhalakia, A., & Criss, S. (2007). A Framework for Building Organizational Capacity Integrating Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation. <i>Journal of Public Health Management Practice</i> , S24-S32.....	9
Preskill, H., & Boyle, S. (2008). A Multidisciplinary Model of Evaluation Capacity Building. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i> , 29, 443-459. ....	10
Smith, R., & Lavoie, J.G. (2008). First Nations Health Networks: A collaborative system approach to health transfer. <i>Health Care Policy</i> , 4, 101-112 .....	13
Taylor-Powell, E., & Boyd H.H. (2008). Evaluation capacity building in complex organizations. In M.T. Braverman, M.Engle, M.E. Arnold, & R.A. Rennekamp (Eds.), <i>Program evaluation in a complex organization system: Lessons from Cooperative Extension</i> . <i>New Directions for Evaluation</i> , 120, 55-69...	13
Volkov, B.B., & King, J.A. (2007). A Checklist for Building Organizational Evaluation Capacity. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/evaluation-capacity-buildinginstitutionalization/">http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/evaluation-capacity-buildinginstitutionalization/</a> . ....	16

## ABOUT THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

This annotated bibliography was produced to inform the development of a survey of the challenges experienced by Aboriginal, Northern and Remote communities involved in evaluation. The bibliography was undertaken by Reciprocal Consulting on behalf of the CAPTURE Project. The CAPTURE Project is a strategic initiative funded by the Canadian Partnership Against Cancer. CAPTURE is creating a knowledge exchange platform to facilitate the collection, sharing and using of real-world knowledge on health promotion programs ([www.thecaptureplatform.ca](http://www.thecaptureplatform.ca)). This work was funded by the Public Health Agency of Canada.

The annotated bibliography is based on 10 articles that addressed evaluation capacity building. The articles were not meant to represent an exhaustive review of the literature. Each article was reviewed by two researchers. Information was extracted that focused on unique challenges or barriers to doing research with Aboriginal, Northern or Remote communities, suggestions for working with or researching with Aboriginal, Northern or Remote communities, knowledge translation, gaps in evaluation knowledge and evaluation skills, evaluation capacity building efforts, and the importance of building evaluation capacity.

## ARTICLES ABOUT BUILDING EVALUATION CAPACITY

**Adrien, M. et al. (2008). Bridging the gap: The role of monitoring and evaluation in evidence-based policy making. Evaluation Working Paper, 12, 1-223.**

### **The Unique Challenges/Barriers to doing Research with Aboriginal Communities**

- Lack of funding (173)
- Mismanagement or inadequate staffing (173)
- Inadequate training of the personnel (173)

### **Suggestions for Working and/or Researching with Aboriginal Communities**

- \* not Aboriginal specific – in the following I framed it as research communities and FN communities rather than donors and governments of developing countries.
- Governments of developing countries (FN communities) are responsible/accountable for policy development for their own people, not to the donor organizations (researchers) – this requires strengthening of oversight of policy development and budgets and reinforcing roles. Also means donor organizations (researchers) need to reduce their excessive demands (17-18)
- Manage results – both partners manage resources and improve decision-making to focus on results. Researcher should support FN communities (19)
- Mutual accountability – both pledge they will hold each other mutually accountable for developing results (19)

- Harmonisation – researchers should aim to be more harmonized, collectively effective, less burdensome on communities in fragile states. Also establish common arrangements for planning, funding, and implementing programs/research (19)
- Provide accessible summaries of research (41)
- Involve key stakeholders and other potential users in the scoping and designing phase (136)
- Capacity building (136)
- Take opportunities to talk about important concepts (ex. informed consent) (136)
- Help users understand logic and the trade-offs between different designs (136)
- Involve as many key user audience members in periodic briefings on the progress (136)

### **Good Knowledge Translation with Aboriginal People**

- Different messages may need different audiences at different times (40)
- Multiple channels of communication (40)
- Publish in journals that are user friendly (41)
- Use language and styles of presentations that engage interest (41)
- Target material to the needs of the audience (41)
- Tailor dissemination events to the target audience (41)
- Use a combination of dissemination methods (41)
- Use the media (41)
- Be proactive and contact relevant policy and delivery agencies (41)
- KTE should have audience specific strategies (78)
- Clarify what each user wants to know and how much detail they want (137)
- Understand how different users want to hear the results (visually, orally, written, etc) (137)
- Clarify if users want hard facts like statistics or photos and diagrams (137)
- One size doesn't fit all – use different strategies with different audiences (137)
- Don't overwhelm people with the level of detail and technicality (137)
- Use the right language in KTE (137)

### **Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research. (2010). Healthy Moms, Babies, and Children: Improving the Health of Aboriginal Populations in Canada. Edmonton, AB: McNeil, D.A., Rikhy, S., Siever, J., Johnston, A., & Tough, S.**

#### 1. What Are the Gaps in Knowledge/Evaluation Skills?

- “The lack of published information on evidence based programs in this area indicate that projects be developed along the continuum from evaluation to research, and should be based on the well defined principles of community development and guidelines for collaboration in Aboriginal communities” (p. ix)
- “The unintended positive outcomes of local midwifery care should be included in evaluations of impact” (p. ix)
- Cultural safety and cultural alignment (p.10)
- Stronger evaluation methods are needed to identify the true promise of the program (p.30)

- “Lack of consistent evaluative research on health programs and activities was an ongoing and apparent concern” (p.89)
- In addition to increasing the number of evaluations, there may also be an opportunity to increase the compatibility of ongoing evaluations (p.89)
- There were mixed findings for many outcomes, including lack of consistency in the studies’ findings across all care programs. (p.89)
- “Authors struggled to determine the overall effectiveness of antenatal programming” (p.89)
- “There is an opportunity to identify common research or evaluative methods, outcomes and outcome measures to increase the comparability of evaluations” (p.89)
- “Further complicating the evaluation of health programming is uncertainty about how to best align evaluation procedures with Native ways of knowing, while still maintaining the rigor of research methods” (p.89)
- “There is a disparity between research-based validity and community-based capacity for research...it can be impractical or complex to implement rigorous research methodologies in a community setting” (p.89)
- “These findings suggest that consideration of alternative evaluation designs and opportunities for evidence are needed to better align with community capacity for research as well as Native ways of knowing” (p.90)
- “There may be an opportunity to include factors such as the strength of the community relationships, the presence of energetic champions, and tailoring of interventions in program evaluations” (p.90)

### 3. What Was Done to Build Capacity?

- Increased communication between participants and researchers helped their relationship to grow and promoted cultural sensitivity

## **Arnold, M.E. (2006). Developing Evaluation Capacity in Extension 4-H Field Faculty: A framework for success. *Journal of Evaluation*, 27, 257- 269.**

### 1. What Are the Gaps in Knowledge/Evaluation Skills?

- Many of the individuals from the program logic model workshop had a hard time taking what they learned about program logic models and applying it to their own programs.
- Another issue that people faced was that they would attend training sessions on program logic models, but would not be able to apply the skills they had learned until several months later – because of this, many people could no longer remember how to apply program logic models to their programs.

### 2. What Was Done to Build Capacity?

- Evaluation capacity building requires sustained effort and guidance in order for evaluation to become an ordinary practice within the organization.
- Other factors that need to be considered when implementing an evaluation culture include “the role of the stakeholders, the source of the demand for evaluation, the multilayered and often quite nuanced levels of an organization, the types of methods

and training needs, and the resources and flexibility required for successful capacity-building efforts.” P.258

- In order for organizations “to learn about, understand, and improve local practice”, organizations need to “develop a culture that understand and appreciates the value of evaluation”. P.258
- It is ideal for an organization to have a large number of evaluation practitioners when implementing an evaluation culture; it is less helpful when individuals either see no value in evaluation or when they share their extensive evaluation expertise outside of the organization.
- Arnold developed an evaluation framework that can be used for one-on-one consultations to large scale multisite evaluations. The framework includes four components: (1) training individuals on creating and using program logic models (e.g. identifying indicators); (2) providing one-on-one training for individual evaluation projects; (3) conducting evaluation in small teams where each member has an important role; and (4) conducting at least one multisite evaluation each year.
- The first step to a successful evaluation is sound program planning, e.g. a program logic model.
- The evaluation should be flexible, also “make things simple and provide lots of support and encouragement” pp.261-2
- “collaborative evaluations allow opportunity for exchanges of ideas and methods and can diminish feelings of uncertainty or inadequacy as educators learn and practice evaluation skills together” p.261
- In order to make multisite evaluations work (evaluations of a program found in several different locations) the program needs to have common goals and methods across sites – this is necessary for validity. You also need buy-in from the local coordinators who are helping evaluate – often the results of the evaluation are motivation enough. Evaluation training for everyone helping conduct the evaluation is also recommended prior to the commencement of the evaluation – this will help clarify goals and expectations.
- When building evaluation capacity it is important to have a supportive infrastructure such as an in-house specialist who can provide evaluation support, provide training and keep evaluation on track. It is also necessary to provide adequate resources for the training and conduction of evaluation. Finally, it is useful to have access to individuals with expert knowledge in data entry, analysis and interpretation (e.g. grad students).
- This framework helps build capacity in evaluation in a way that is supportive and unifying – it is recommended for programs that are similar but delivered in different locations.

**Huffman, D., Thomas, K., & Lawrenz, F. (2008). A Collaborative Immersion Approach to Evaluation Capacity Building. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29, 358 – 368.**

#### 1. Why Build Evaluation Capacity?

- The accountability movement has placed demands on private and federal agencies/organizations and grant-funded projects to provide evidence regarding the impact of their work. (p. 358)

- External stakeholders are extremely interested in evidence of program effectiveness. (p. 358)
  - Ideally, an organization has the capacity to engage in evaluation for both external accountability purposes and for the sake of building capacity to improve programs and better serve constituents. (p.358)
  - Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB) is intentional work that is separate from evaluation work itself. (p. 359)
  - ECB also focuses on developing processes and practices that make evaluation part of the everyday work of an organization. (p.359)
  - ECB can include professional training and education for individuals; however, it goes further by attempting to extend the development of individuals to affect the future work of the organization. (p.359)
2. What Are the Gaps in Knowledge/Evaluation Skills?
- Lack of evaluation capacity can mean that organizations are unable to conduct evaluation and respond to the demands of stakeholders as well as they would like (p. 358)
  - Transferring evaluation knowledge/skills gained from workshops to real-world evaluation
3. What Was Done to Build Capacity?
- social–constructivists believe learners need to engage with the concepts in a social and cultural context so that their individually constructed understandings will mesh with social and cultural norms of understanding (p.361)
  - Social–constructivist views of learning, therefore, support the notion that ECB should be a real-world, hands-on process of learning that takes place in both a social and cultural context. (p.361)
  - In order to develop ECB, individuals should be given the time and freedom to try out new evaluation ideas in a safe and supportive environment.
  - There are four different ways to promote ECB including providing tools, workshops, fellowships, and immersion
  - Tools/technical assistance are an important part of evaluation, but are not adequate on their own to provide an ECB as real world experience is necessary as well.
  - Workshop/institute approach is helpful when developing specific evaluation skills, but as with the tools/technical assistance approach, it is not completely adequate as the skills do not necessarily transfer easily to real-world evaluation.
  - The fellowship/internship approach is very useful in developing capacity in the evaluation field, but does not necessarily develop capacity building within organizations.
  - The collaborative/immersion approach is favored by these researches – this approach uses hands on experience to train and build evaluation capacity and evaluation capacity building. Experienced evaluators were teamed up with inexperienced evaluators and immersed in an evaluation.
  - The collaborative approach believes that organizations can increase their evaluation capacity as the individuals belonging to the organization increase their capacity and vice versa – they grow together

**McDonald, B., Rogers, P., & Kefford, B. (2003). Teaching People to Fish? Building the Evaluation Capability of Public Sector Organizations. *Evaluation*, 9, 9-31.**

1. Why Build Evaluation Capacity?

- “Continuing interest in improving public sector performance and accountability” (9)
- “Sometimes these efforts are motivated by a perception that there are not enough external evaluators to conduct the evaluations required or that there are insufficient funds” (10)
- “Evaluation capability will provide enduring organizational benefits, including a sustainable resource for producing evaluations as well as a system for encouraging and using evaluation” (10)

2. What Are the Gaps in Knowledge/Evaluation Skills? (BARRIERS)

- “Performance management (and evaluative enterprise in general) cannot be forced on people. Attempting to impose it will likely lead to goal displacement, unreliable information and an increase in the risk that programme relevance will be diminished rather than augmented” (11)

3. What Was Done to Build Capacity?

- “An evaluation capability should also include effective use of external evaluations and ongoing monitoring.” (10)
- “The aim is not just to conduct evaluations but also to commission, manage and use them.” (10)
- “In addition to having skills and knowledge about evaluation, create an environment in which these can be deployed.” (10)
- “As well as formal policies, systems and practices, ... we need to consider the effect of informal practices, symbolic actions, evaluative beliefs, values and attitudes” (11)
- (\*the ECB studied sounds very applicable to our situation)
- McDonald, Rogers & Kefford developed a four phase evaluation framework. Phase one consisted of addressing a specific need. Phase two involved experimenting with volunteer projects. Phase three was a mandatory evaluation for all new projects. Finally, phase four included expansion and consolidation.
- With phase one, the role of the evaluator was researcher. Work was evaluated with an independent blind review of reports and the evaluation framework was designed.
- With phase two, the role of the evaluator was mentor, informal trainer, and researcher. The work was evaluated through an external evaluation using semi-structured interviews.
- Phase three was mandatory evaluation of new projects. The role of the evaluator was mentor, formal trainer, researcher, facilitator, and special events manager. The work was evaluated through a mixed-methods internal evaluation. A framework for the impact of the evaluation was developed along with a social impact assessment and a values inquiry.
- Phase four included expansion and consolidation. The role of the evaluator was the same as phase three, but with more emphasis on evaluation and research. The work was evaluated by a planned external review and through continued internal evaluation. A strategy for expanding evaluation research was developed.

- A reflection and re-planning process took place after each phase.
- McDonald, Rogers and Keffor suggest to think big (have an overall broad picture evaluation plan), but start small (e.g. “stage, trial and grow evaluation”) (23)
- Focus on Supply and Demand: It is important to build capacity within your organization (e.g. through training etc..) and without (through dissemination of findings)
- Work Top Down and Bottom Up: Working with both the senior managers and project staff to develop support for the evaluation, to understand and meet their evaluation needs, and to develop policies and frameworks. This strategy keeps the evaluation focused and from being only a token attempt.
- Address Evalophobia: it needs to be made clear that answering the evaluation questions thoroughly and correctly is more important than seeing positive results. The evaluation environment must be positive and supportive.
- Develop a Common Evaluation Framework: use a generic program theory – Bennett’s Hierarchy was used in this case and was found to be very useful. However “we advocate going beyond average outcomes to identify sub-groups and multiple pathways through projects to get some insight into the crucial matter of what worked for which groups and why. Finally, where appropriate, we encourage projects to increase their evidence for causal attribution beyond simply measuring performance against a program theory”. (26)
- Build Knowledge About What Works in Evaluation in your Context: Good evaluation practice depends on context. (27)
- Evaluate Each Stage: “walk the talk” – used to improve on ECB efforts and for funding bodies.

**Nu’man, J., King, W., Bhalakia, A., & Criss, S. (2007). A Framework for Building Organizational Capacity Integrating Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation. *Journal of Public Health Management Practice*, S24-S32.**

## 2. What Are the Gaps in Knowledge/Evaluation Skills?

- “The effect of formal policies, systems, and practices, as well as informal practices, symbolic actions, beliefs, values, and attitudes, must be understood and integrated into capacity building efforts” S25
- “To achieve and sustain change, individuals need an appropriate environment and the proper mix of opportunities in which to use the acquired knowledge and skills in the context of formal and informal organizational systems.” S25
- “Knowledge transfer alone is insufficient to change the capacity of an organization, primarily because group trainings or information delivery does not consider the context in which the organization works, and why” S25
- “Tailored individualized assistance, which may result in greater change than from information transfer, can be resource intensive, thereby limiting the number of organizations that can be served.” S25
- “Successful utilization of the individual assistance often requires foundational learning of knowledge or skills as a prerequisite” S25

## 3. What Was Done to Build Capacity?

- “Common approaches rely on the simple transfer of knowledge and skills through tailoring individualized assistance, training groups of individuals, or providing information through the dissemination of materials and tools” S25
- Nu'man et al. developed a multi level approach framework to evaluation; the framework is comprised of three components. The first component consists of defining and prioritizing needs (e.g. a program logic model is developed, get an accurate description of program). The second component consists of analyzing and categorizing needs (e.g. formal systems, resources, and informal systems and organizational culture – funding, training etc...). The third component consists of developing and implementing strategies (builds on learning by doing – focuses training on a specific area based on a needs assessment). Engage the participants through the entire process.
- Objectives were revised using the SMART model
- “Effective capacity building involves combining strategies to ensure long-term sustainability. Gleaned from this experience are salient lessons” (S30)
- “Providing organizations with opportunities to create usable products, such as an agency program logic model or a monitoring and evaluation plan during training, would make individuals more likely to realize greater benefit from the training” (S30)
- “Training must be supplemented with the use of other capacity building strategies and follow-up and support over time to realize the greatest effect in improving the planning and implementation of... prevention programs” (S30)
- “Effective capacity building must involve ongoing, systematic, and planned processes with measurable performance objectives, defined outcomes and indicators, and strategies to track and measure those outcomes over time” (S31)
- “There is a need to define the environmental context necessary to support successful implementation activities” (S31)
- “The values of active participation of the beneficiaries, learning by doing, and respect for diversity should guide the development of organizational capacity building indicators” (S31)
- “General guidelines should also be considered in developing indicators, including keeping the number of indicators to a minimum, linking indicators to a particular goal or objective, and creating SMART indicators so that change can be measured” (S31)
- “Although external motivation can be used to “nudge” organizations, they must want to improve and enhance their systems and services before substantial changes in capacity can occur” (S31)
- \*Our ECB may be outside the scope of this project (S32)

**Preskill, H., & Boyle, S. (2008). A Multidisciplinary Model of Evaluation Capacity Building. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29, 443-459.**

1. Why Build Evaluation Capacity?

- The catalyst for ECB could have been the 2000 AEA conference theme “Evaluation Capacity Building” or the 2001 AEA conference theme “Mainstreaming Evaluation”.
- ECB could have been the result of the evaluators’ “increasing commitment to involving stakeholders in the evaluation process and the recognition that they were learning from and about evaluation through their participation” (p.443)

- Definition: “ECB involves the design and implementation of teaching and learning strategies to help individuals, groups, and organizations, learn about what constitutes effective, useful, and professional evaluation practice. The ultimate goal of ECB is sustainable evaluation practice—where members continuously ask questions that matter, collect, analyze, and interpret data, and use evaluation findings for decision-making and action. For evaluation practice to be sustained, participants must be provided with leadership support, incentives, resources, and opportunities to transfer their learning about evaluation to their everyday work. Sustainable evaluation practice also requires the development of systems, processes, policies, and plans that help embed evaluation work into the way the organization accomplishes its mission and strategic goals” (444)
  - Why ECB? (446)
    - i. “A need to meet accountability requirements”
    - ii. “changes in the external environment”
    - iii. “a desire to enlighten and support government policy making and planning”
    - iv. “changes in the organization”
    - v. “a mandate from leadership to increase the learning function of evaluation”
    - vi. “a perceived lack of internal evaluation knowledge and skills”
    - vii. “a desire to seek new or increased funding”
    - viii. “a perceived shortage of evaluators with expertise and background in specific program content or specialized organizations”
    - ix. “a desire to use evaluation to make program improvements”
2. What Are the Gaps in Knowledge/Evaluation Skills? (BARRIERS)
- “There appear to be few comprehensive conceptual frameworks or models that could be used to (a) guide practitioners’ ECB efforts and/or (b) empirically test the effectiveness of ECB processes, activities, and outcomes” (444)
  - Lack of leadership is a barrier to implementing ECB in organizations
3. What Was Done to Build Capacity?
- “It is critically important that ECB facilitators consider several design issues” (444)
  - Finding out the organizations reason for engaging in ECB helps determine if the timing is right and also helps to indicate who should be involved in the evaluation and which training/strategies will be most effective.
  - You need to have buy-in from the stakeholders; everyone involved should believe that organization members can learn how to conduct evaluations, that training in evaluation enhances evaluation benefits, and that training in evaluation will enhance the effectiveness of programs.
  - “The motivations, assumptions, and expectations of any ECB effort need to be fully thought through and articulated prior to taking any of the next steps in designing and implementing an ECB effort. Failure to do so may result in making decisions that limit the effectiveness of when, how, and where members learn from and about evaluation” (447)
  - There are a number of ways to building capacity within an organization including internship, written materials, technology, meetings, appreciative inquiry, communities of practice, training, involvement in an evaluation process, technical assistance, and coaching or mentoring.

- When choosing an evaluation strategy it is important to know that different strategies produce different learning outcomes;“ Some of the strategies focus on knowing how, some on knowing what. Some support the co-creation of meaning and understanding and building stronger relationships, whereas others provide opportunities for skill development and feedback” (448)
- Deciding which strategy to use should consider the participants, the resources, desired learning objectives, organization change theories, and expected outcomes.
- Participants: it is useful to know how the participants feel about evaluation (e.g. useful vs. useless), motivation for participating in evaluation, and preexisting evaluation knowledge/skills.
- Resources: it is necessary to know what resources can be allocated to evaluation (e.g. time, money, personnel, space, technology, materials).
- Evaluation strategy: when designing an evaluation strategy, consider a number of theories on evaluation (e.g. evaluation, adult learning, workplace learning, individual change, organizational change) before you decide which theory will help guide your evaluation and achieve specific learning objectives
- ECB Objectives: it is important to have clearly defined objectives in order to ensure an effective evaluation. Preskill and Boyle defined 36 different possible objectives organized into three areas – knowledge, skills and affective domains.
- Communication about ECB: It is important to keep lines of communication open between all the stakeholders in the evaluation. Communication can affect the buy-in from the stakeholders. Communication methods, sources, content, targets, and frequency should all be carefully planned. It is important to communicate participants’ roles, funders’ expectations and the purpose of the initiative. Methods of communication include “meetings, brochures, videos, and teleconferences”. Information should be conveyed in a positive way. (451)
- Other important factors include the timing of the ECB implementation, the knowledge/skills of the facilitator, the participation/enthusiasm from the participants, and if the program was implemented as it was designed.
- It is important to evaluate the ECB efforts not only to promote evaluation by engaging in it, but also because it evaluators learn about what works, ECB practitioners increase their own accountability, and it helps secure funding for ongoing ECB activities.
- It is important that findings are disseminated and are applied in the short and long term. It should be made clear that knowledge transfer is expected and it should be built into the evaluation plan.
- In order for ECB to successfully be implemented in an organization, there needs to be support from within the organization
- In order to make ECB sustainable it is important to embed evaluation into daily work practices and policies. It is also to have clearly defined and easily understandable evaluation guidelines. It is necessary to have an adequate amount of financial, personnel and material resources in order to conduct an evaluation. Other important factors include making use of evaluation findings, the organization must have a shared commitment to sustaining evaluation, have an effective reporting system, have a strategic plan for the evaluation, and provide ongoing opportunities to learn about evaluation.

- Diffusion is the final step to this evaluation process – it occurs when those participating in ECB within an organization share their learnings about evaluation with others from outside of their organization (e.g. presentations).

**Smith, R., & Lavoie, J.G. (2008). First Nations Health Networks: A collaborative system approach to health transfer. *Health Care Policy, 4*, 101-112**

1. What Are the Gaps in Knowledge/Evaluation Skills? (BARRIERS)
  - Negative connotation or organization that you work for
  - Not having the correct resources
  - Culturally sensitive/aligned
  - It is an asset to have Aboriginal people doing evaluations for Aboriginal people
2. What Was Done to Build Capacity?
  - Excellent working relationships are characterized by open communication and mutual respect
  - The FNHN has developed its own evaluation methods, “which use a traditional storytelling format to facilitate input and participate from service users. One respondent referred to this approach as ‘adapting our own way of knowing’ rather than enforcing academic or provider-centric perspectives” (109)

**Taylor-Powell, E., & Boyd H.H. (2008). Evaluation capacity building in complex organizations. In M.T. Braverman, M.Engle, M.E. Arnold, & R.A. Rennekamp (Eds.), *Program evaluation in a complex organization system: Lessons from Cooperative Extension. New Directions for Evaluation, 120*, 55-69.**

1. Why Build Evaluation Capacity?
  - “Evaluation capacity building (ECB) has emerged as an area of great interest as governments, organizations, and programs seek to enhance their effectiveness and accountability.” 56
  - The goal of ECB is to strengthen and sustain an organization’s capacity to “(1) design, implement, and manage effective evaluation projects; (2) access, build, and use evaluative knowledge and skills; (3) cultivate a spirit of continuous organizational learning, improvement, and accountability; and (4) create awareness and support for program evaluation and self-evaluation as a performance improvement strategy. 56
  - ECB is the “the intentional work to continuously create and sustain overall organizational processes that make quality evaluation and its uses routine” 56
  - “ECB in Extension may or may not be part of “doing an evaluation.” It may involve developing general awareness, skills, resources, and infrastructures to support evaluation, that is, the organizational processes that embed evaluative inquiry into the organization” 56

- “External demand for accountability and documented evidence of impact faced by all federally funded organizations since the 1993 Performance and Results Act” has helped set the stage for ECB. 56
  - Other organizations have a number of stakeholders (e.g. funding from tax money, grants, contracts) who want to know what the results of the program.
  - ECB is also used as a way to manage limited resources
  - Some organizations see ECB “as a core function” (56) in order to be dynamic organizations. They want to promote “critical inquiry and ethical conduct” and to “develop the intellectual capital of staff” (56). Evaluation becomes everyone’s responsibility and is used to “improve program and organizational performance” (56)
  - Other organizations use ECB to “check their work, link theory to practice, and use evaluation research to identify and develop best practice as well as document and communicate results.” (57) ECB gives organizations the “means to present their work and gain recognition” (57)
  - A program evaluator is a professional who demonstrates skills and practices connected to planning and implementing an evaluation, while an ECB professional supports the processes and practices that sustain evaluation (57)
  - The purpose of training in evaluation “is typically to enhance knowledge, skills, and confidence so that participants are able to conduct adequate evaluations of their own programs” (59)
2. What Are the Gaps in Knowledge/Evaluation Skills? (BARRIERS)
- “A continuing challenge concerns provision of appropriate professional development activities to meet the broad range of individuals with differing and changing needs, orientations, and evaluative responsibilities” (59)
  - “Program and evaluation learning are best integrated into practice when the learning objective is clear and understood by all, and when the process includes time for reflection” (59)
  - The strongest evaluation presence and sustained function are found in states that have invested in full-time evaluation positions (60).
  - Adequate financing and enough time remain challenges for evaluation (61)
3. What Was Done to Build Capacity?
- Professional development in the form of “building knowledge, beliefs, and skills of individuals in evaluation” (58)
  - Some organizations offer “online self-instruction modules and graduate-level course for their faculty and staff, as well as for personnel from other organizations with fewer resources. Staff may be encouraged to attend regional and national evaluation conferences, workshops, and institutes” (59)
  - “Technical assistance involves personalized real-time consultation conducted face-to-face, by phone, via web-based technologies, or by e-mail. These requests offer teachable moments and opportunities to build relationships, as well as possibilities for continued learning when the learner perceives the assistance as relevant and practical.” (59)
  - “collaborative evaluation projects achieve greater impact and sustained change. Through collaborative inquiry, the team designs and implements an evaluation, gaining access to expertise and resources in a peer-learning, non threatening environment that

is ground in real contexts and authentic activities consistent with social constructivist learning theory” (59)

- Mentoring and coaching in ECB consists of an evaluation expert helping a colleague gain knowledge, skills and confidence in evaluation or an evaluation expert becomes a “coaching member of a program team” (60)
- In communities of practice, individuals organize themselves around a mutual interest such as “a common problem, in response to a request, to share assets, or for personal growth. Members in these self-organizing groups recognize and value the commitment to shared learning and shared practice” (60)
- “To meet their professional needs, extension evaluators have created and participate in an active Topical Interest Group of the American Evaluation Association..., which has a listserv for sharing information and materials. In addition, Extension evaluators connect with local, regional, and national Extension networks and workgroups; share expertise and materials; hire consultants; and access resources inside and outside Extension.” (60)
- Extension evaluators support professional development and self-learning in evaluation by facilitating access to practical, relevant evaluation materials (e.g. powerpoint presentations, case studies, training manuals). These materials are available in both print and electronic forms. (60)
- It is important to have evaluation champions to advocate for ECB, share responsibilities and “communicate the value of evaluation” (61)
- Networking, partnering and relationship building are important ways to gain resources and help integrate evaluation into other areas.
- 10% of the program should be allocated to evaluation of the program
- Extension organizations use several different technologies to support evaluation activities. Support includes “software and electronic templates to facilitate state and federal reporting” and systems for “collecting data and communicating results” (see [www.cyfernet.org](http://www.cyfernet.org)). (61)
- Plan enough time for efficient and clearly defined evaluation activities (include time designations in work plans, contracts, grant applications etc...)
- Incentives for engaging in evaluation include “leadership opportunities, recognition by peers, opportunities to demonstrate scholarship and grow professionally, having data to legitimize and validate one’s work, and having information to improve programs and practice” (63)
- It is necessary to have open lines of communication between the entire organization.
- It is better to work on teams where all members of the organization feel ownership and take action together
- Data management systems are necessary to collect and manage data and to disseminate the findings.
- Evaluation policies and expectations should be explicit and clearly defined.
- “Think about the individual, team, and organization simultaneously and maintain clarity in ECB purpose. We liken ECB to building a government monitoring and evaluation system as a long haul effort, requiring patience and persistence” (66)
- Use demands for evaluation as motivators for continuing/promoting evaluation
- Get creative with evaluation – try to get evaluation to become a habit
- Use every opportunity to build evaluation capacity (e.g. networking, relationship building, workshops)

- Work with people's abilities, interests, strengths and weaknesses (be flexible) – “not everyone needs to be an evaluation expert” (67)
- ECB practitioners facilitate and educate on evaluation – they do not conduct evaluations
- Encourage and support all members of the organization “interested in becoming leaders, mentors and advocates” (68)
- Engage others outside the organization (e.g. stakeholders, external evaluators) to help with ECB.

**Volkov, B.B., & King, J.A. (2007). A Checklist for Building Organizational Evaluation Capacity. Retrieved from <http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/evaluation-capacity-buildinginstitutionalization/>.**

1. What Was Done to Build Capacity?

- Best Practices in Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB)
- Promote an ECB -friendly environment :
  - Need support from management
  - Need evaluation leaders
  - Describe ECB benefits for your organization
  - Determine how willing organization is to change
  - Include input from all stakeholders
  - Provide opportunities for social events regarding ECB (e.g. discuss evaluation findings at brown bag lunches)
- Use the external environment and its influence on the organization to your benefit:
  - Incorporate external mandates/expectations into evaluation
  - Determine external support for evaluation
- Develop a long- term ECB plan:
  - Develop an ECB committee to advance evaluation agenda
  - Incorporate ECB in organization policies and procedures
  - Create and ECB framework for your organization
  - Make sure members of the organization have access to a detailed logic model/evaluation plan
  - Evaluate the capacity building techniques regularly
- Build support for evaluation process and communication systems:
  - Create organizational structures to help with evaluation activities
  - Assign a leader for the development and evaluation of evaluation activities
  - Build evaluation skills in the organization (e.g. collecting, analyzing, interpreting data)
  - Develop an internal reporting system
  - Develop a communication strategy to disseminate findings
- Maintain open communication regarding the organization's evaluation process:
  - Establish clear roles and expectations
  - Provide sufficient time for evaluation activities
  - Offer incentives for participation

- Provide professional development in evaluation
- Involve people in a meaningful way in the evaluation to facilitate learning
- Routinely evaluate ECB process to promote and encourage evaluations
- Build “peer learning structures”:
  - Encourage trust building (both interpersonal and organizational)
  - Incorporate a system to have decision making informed by evaluation
  - Create on-going learning activities
  - Provide opportunities for reflection (both individual and group)
- Enhance access to evaluation resources:
  - Make effective use of evaluation personnel (e.g. engage staff in evaluation activities, present findings)
  - Provide access to best practices in evaluation (for both general evaluation and program specific evaluation)
  - Ensure there is sufficient resources to access (e.g. websites, consultants)
- Secure support for evaluation within organization:
  - Assign long-term fiscal support
  - Provide basic resources
  - Make evaluation a priority (e.g. enough time)
  - Can develop revenue-generating strategies to support evaluation (e.g. serving as evaluation consultants for other organizations)

## CONTACT THE CAPTURE PROJECT

Simon Fraser University

8888 University Drive

WMC Room 2805

Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6

Telephone: 778.782.6707

Fax: 778.782.3055

Website: [www.thecaptureproject.ca](http://www.thecaptureproject.ca)

Email: [info@thecaptureproject.ca](mailto:info@thecaptureproject.ca)