

# How does stakeholder engagement in program evaluation really work?

Janet Clinton, Sarah Appleton, Kathryn Cairns & Rebecca Broadbent

University of Auckland, New Zealand  
Australasian Evaluation Society International Conference  
Canberra. 2009.



## Aims

- Explore stakeholder's engagement in program evaluation
- Investigate the impact of program evaluation
- Describe the relationship between program change and stakeholder evaluation engagement
- Feedback on the measurement and validity of these concepts

## Stakeholder Evaluation Capacity

The practice of stakeholder engagement is

- Complex
- Time consuming
- For what gain

- Positive stakeholder evaluation engagement and capacity relates to positive organizational learning & change.
- The capacity & willingness to engage in program evaluation positively correlates with program outcomes and sustainability
- Stakeholder evaluation readiness is developmental

## Influence of evaluation

Evaluation has been related to

- Learning
- Program implementation
- Informed decision making
- Program outcomes
- Increase change
- Sustainability

- Understand stakeholder engagement ?
- Tease out the relationship?
- Does it work?

## Hypothesis

- Evaluation readiness is a measure of stakeholder engagement in evaluation
- Adaptation is a measure of the stakeholders program change

Then we could Hypothesis:

- There will be a positive relationship over time between stakeholder evaluation readiness and program adaptation
- Evaluation will positively impact with program change and program sustainability

## Methodology

- Used multiple forms of data collected in long term evaluation
  - Measure evaluation engagement
  - Adaption
  - Program variables
  - Process variables
- Recoded the data using scoring rubric to create a uniform measure
- Analysed the relationships

# Evaluation of Let's Beat Diabetes

A five year evaluation of a district-wide plan in Counties Manukau, NZ, aimed at long-term sustainable changes to prevent and/or delay the onset of Type II Diabetes, slow disease progression, and increase the quality of life for people with diabetes

## ACTION AREAS



- **Social Marketing**
- **Urban Design**
- **Food Industry Accord**
- **Health Promotion**
- **Well Child services**
- **Schools Accord**
- **Community Leadership**
- **Primary Care**
- **Vulnerable Families**
- **Service Integration**

- **Maori support**
- **Pacific people support**
- **Funding environment**
- **Learning environment**
- **Sustainable governance**
- **Organizational development**
- **Information systems**



ENABLERS



# Evaluation Measures

The key findings were coded and combined into a database to provide an overview of the development status of the initiatives, Action Areas, program enablers and the overall LBD program.

## Program

- ❖ Type, quality
- ❖ Adherences to program plans
- ❖ Adaptation and program change
- ❖ Degree of implementation

## Program Outcome

- ❖ Contribution to a common goal
- ❖ Focused initiative outcomes

## Program Organizational Development

- ❖ Organizational development
- ❖ Sustainability
- ❖ Collaboration
- ❖ Evaluation capacity and willingness

## Data Sources

- **Program Monitoring data at initiative and action area:**
  - Monthly reports from each
  - Operational reports
  - Program reports
- **In-depth Interviews:**
  - Program provider
  - Key stakeholders
  - Community leaders
- **Questionnaires: Action Area and initiative**
  - Collaboration
  - Sustainability
  - Organizational Development
- **Focus group interviews**
  - Community participants
- **Evaluation Case studies**

Evaluation Variable	Scoring	Definition and Evidence
Meeting KPIs	No information = 0 Unmet = 1-3 Partially met = 4-7 Met = 8-10	<b>Degree to which the initiative or Action Area met their KPIs to date.</b> Programme reporting, meetings minutes and interview data.
Adaptation	No information = 0 Low = 1-3 Medium = 4-7 High = 8-10	<b>Changes to plans or KPIs to suit context. Based on recorded change.</b> Programme reporting, meeting minutes and interview data.
Degree of Implementation	No information = 0 Low = 1-3 Medium = 4-7 High = 8-10	<b>Degree to which the programme or goals have been implemented.</b> Programme reporting, meeting minutes and interview data.
Organisational Development	No information = 0 Low = 1-3 Medium = 4-7 High = 8-10	<b>Degree to which the Action Area or initiatives have organisational structures.</b> Programme reporting, meetings minutes and interview data.
Progress	No information = 0 Low = 1-3 Medium = 4-7 High = 8-10	<b>Overall view of the progress made towards goals.</b> Programme reporting, meetings minutes and interview data.
Collaboration	No information = 0 Low = 1-3 Medium = 4-7 High = 8-10	<b>Degree of partnership or relationship.</b> Programme reporting, meetings minutes and interview data.
Sustainability	No information = 0 Low = 1-3 Medium = 4-7 High = 8-10	<b>Degree of programme sustainability.</b> Programme reporting and interview data.
Evaluation Readiness	No information = 0 Low = 1-3 Medium = 4-7 High = 8-10	<b>The preparedness to begin evaluation.</b> Programme reporting. Return of self-completion questionnaires.

## Year By Year Relationships

- **Monitoring**

- KPI's → degree of implementation
- Adaptation negative → KPIs

- **Progress Outcomes**

- KPI
- Evaluation Readiness
- Degree of implementation
- Organization development

- **Organizational management**

- Collaboration: Sustainability and KPI
- Sustainability: KPI and collaboration
- Evaluation Readiness: Adaptation year 1 & Outcomes year 2

## Relationships: Over four years

- No statistically significant differences in the means across the four years
- Combined data across all years

Overall Means

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Meeting KPIs	5.29	2.19	52
Adaptation	2.60	1.77	52
Degr of Implement	5.92	2.27	52
Org Develop	7.27	1.85	39
Team Cohesion	5.62	2.23	26
Sustainability	5.91	2.08	39
EvalReadiness	5.47	2.15	39
Progress	6.04	2.11	52

	Component	
	1	2
Team Cohesion	<b>.916</b>	.018
Sustainability	<b>.824</b>	-.109
Org Development	<b>.756</b>	.104
Eval Readiness	<b>.651</b>	.099
Deg of Implement	.159	<b>.885</b>
Progress	.383	<b>.780</b>
Adaptation	-.382	<b>.741</b>
Meeting KPIs	.372	<b>.683</b>

Dimensions  
Component Correlation Matrix

Component	1	2
1	1.000	.223
2	.223	1.000

## Overall relationships

	Meeting KPIs	Adaptation	Degree of Implementation	Organizational Development	Team Cohesion	Sustainability	Eval Readiness	Progress
Meeting KPIs	1	.12	.75**	.30	.57**	.36*	.17	.85**
<b>Adaptation</b>	.12	1	.44**	.10	-.18	-.20	.12	.31*
Degree of Implementation	.75**	.44**	1	.40*	.26	.24	.28	.82**
<b>Organizational Development</b>	.30	.10	.40*	1	.67**	.60**	.46**	.40*
Team Cohesion	.57**	-.18	.26	.67**	1	.57**	.64**	.53**
<b>Sustainability</b>	.36*	-.20	.24	.60**	.57**	1	.36*	.33*
Evaluation Readiness	.17	.12	.28	.46**	.64**	.36*	1	.45**
<b>Progress</b>	.85**	.31*	.82**	.40*	.53**	.33*	.45**	1

## So what does this mean?

- Clear relationship between program and process variables
- Demonstrated the relationship between program fidelity program outcomes and program management
- No direct relationship between change and stakeholder engagement in evaluation
- The relationship with evaluation readiness with the program variables

Readiness relates to

- Organisational development
- Team Cohesion
- Sustainability
- Program Progress

## Conclusion

- Reject the first hypothesis: That there is a relationship between stakeholder engagement and adaptation
- Accept the second hypothesis: Evaluation will positively impact with program change and program sustainability

## Challenges

- Just a small part of the puzzle
- Evaluation willingness and the capacity might need to be separated to really understand the concept
- There is a problem with adaptation as a the measure of program change
- There isn't enough data to make it robust
- Its all just circular

- Where to next?
  - Combine data from another project
  - Build the data set look for causality





Thank you

[j.clinton@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:j.clinton@auckland.ac.nz)