

Evaluating People-Centred Civic Engagement Practices

Part of the **COMMUNITY VOICES FOR SYSTEMS CHANGE** Project
Isobel Goddard with the Toronto Neighbourhood Centres



Introduction

Community Voices for System Change (CVSC):

The CVSC initiative has been a two-year project embarked on by Toronto Neighbourhood Centres (TNC) with Maytree to embed people-centred civic engagement (PCCE) practice into non-profit agencies in the TNC network, focussing on systemic changes that would cause a cultural change, specifically by:

- Developing and committing to a common understanding of people centred practices and values, and
- Supporting agencies to shift culture and enhance approaches to meet these aspirations.

The project took the journey to achieve this by building a community of practice, building trainings, and aligning evaluations (the focus of this report), and creating a definition of PCCE. This shift started with a baseline survey completed by TNC member agencies, and the resulting co-designed definition of PCCE:

Committing to PCCE means putting community voices at the centre of our efforts to support positive community change and deepen our democratic practice. This entails enabling the people we serve to have more control over their lives through civic engagement; enabling people to take part in decision-making processes that affect their lives; working in accordance with the rights, holistic needs, expectations, and expertise of people, communities, and their lived realities; consciously engaging the perspectives and lived experiences of residents and working together as co-pilots to bring about change; ensuring that people have the power, knowledge, support, and respect they need to actively and meaningfully participate in civic engagement; and supporting processes that build capacity for civic participation.

Evaluating evaluation:

The goal to align evaluations set out to identify an evaluation approach that fully aligns to the people-centred goals of the TNC and support the shift towards a more inclusive, engaging, and dignified evaluation of our PCCE activities. The review of evaluative approaches considered the PCCE definition, as well as the survey results which highlighted member-identified barriers and enablers to PCCE that currently exist in the network.

Through this lens, the result is a decomposition and review of six evaluative approaches including their design, development, implications for use, and potential or prescribed applications for use (where applicable), all of which comes together to understand their potential use for aligning TNC agency evaluations.

Using the report

This report has been designed to offer users the opportunity to review the six evaluation approaches and how they may be useful for the agency's circumstances in relation to the people-centred civic engagement goals of the Toronto Neighbourhood Centres. A summary table provides an overview of the approaches, and following this, more details are provided for each approach.

This report does not hold all the answers but is a starting place for the shift closer towards putting our communities at the centre of everything we do.

A Note on Uncolonising Evaluation

As an organisation working on indigenous land and benefiting from settler colonialism, it is important for the Toronto Neighbourhood Centres to acknowledge, understand, and challenge the systems of power it benefits from and consider how we can work together to break down and rethink these systems to build equity.

Uncolonising evaluation is one that has been discussed by many evaluators over recent years, the most prolific concept is that to ensure non-indigenous folks are not leading or holding power over indigenous peoples. One suggested method for achieving this is the establishment of advisory groups ([Johnston-Goodstar, 2019](#)). However, in their development of an empirically designed 'Indigenous Framework for Evaluation', [LaFrance and Nichols \(2010\)](#) highlight indigenous researcher Brant-Castellano and her speech to the Canadian

Evaluation Society (1997) in which she informs on the need for “more research and evaluation that is grounded in indigenous values”, while also emphasising there are two considerations we must be aware of when conducting research and evaluation which involves indigenous peoples (which in cases of evaluation engaging communities in Toronto, it inevitably will). Those two considerations are:

- “The appropriation of voice - who has the right to speak authoritatively on aboriginal experience, and
- the validity of fact and interpretation assembled by outsiders to the culture and community”.

The reviews of evaluative approaches highlighted in this report aim to show how we can move towards a more people-centred approach to civic engagement, and as with all community development activities, this starts with knowing your community and its nuances. If we are to initiate truly effective evaluation of PCCE, we must do so with a lens of uncolonisation, and understand how to engage indigenous peoples while upholding their values and systems.

More research and engagement is needed to build our capacity for this, but we can start with the Indigenous Framework for Evaluation (LaFrance & Nichols, 2010). This research collaboration led by indigenous peoples, who shared many concepts, including:

- the importance of evaluators supporting communities to define their own standards by demonstrating that there is flexibility in what is measured and assessed, and
- “hav[ing] an understanding of the self-determination that fuels the goals and aspirations of Indian communities to preserve, restore, and protect their cultures and ways of doing things.”

There are a few resources available to support the development of a uncolonising lens for evaluators, which should be applied to the review and application of all evaluation approach(es) reviewed below. There is also a free 8-week EdX course available ([EdX, 2020](#)), and it is highly recommended that all efforts start with understanding colonisation, indigeneity, intersectionality, and structures of power including who does and does not have access to them.

Overview of Evaluation Approaches

Evaluation Approach	Brief description	Example(s)	Summary	Application to TNC PCCE
Appreciative Inquiry	Takes a positive lens to the current and historical view of the community and looks to see how this can be carried forward.	Imagine Chicago	A flexible approach. Would help build towards capacity for TNC goals. Inspiring, motivating, and unites community.	Has a high potential for application where organisations can commit to the mindset shift.
Beneficiary Assessment	An approach that assesses the value of an intervention as perceived by the (intended) beneficiaries, thereby aiming to give voice to their priorities and concerns.	Farmers In Agricultural Extension	The goals of this approach match those of the TNC CVSC initiative, but the methods and language are organisationally driven, leaving the power with managers and policymakers	Very low potential for application, as it aligns with a minimal number of principles of the TNC.
Developmental Evaluation	An approach to evaluation that offers ongoing feedback to the focus of evaluation for ongoing development. Used in cases of social innovation, radical program redesign, complex issues, and crises.	British Columbia Health Authority Projects (2012) TNC RAG Earning the Rainbow Workshop Series (2021)	It can be hard to do, and hard to fund (because of accountability) so users of this approach should start small. But it is effective for places and people who are serious about innovation.	High potential for application where initiatives are new, being established in complex systems, and funders are on board.

Horizontal Evaluation	An approach that combines internal and external evaluators (peers and visitors) as opposed to hierarchical evaluation.	Horizontal Evaluation of the Youth Employment Strategy - Career Focus Stream (Employment and Social Development Canada, 2020)	This approach is a significant commitment and would require external support.	Some potential for application with organisation(s) who have capacity for 3-day workshop and additional supports for residents.
Participatory Evaluation	An approach that involves the stakeholders of a programme or policy in the evaluation process. This involvement can occur at any stage of the evaluation process	Supporting indigenous governance in Colombia (Guijt and Gaventa, 1998)	There is a lot of guidance for this approach which is simple and straightforward to apply. Some guidance may offer organisations a new lens on Participatory Evaluation. However, even full application of this approach will likely leave evaluators and participants with barriers to full engagement.	Some potential for application as refocussing on the participants using the guiding questions could help guide organisations in questioning if methods are truly people centred.
Principles-Focused Evaluation	This is a specific branch of Developmental Evaluation. It is an approach where we evaluate based on the principles from which we are working.	Vibrant Communities (Tamarack Institute, no date). 9 Evidence Based Principles to Help Youth Overcome Homelessness (The Homeless Youth Collaborative on Developmental Evaluation, 2014).	This approach describes goals, objectives, and implementation that closely align with the TNC's PCCE goals. However, as an approach, and a relatively new one, it is incredibly open to implementation, although there are guidance and examples available.	High potential for application although practical application would be specific to each case/ organisation.

Appreciative Inquiry

Brief Description

A 4-5 step cyclical approach to change that can be used as a tool for program evaluation and monitoring. It focuses solely on what is going well in an organisation and how it can be replicated and expanded, instead of highlighting and strategising how to fix what is going wrong.



([The David L. Cooperrider Center for Appreciative Inquiry at Champlain College, 2017](#))

The approach is based on 5 principles:

<i>Principle</i>	Summary	Details
<i>Constructionist Principle</i>	Words create worlds	Reality, as we know it, is a subjective vs. objective state and is socially created through language and conversations.
<i>Simultaneity Principle</i>	Inquiry creates change	The moment we ask a question, we begin to create a change. "The questions we ask are fateful."
<i>Poetic Principle</i>	We can choose what we study	Teams and organizations, like open books, are endless sources of study and learning. What we choose to study makes a difference. It describes – even creates – the world as we know it.
<i>Anticipatory Principle</i>	Images inspire action	Human systems move in the direction of their images of the future. The more positive and hopeful the image of the future, the more positive the present-day action.
<i>Positive Principle</i>	Positive questions lead to positive change	Momentum for [small or] large-scale change requires large amounts of positive affect and social bonding. This momentum is best generated through positive questions that amplify the positive core

([The David L. Cooperrider Center for Appreciative Inquiry at Champlain College, 2017](#))

Example(s) of Use:

[Imagine Chicago](#) (2019). An example of intergenerational interviewing, youth capacity building, and asset-based community development. A particularly relevant field this project utilises in its early days is civic dialogue, the principle of which is that the civic voice is key to shaping change. This

project's goal was to sustainably engage the community and used AI to kick this off ([Browne & Jain, 2002](#))

Application to TNC PCCE

Design and Development:

Has had a long period of development since it's initiation in 1980:

- Started in 1980, The Cleveland Clinic is described in context of the original intent and development of AI.
- While developed in the field of organisational behaviour (the intersection of Psychology and Business), the approach focuses heavily on 1-2-1 inquiry and individual stories of positive experiences.
- In many, if not all the examples, the approach is applied organically, in a way that makes sense for the organisation that isn't mechanical, forced, and therefore is more easily adopted especially as those who adopt are involved, sponsor, and honoured (e.g. The Roundtable Project, 1987).
- The Appreciative Research Carnival is an example of AI being taken over by clients (data collection and the development of future plans (1988).
- One iteration in 1989 did support development through refocusing into 5 areas, including people-centered approaches to sustainable economic development (SIGMA program for global change).
- Imagine Chicago is the first Community Development change management approach to adopt AI (2019).

([The David L. Cooperrider Center for Appreciative Inquiry at Champlain College, 2017](#))

Reference to Key Words/ Concepts:

- Community members are engaged at every stage of the examples reviewed.
- Imagine Chicago:
 - o *civic-engagement*
 - o *cross-cultural*
 - o *inter-generational strength-based community organizing*

TNC Barriers & Enablers of PCCE:

	Barriers	Approach's ability to address them
1	Organizational Structure & Supports	Potentially. This approach would take some mindset adjustment but has been shown to bring people together with its positive nature.
2	Staff capacity	Potentially. By focussing on small changes that can be made, and/ or highlighting ways in which capacity has been increased in the past.
3	Residents' capacity	Yes. This approach is focussed on demonstrating where residents have achieved their goals in a small way to identify what could be implemented on a larger scale.
4	Funding	Potentially. Like the other barriers, the basis of this approach is to highlight positive case histories; If achieving funding, especially to implement organisational change, is something that has been achieved in the past, it can be achieved again. However, this approach requires significant resources e.g. staff time.

Enablers		Does it leverage the enablers?
1	Sustained integration throughout organisation	Yes. The process can be naturally rolled out in a cyclical way.
2	Opportunities for staff to connect and exchange ideas	Yes.
3	Training, capacity, and confidence building opportunities	Yes, this approach requires a capacity building to facilitate the required mindset shift.
4	Resources for residents (e.g. funds, training, etc.)	Yes, the approach helps to build community capacity based on what has been successful in the past.
5	Community of practice (ideas, best practices, resources)	Yes, this is this approach's entire premise.

Other Considerations:

- This is an evaluation that can review civic engagement and create it through its approach.
- It has the power to turn a one-off high point into the baseline of an organisation through discussion, envisioning a future, and empowering those engaged to create it.
- Less problem solving, more future creation, based on the concept that words create worlds.
- Less deficit-focussed, more resource-rich highlighting.
- Not an easy mindset shift.
- Evidence suggests starting small and building from there by continuing the cycle.
- Be sure to focus significant time on 1-2-1 inquiry.

Summary

While this approach does not offer immediate solutions to all of the barriers identified by the TNC, it is a very flexible approach to potentially building towards capacity for these objectives to be achieved in a way that is inspiring, motivating, and unites community.

Additional Source(s):

- [Additional case studies of the Imagine Project](#) (Imagine Chicago, 2019)
- [How AI can be used for Evaluative Purposes](#) (Preskill, 2007)
- [In-depth look at applying AI](#) (Lee, 2010)

Beneficiary Assessment

Brief Description

The goal of Beneficiary Assessment (BA) is to understand the meaning people give to different areas of their lives to develop programs that offer people the chance to improve their lives as they see fit. BA is an approach that assesses the value of an intervention as perceived by the (intended) beneficiaries, thereby aiming to give voice to their priorities and concerns. It achieves this by gathering qualitative information through personal accounts and observation (watching people in their own environment).

Example(s) of Use:

[The World Bank and the evaluation of its Agricultural Extension program](#) (Salmen, 1999).

Application to TNC PCCE

Design and Development:

Developed and used by large-scale for-profit organisations e.g. banks, wishing to assess and manage their social impact.

Reference to Key Words/ Concepts:

- *From the perspective of its users.*
- *Fuller participation of people in their own development.*

TNC Barriers & Enablers of PCCE:

	Barriers	Approach's ability to address them
1	Organizational Structure & Supports	Experienced World Bank BAs take 12-16 weeks and it costs \$40,000 USD
2	Staff capacity	This approach relies heavily on staff to conduct evaluation methods without offering capacity enhancements.
3	Residents' capacity	This approach minimises resident involvement by utilising observations.
4	Funding	Does not specifically address these barriers.

Enablers		Does it leverage the enablers?
1	Sustained integration throughout organisation	No, the approach appears to be implemented in silos, focussing on individual projects.
2	Opportunities for staff to connect and exchange ideas	No, the approach appears to be implemented in silos, focussing on individual projects.
3	Training, capacity, and confidence building opportunities	None, this approach is typically implemented by an external evaluator.
4	Resources for residents (e.g. funds, training, etc.)	None.
5	Community of practice (ideas, best practices, resources)	None.

Other Considerations:

- Specific process (at least for banks):
 - o Understanding the context
 - o Selection and Orientation of Assessors
 - o Analysis and Reporting
- The review of the approach consistently refers to this as an *approach for managers to observe participants*, with the resulting information going *directly to managers and policymakers responsible for improving people's lives* ([Salmen, 1999](#)).
-

Summary

The goals of this approach match those of the TNC CVSC initiative, but the methods and language are organisationally driven, leaving the power with managers and policymakers. This acts as a cautionary tale for the importance of understanding all the details before adopting an evaluative approach, or even an approach to service provision.

Additional Source(s):

[World Bank's description of Beneficiary Assessment](#) (2016)

Developmental Evaluation

Brief Description

An approach to evaluation that offers ongoing feedback to the focus of evaluation for continuous development. Used in cases of social innovation, radical program redesign, complex issues, and crises where the measures of success cannot be pre-identified, and often implemented in an unpredictable environment e.g. change of govt resulting in large-scale policy change, or climate change.

Example(s) of Use:

[BC Health Authority Projects](#) (SFU, 2012)

1. Implementing a new set of excellence standards within mental health programming. A new approach to program standards alongside awareness of significant change and unknown environmental factors due to occur.
2. Challenging stigma in medical professionals treating substance users.
3. New approach to offering wrap-around services to underhoused substance users. Used discussions with a client to be used as a critical case example (anchor).

These examples using any other evaluation approach would have demanded they specify exactly how things will turn out.

Application to TNC PCCE

Design and Development:

This approach was developed using a developmental approach. Came from a seasoned evaluator (Michael Quinn Patton) who responded to community program implementers who needed something different.

Reference to Key Words/ Concepts:

- *Social innovation*
- Implemented in *co-design* situations

TNC Barriers & Enablers of PCCE:

	Barriers	Approach's ability to address them
1	Organizational Structure & Supports	Potentially, it is possible for this evaluation to be conducted by program staff and engage all folks.
2	Staff capacity	Yes, this approach is suggested as a more natural approach, it can be incorporated more easily into the work itself, especially as evaluation and program are entwined.
3	Residents' capacity	Potentially. Because of the openness of this approach, there is more opportunity, but also more risk of not responding to and/ or addressing all the needs of the clients who are engaging, resulting in disenfranchisement and potentially risky behaviour. However, the flexibility of this approach could allow for the 'program' to adapt based on residents' changing capacity throughout its course.

4	Funding	<p>Potentially, while this approach requires staff time, its flexible nature makes it easier to learn and apply.</p> <p>Once someone is familiar with this approach, it requires less resources than many other approaches because of its flexible nature. Although it is still an additional role for a staff person to play.</p>
----------	---------	--

Enablers		Does it leverage the enablers?
1	Sustained integration throughout organisation	<p>Yes, supports the embedding of outcomes from social innovation as it 'forces' documentation of the chain of innovations.</p> <p>Also supports having to deal with unintended consequences: Recognising them takes a lot of time and field work and other approaches do not typically allow for this. Additionally, it facilitates real-time feedback, resulting in a continuous development loop.</p>
2	Opportunities for staff to connect and exchange ideas	Yes, especially given this approach's very flexible nature and how integral storytelling is.
3	Training, capacity, and confidence building opportunities	Yes. Because this approach is flexible, again it lends itself to the evaluator and participating staff to identify training opportunities that help meet their goals, and opportunities to develop confidence would fit well with this work i.e. presenting, leading discussions, innovating.
4	Resources for residents (e.g. funds, training, etc.)	Potentially. By using this type of approach, funding could be applied for using the evaluation data at any point of the programming where funding and training for residents needs have been identified.
5	Community of practice (ideas, best practices, resources)	Yes, both through being applicable with a range of evaluation methods, but also other methods (see examples, adding language to existing practice).

Other Considerations:

- Moves away from the approach of supporting programs and people to be test-ready, and just supports programs to adapt to the world.
- Recommendation for implementation is to try something, understanding if it has worked, and trying something else as these things emerge. This will create a ripple effect, and eventually an entire system emerges from this intervention.
- You cannot be objective, but you can be independent. The evaluation becomes part of the program, and this is debated among evaluators as controversial.
- For people and places who are serious about innovation i.e. if you're working with communities and you don't have a model to evaluate against.
- Allows room for the program to respond to the false baseline phenomenon with retrospective baseline work.

- People go through programs in groups - these are often the most important part of a program for participants. This is called emergence, and it should be considered as part of the evaluation. Emergence is undetectable with approaches where the evaluator is separate or external to the program.

Summary

It can be hard to do, and hard to fund (because of accountability) so users of this approach should start small. But it is effective for places and people who are serious about innovation.

This is an approach for when things are not predictable, and an approach to be used by early adopters (including funders).

Additional Source(s):

[Planning and Evaluating for Social Change: An Evening at SFU with Michael Quinn Patton, Part One](#) (SFU, 2012)

Horizontal Evaluation

Brief Description

An approach that combines internal and external evaluators (peers and visitors) and engages them in a 3-day workshop of site visits, plenaries, presentations, and group work.

Example(s) of Use:

[Horizontal Evaluation of the Youth Employment Strategy - Career Focus Stream](#) (Employment and Social Development Canada, 2020)

Application to TNC PCCE

Design and Development:

Originally developed to evaluate new methodologies for agricultural research and development and continues to be used as an approach for evaluating research and development.

Reference to Key Words/ Concepts:

- *Powerful vs. powerless*
- *Expert vs. inexperienced* (perceived)
- *Sense of community*
- *Building of trust*

TNC Barriers & Enablers of PCCE:

	Barriers	Approach's ability to address them
1	Organizational Structure & Supports	Deliberately places peers (internal and external) in the role of evaluator which tends to lead to implementation of the recommendations, particularly because recommendations flow "horizontally" rather than the typical "vertical" approach to evaluation where outsiders are perceived to be of higher professional status. However, the specified methodology with requirement of expert facilitator could address staff capacity challenges but result in cost increase for this approach.
2	Staff capacity	Supported by expert facilitator.
3	Residents' capacity	Does not specifically address these barriers, and depending on residents' other commitments, a 3-day workshop could be either very inaccessible or accessible.
4	Funding	Does not specifically address these barriers.

Enablers		Does it leverage the enablers?
1	Sustained integration throughout organisation	The process is short and intense, so would suggest additional elements required to sustain progress, and/ or long-term planning of repeated cycles.
2	Opportunities for staff to connect and exchange ideas	Yes, in a formal yet dynamic environment. Approach is also known to building trusting communities and act as a platform for information sharing.
3	Training, capacity, and confidence building opportunities	Yes, offers the formal structure to support staff and community members to learn how to process and offer constructive criticism. It can also be confidence and capacity building to receive feedback.
4	Resources for residents (e.g., funds, training, etc.)	Offers capacity building in critiquing but does not offer opportunity to provide resident-facing funding.
5	Community of practice (ideas, best practices, resources)	Yes, this approach is specifically developed to achieve this.

Other Considerations:

- Very collaborative, can engage people who would implement the outcomes themselves.
- Provides practical solutions that could be implemented immediately.
- Workshops take a lot of pre-planning, targeted engagement based on skills, experience, and management of people involved (specific types of feedback required at certain times).
- The approach is specific, and there is specific guidance available for running a workshop ([Shareweb, Learning & Networking, no date](#)). It is recommended you approach a facilitator who is familiar with Horizontal Evaluation.
- The workshop happens quite far into the development process, so no engagement from external people until quite far in.
- If already using external evaluators and looking to take an approach that offers deeper insight, this approach could be used in conjunction as a way to offer more information and increase the level of people-centredness in your evaluation methods.

Summary

There are elements of this approach that appear to meet the goals of TNC's PCCE practices (i.e. removing the power dynamics, building community), however, the approach is highly prescribed with a lot of aspects that may not work for an organisation for a long list of potential reasons. If an organisation could take this approach, and residents are consulted on the implementation, it would be interesting to know the outcomes.

Additional Source(s):

[Horizontal Evaluation: Stimulating social learning among peers](#) (Thiele, G. et al. 2006)

Participatory Evaluation

Brief Description

An approach that involves the stakeholders of a programme or policy in the evaluation process. This involvement can occur at any stage of the evaluation process. Not necessarily just qualitative feedback or mapping but could be involved in the design and implementation or both qualitative and quantitative evaluation, for example, perhaps overseeing the work of external evaluators.

At the heart of PE are four broad principles: Participation, Negotiation, Learning, Flexibility. Other versions include:

- [Community-Based Participatory Evaluation](#) (Aldrich, L. et al., 2009)
- [Community-Based Evaluation](#) (Centre for Community Based Research, 2019)

Example(s) of Use:

Supporting indigenous governance in Colombia

Application to TNC PCCE

Design and Development:

Different forms existed in the 1970s. General descriptions point to aid organisations, governments, banks, and other large commercial organisations adopted this approach to be more accountable and to assess the ethical and environmental impact of their activities ([Guijt and Gaventa, 1998](#)).

This method exists to move away the responsibility of evaluation, impact, and the success of a project being taken on by government bodies and aid organisations while aiming to be more inclusive, accountable, and a responding to trends to consider internal experiences and local people's experiences into perspective.

However, this report also describes Participatory Evaluation as "provid[ing] an opportunity for development organisations to focus better on their ultimate goal of improving poor people's lives." ([Guijt and Gaventa, 1998](#)).

Reference to Key Words/ Concepts:

- *Stakeholders*
- *Program participants*

When initiating this type of evaluation, the key is to consider who to involve, how and why. Guijt, writing for WHO, offers questions to consider when doing this highlight the approach could be used and mapped to evaluate people-centred practices ([2014](#)):

- Is the purpose to ensure that the voices of those whose lives should have been improved by the programme or policy are central to the findings?
- Is it to ensure a relevant evaluation focus? Is it to hear people's own versions of change rather than obtain an external evaluator's set of indicators?
- Is it to build ownership of the UNICEF programme?

TNC Barriers & Enablers of PCCE:

	Barriers	Approach's ability to address them
1	Organizational Structure & Supports	Questionable. The goal of this evaluation approach is to improve evaluation/ programming, and improve ethicalness of evaluation; It is the right thing to do this type of evaluation, but it needs a considered approach to be truly effective, and not an additional drain on resources.
2	Staff capacity	No. The tools used all aim to compare a situation before and after intervention. This involves double reviewing, additional time, resource and capacity, something we have a scarcity of.
3	Residents' capacity	Yes, if properly applied. According to UNICEF, three questions must be continually asked, and the answers adjusted until a feasible approach to participation is found: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What purpose will stakeholder participation serve in this impact evaluation? 2. Whose participation matters, when and why? 3. When is participation feasible? Only after this can the question of how to make impact evaluation more participatory be answered
4	Funding	No. this barrier, like many of the others, is compounded.

	Enablers	Does it leverage the enablers?
1	Sustained integration throughout organisation	No obvious map for achieving this. There would need to be a purposeful and additional effort to achieve this.
2	Opportunities for staff to connect and exchange ideas	Potentially. This could be possible if enabler 1 is achieved.
3	Training, capacity, and confidence building opportunities	This would be necessary for success, but additional considerations would be required to achieve this.
4	Resources for residents (e.g. funds, training, etc.)	See enabler 3.
5	Community of practice (ideas, best practices, resources)	The approach allows for this, but as with the other enablers, would need concerted approach to build.

Other Considerations:

- Purpose of stakeholder engagement.
- Who's participation matters, when, and why.

- When is participation feasible? [What is feasibility? How are we measuring it? Who is measuring it?]
- Pilot the evaluation method [track all relevant elements].
- Continue to ask why.
- There is a lot of varying information on exactly how PE works, and what level of engagement is expected from participants. [University of Kansas](#) goes through in more detail, including guidance on Finding and training stakeholders to act as participant evaluators (no date).
- Benefits of PE are neither automatic nor guaranteed.

Summary

This is an approach our sector is well practiced in, however, there are no guarantees with this approach that we can achieve our PCCE goals.

Additional Source(s):

[A guide to Participatory Evaluation](#) (INTRAC, 2017)

Principles-Focused Evaluation

Brief Description

This is a specific branch of Developmental Evaluation. It is an approach where we evaluate based on the principles from which we are working. Using principles as an anchor, it can be used to evaluate beyond projects e.g., initiatives, programs, or strategies, etc. particularly within complex systems. This is because within social justice, the work is primarily principles driven.

This approach does not lend itself to standardised methods, it is more of a way of thinking. However, there tend to be overarching questions people lean towards when carrying out PBE:

- Is the principle(s) meaningful to those whom it is meant to provide guidance?
- Is the principle adhered to?
- If adhered to, does it lead toward desired results?

Note: Principles differ from values and goals in that values are beliefs, principles are behaviour based, and goals tell us specifically what we should do.

Example(s) of Use:

- [Vibrant Communities](#) (Tamarack Institute, no date) - Different communities across Canada, coming together to reduce poverty, deepen community, build youth futures, and climate transitions.
- [9 Evidence Based Principles to Help Youth Overcome Homelessness](#) (The Homeless Youth Collaborative on Developmental Evaluation, 2014). 6 youth homeless shelters in Minnesota looking to evaluate their effectiveness in adhering to principles through their work. The group ultimately discovered they needed to shift away from transactional service provision to building relationships, especially as this is a key skill homeless youth require to move to more stable housing situations.

Application to TNC PCCE

Design and Development:

This approach originated from Developmental Evaluation and became a specific form of DE. Most examples are non-profit based.

Reference to Key Words/ Concepts:

- *Social justice*
- *Social change*
- Described as an approach that focusses on *intended user of intended user*.

TNC Barriers & Enablers of PCCE:

	Barriers	Approach's ability to address them
1	Organizational Structure & Supports	Does not specifically address these barriers.
2	Staff capacity	Does not specifically address these barriers.
3	Residents' capacity	Does not specifically address these barriers.
4	Funding	Does not specifically address these barriers, and as an innovative approach, is recommended to be used with early adopters.

	Enablers	Does it leverage the enablers?
1	Sustained integration throughout organisation	The approach prescribes carrying out the process of establishing true principles; this will support sustainable integration throughout an organisation as a true PBE is inspirational and motivational. Also encourages the shift from 'silver bullet intervention' to building an environment of long-term learning and change.
2	Opportunities for staff to connect and exchange ideas	Yes, either within or between organisations; anywhere principles bring people together in their activities.
3	Training, capacity, and confidence building opportunities	There are no specific methodologies prescribed with this approach, but effective evaluation of the implementation of principles could be argued to build confidence.
4	Resources for residents (e.g. funds, training, etc.)	Not specifically offered by this approach.
5	Community of practice (ideas, best practices, resources)	Yes, where principles are shared. However, the concept of principles is to act as an anchor rather than offer specific practices and therefore all applications will likely be different, even between people/ organisations working from the same principle(s).

Other Considerations:

- A key element of this approach is to establish your principles and this takes considerable capacity.
- Supports focussing on the systemic causes of issues as opposed to attributing individual blame.
- Builds on community strengths instead of being deficit based.

- This is a helpful approach when there's complexity and systems interactions. If you are aware of systems change and managing complexity, you can use principles-based evaluation to guide you through this.

[\(Tamarack Institute, 2018\)](#)

Summary

This approach describes goals, objectives and implementation that closely align with the TNC's PCCE goals. However, as an approach, and a relatively new one, it is very open to implementation, although there are guidance and examples available. It would take some additional education, but could be highly relatable in the case of TNC.

Additional Source(s):

[Principles-Focused Evaluation: The Guide](#) (Patton, 2017)

References

Aldrich, L., Silva, D., Marable, D., & Sandman, E. (2009). *Using Community-Based Participatory Evaluation (CBPE) Methods as a Tool to Sustain a Community Health Coalition* [online]. *The Foundation Review*, 1(1). [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4087/FOUNDATIONREVIEW-D-09-00011>

Browne, B. W. & Jain, S. (2002). *Imagine Chicago: Ten Years of Imagination in Action* [online]. Chicago: Imagine Chicago. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://appreciativeinquiry.champlain.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Imagine-Chicago-Book.pdf>

Centre for Community Based Research. (2019). What is community based evaluation? [online]. Evaluating Refugee Programs. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://www.eval4refugee.ca/what-is-community-based-evaluation>

Cultural Research Network. (2020). *Decolonizing Evaluation: An in-depth look into equitable evaluation work with First Nations communities* [online]. Cultural Research Network. [Viewed July 2021]. Available from: <http://culturalresearchnetwork.org/october-27-28-virtual-study-group-decolonizing-evaluation-an-in-depth-look-into-equitable-evaluation-work-with-first-nations-communities/>

The David L. Cooperrider Center for Appreciative Inquiry at Champlain College., (2017). *5 Classic Principles of AI* [online]. AI Commons. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://appreciativeinquiry.champlain.edu/learn/appreciative-inquiry-introduction/5-classic-principles-ai/>

The David L. Cooperrider Center for Appreciative Inquiry at Champlain College., (2017). *5-D Cycle of Appreciative Inquiry* [online]. AI Commons. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://appreciativeinquiry.champlain.edu/learn/appreciative-inquiry-introduction/5-d-cycle-appreciative-inquiry/>

The David L. Cooperrider Center for Appreciative Inquiry at Champlain College., (2017). *Appreciative Inquiry – A Brief History* [online]. AI Commons. [Viewed May 2021]. Available from: <https://appreciativeinquiry.champlain.edu/learn/appreciative-inquiry-brief-history/>

The David L. Cooperrider Center for Appreciative Inquiry at Champlain College., (2017). *Appreciative Inquiry: Toward a Methodology for Understanding and Enhancing Organizational Innovation* [online]. AI Commons. [Viewed May 2021]. Available from: <https://appreciativeinquiry.champlain.edu/educational-material/appreciative-inquiry-toward-methodology-understanding-enhancing-organizational-innovation/>

EdX., (2020). Decolonising Evaluation [online]. EdX. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://www.edx.org/course/decolonising-evaluation>

Employment and Social Development Canada. (2020). Horizontal Evaluation of the Youth Employment Strategy — Career Focus Stream [online]. Canada: Evaluation Directorate – Strategic and Service Policy Branch. [Viewed July 2021]. Available from: <https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/canada/employment-social-development/corporate/reports/evaluations/horizontal-career-focus/youth-employment-strategy-career-focus-EN.pdf>

- Guijt, I., (2014). (2014). *Participatory Approaches, Methodological Briefs: Impact Evaluation 5*, UNICEF. Office of Research, Florence. [Viewed May 2021]. Available from: https://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/Participatory_Approaches_ENG.pdf
- Guijt, I., & Gaventa, J. (1998). *PARTICIPATORY MONITORING & EVALUATION: LEARNING FROM CHANGE*. IDS Policy Briefing [online]. (12). Unknown. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://www.ids.ac.uk/download.php?file=files/dmfile/PB12.pdf>
- The Homeless Youth Collaborative on Developmental Evaluation., (2014). *9 Evidence Based Principles to Help Youth Overcome Homelessness* [online]. Unknown: Unknown. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://face2face.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/9-Evidence-Based-Principles-to-Help-Youth-Overcome-Homelessness-Webpublish.pdf>
- Imagine Chicago., (2019). *Cultivating Hope & Civic Engagement* [online]. Imagine Chicago. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://www.imaginechicago.org/>
- Imagine Chicago., (2019). Global Imagine Projects [online]. Imagine Chicago. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://www.imaginechicago.org/global-initiatives>
- INTRAC., (2017). *Participatory Evaluation* [online]. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://www.intrac.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Participatory-evaluation.pdf>
- Johnston-Goodstar, K. (2019). Decolonizing evaluation: The necessity of evaluation advisory groups in Indigenous evaluation [online]. Centre for Suicide Prevention. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://www.suicideinfo.ca/resource/decolonizing-evaluation-the-necessity-of-evaluation-advisory-groups-in-indigenous-evaluation/>
- Patton, M. Q., (2017). *Principles-Based Evaluation: The Guide*. New York: Guilford Publications
- Preskill, H. (2007). *Using Appreciative Inquiry in Evaluation Practice* [online]. Better Evaluation. [Viewed May 2021]. Available from: https://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/Preskill_Using%20Appreciative.pdf
- LaFrance, J. & Nichols, R. (2010). Reframing Evaluation: Defining an Indigenous Evaluation Framework [online]. The Canadian Journal for Program Evaluation. [Viewed August 2021]. Available from: <https://evaluationcanada.ca/secure/23-2-013.pdf>
- Lee, S. (2010). *appreciative inquiry foundations and practice* [online]. Learning Personalized. [Viewed May 2021]. Available from: <https://www.learningpersonalized.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Appreciative-InquiryWorkbookSallieLee.pdf>
- Salmen, L. F., (1999). *A Review of Beneficiary Assessments of Agricultural Extension and An Inquiry into their Potential as a Management Tool* [online]. Unknown: AKIS. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/voice-of-farmer-in-ag-research-wbank.pdf>
- Shareweb, Learning & Networking., (no date). *Horizontal Evaluation* [online]. Shareweb, Learning & Networking. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: https://www.shareweb.ch/site/Learning-and-Networking/sdc_km_tools/Documents/Horizontal%20Evaluation.pdf
- SFU Continuing Studies., (2012). *Planning and Evaluating for Social Change: An Evening at SFU with Michael Quinn Patton, Part One* [online]. YouTube. [Viewed May 2021]. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b7n64JEjUUK>

SFU Continuing Studies,. (2012). *Planning and Evaluating for Social Change: An Evening at SFU with Michael Quinn Patton, Part Two* [online]. *YouTube*. [Viewed May 2021]. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G-aF1buihw0>

Tamarack Institute., (2018). *Resource Library* [online]. *Tamarack Institute*. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://www.tamarackcommunity.ca/library/webinar-principles-focused-evaluation>

Tamarack Institute., (no date). *Vibrant Communities* [online]. *Tamarack Institute*. [Viewed June 2021]. Available from: <https://www.tamarackcommunity.ca/vibrant-communities>

Thiele, G., Devaux, A., Velasco, C., & Manrique, K., (2006). *Horizontal Evaluation: Stimulating social learning among peers*. [online]. ILAC Briefs 52522, Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative. [Viewed July 2021]. Available from: <https://ideas.repec.org/p/ags/ilacbr/52522.html> doi: 10.22004/ag.econ.52522

University of Kansas. (no date). *Section 6. Participatory Evaluation* [online]. *Community Toolbox*. [Viewed May 2021]. Available from: <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/evaluate/evaluation/participatory-evaluation/main>

The World Bank., (2016). *Beneficiary assessment: an approach described (English)* [online]. *The World Bank*. [Viewed July 2021]. Available from: <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/802501468739312293/beneficiary-assessment-an-approach-described>