Evaluating Get it On! – Challenges for the evaluation of social marketing.
*Paper presentation from Jeffery Adams and Stephen Neville, Massey University.*
Social marketing programmes aim to influence the behaviour(s) of a target audience; however the evaluation of these programmes often does little more than describe the programme, and identify the programme's reach and people's awareness of it. In this presentation we discuss the evaluation of Get it On! a successful New Zealand programme which uses social marketing and other health promotion concepts to influence (i.e. maintain and/or increase) gay and bisexual men's use of condoms for anal sex. This presentation will demonstrate the usefulness and appropriateness of an integrated programme evaluation design drawing on program theory-based evaluation, combined with a valuing orientation utilizing evaluation rubrics. The evaluation aimed to move well beyond simply providing descriptive facts about the programme to provide robust and useful information about the quality of the programme's implementation as well as its impact on influencing behaviour. Such information is vital to funders, program staff and other stakeholders in planning ongoing initiatives to reduce the incidence of HIV/AIDS in New Zealand communities.

Understanding social change in community action: Reconciling complexity.
*Paper presentation from Dr. Sarah Appleton-Dyer and Dr. Adrian Field, Synergia Ltd.*
An underlying premise of many community-based social change initiatives is that achieving attitude and behaviour change among individuals, families and communities depends on creating interventions that work across multiple spheres of activity.
Understanding the interplay of multi-faceted projects across multiple contexts is challenging, and measuring the impact of a single community action initiative on attitude and behavioural change is often seen as daunting, if not futile.
We are working with a range of community initiatives to address bullying, and attitudes towards disabled people. Each project receives limited central government funding with a one-year timeframe for delivery. In such circumstances, evaluation support needs to represent the needs of the funder, the aspirations of the provider, the limits of the project budget, and the dynamic contexts and needs of the projects.
Using rapid reflection approaches, and drawing on results-based accountability, we have worked with community organisations to understand their projects and support them in developing evaluation approaches that are feasible and useful for supporting development and accountability. We will discuss the value of this approach in supporting community organisations to evaluate their work.
This presentation identifies the challenges and opportunities of evaluating community-based initiatives designed to drive social change. Our experience provides practical examples of what works, and equally what does not work when trying to evaluate social change initiatives.

Te Whare Tapa Whā: Providing the structure for conceptualising and measuring youth outcomes for mainstream policy, practice and funding needs.
*Paper presentation from Robyn Bailey and Rae Torrie, Evaluation Works Ltd and Raechel Osborne, Kapiti Youth Support.*
Two related perennial challenges in the evaluation whare are measuring outcomes and doing so in a way that meets a range of stakeholders needs - practitioners, managers, funders and policy officials. Being able to measure meaningful outcomes and demonstrate value is key to the survival of many publicly funded health and social services. Just as important, these organisations and their staff want to know that they are doing...
their best for the people they work alongside. They also want to provide credible, robust evidence about the impact they are making. We think we have found a way forward. This presentation will show how Kapiti Youth Support – a mainstream youth one-stop health and social support service is now able to provide evidence to address fundamental policy and practice questions such as: (1) Are those using our services experiencing positive outcomes? (2) Does our service work for all people, irrespective of gender and ethnicity? (3) Does it work for those ‘most in need’ of positive outcomes? The presentation will illustrate how the blending of western evaluation, youth development and a Māori health model has built a pragmatic, strengths-based, holistic structure that enables answers to ‘big picture’ and organisational questions to be provided seamlessly with day-to-day clinical assessment and client tracking. The presentation will also highlight the challenges in going forward with ‘testing’ the model and measures in other youth one-stop shops.

Building an evaluation system to assess the effectiveness of the Like Minds, Like Mine regional anti-discrimination training nationwide.

*Paper presentation from Andrea Bates, Kites Trust and Judy Oakden, Judy Oakden Consultancy.*

This presentation discusses the challenges and benefits of developing an integrated evaluation system in a context of high funder and community expectations for evidence and a path going forward. The presentation covers how Kites Trust in engaging with external evaluators, the Ministry of Health and the regional Like Minds, Like Mine providers worked to dispel discriminatory myths and stereotypes that typically operated within key stakeholder groups. Like Minds is a nationwide programme aimed at reducing the stigma and discrimination associated with mental illness. Like Minds has two arms, a national campaign that includes the nationwide television campaign, and a regional programme which has regional Providers giving anti-discrimination workshops to target groups in the community. Kites Trust holds a national contract to develop and deliver training to Like Minds Providers. The Like Minds Providers are tasked with taking the ‘Power of Contact’ to their communities and to disseminate the Like Minds anti-discrimination message. Training by Like Minds training providers was evaluated by integrating the Power of Contact values within the evaluation framework.

It ain’t what you do, it’s the way that you do it: Evaluation processes that deliver maximum impact and influence.

*Paper presentation from Clare Bear, Ministry of Primary Industries and Judy Oakden, The Kinnect Group.*

Michael Quinn Patton maintains “the central challenge to professional practice remains doing evaluations that are useful and actually used” (2008 p xvi). How might commissioners and evaluators in Aotearoa build usability into their evaluation design and rollout from the outset, to maximise their evaluation’s impact and influence? We contend that robust evaluation occurs when the evaluation processes and ways of working contribute to the usability and value of the evaluation as much as the final product. This case example from the Evaluation of the Sustainable Farming Fund shares practical tips about how usability was successfully built into the evaluation from the start, including:

- at the scoping, relationship building and contracting stages
- in the way external evaluators engaged with commissioners to design a multi-purpose evaluation approach
- the stance taken to project management and client engagement
- planning communication processes from the outset, including how findings would be communicated with stakeholders.

This joint presentation is by a commissioner and an external evaluator talking together about some of the useful lessons learned.

Laying the solid foundation to build effective evaluation practice.

*Paper presentation from Dr. Rowena Brown, Gregor Peterson and Jane Renwick, Evaluation Consult.*

This presentation emphasises the importance of incorporating and adapting key evaluation values and principles across a range of organisational settings. Indeed, as evaluators we face a dynamic and ever changing environment. The need for evidence based practice has become increasingly important to identify both financial and non-financial outcomes, and for organisations to effectively tell their performance story. In addition, there is a growing need to incorporate best practice to provide value for money and to develop an
understanding of key issues faced by organisations that inform evaluation practice. This presentation draws on our own experience and practice as evaluators, highlighting the need to embed and adapt core evaluation values. We will discuss key projects that demonstrate how we express our values through our approach and a collaborative way of working. We will emphasise our commitment to understanding multiple organisational facets – at the individual, team, and organisational level. In particular, the importance of developing internal capacity and capability of organisations to enable strong, sustainable, fit-for-purpose ways of working.

Opening up the house—are we getting the invitation right?

*Paper presentation from Karen Carding, Education Review Office.*

The Education Review Office reports on the quality of education for children in the schools and early childhood services of Aotearoa New Zealand. Parents, whanau and aiga are the primary audience of our reports. As for other government departments, ERO’s aim is an informed citizenry that is well positioned to demand high quality provision of services. This presentation explores how improving access to our house, our whare, can enhance families and communities involvement in the education of their children.

Through the development of its evaluation methodologies ERO has moved to an evaluation approach that is complementary to each institution’s internal review. Furthermore, ERO’s Statement of Intent 2013-16 makes it clear that ERO wants to promote the more active engagement of parents, whānau and communities in their children’s education.

This presentation describes the ways in which ERO’s current work seeks to promote this engagement, both locally and nationally. It explains some successful practice in engaging with families and communities about their children’s education, through the evaluation process. A range of further possibilities and considerations are also explored as ERO continues to ‘get the invitation right’ and ‘open up the house’. The presentation will be of interest to evaluators who are wanting to promote and build the participation of parents/whānau as critical stakeholders in the evaluation of social service provision.


*Paper presentation from Dr. Sarah Carne, ACC and Alice Kan, UMR Research.*

Client Self-Management (CSM) is widely recognised as an essential component of best practice in the provision of long-term disability supports; however there is no ‘one size fits all’ model that can be utilised. This presentation will provide a brief overview of the ACC CSM model and the evaluation of the pilot as background to inform a focused discussion on lessons learned from this evaluation.

The presentation will identify the evaluation challenges, how these were addressed and share key learnings that can be applied in other evaluation contexts and settings. The evaluation of ACC CSM was designed to enable learnings from clients to feedback to the project team and inform ongoing programme refinement. The presentation will also illustrate how evaluation can be a vehicle to develop client-centred programmes.

Walking the line: ethical evaluation practice in a contentious context.

*Seminar from Marnie Carter, Ned Hardie-Boys and Jessie Wilson, Allen and Clarke.*

Evaluation can be a contentious process, with evaluators required to navigate, analyse and critically appraise the often conflicting perspectives different stakeholders hold regarding the effectiveness (or otherwise) of an intervention, policy or programme.

This seminar reflects on a recently completed implementation and process evaluation of a large scale change to the funding and supply of a medical device. The change was high profile and controversial, and involved a range of stakeholder groups including government officials, health professionals, the medical devices industry and health consumers. Each of these groups held different (and often opposing) but equally valid views on the effectiveness of the change process. The evaluation team was required to sift through the evidence to reach robust evaluative conclusions, whilst respecting and reflecting what was for many a very personal issue which they saw as critical to managing their health and wellbeing.

This seminar will reflect on key lessons learned in undertaking evaluation in a contentious context, and will offer practical tips and techniques including:

- how to walk the line between acknowledging the validity of the impacts reported by participants, but also critically reflect on whether the issues raised are objectively verifiable
- tips on checking for biases, including ensuring the evaluator is not swayed (too much) by the emotive nature of the topic
• how to present opposing views objectively, yet remaining respectful of participants’ stories and experiences.

Designing a Programme to support the Tangata Whenua, Community and Voluntary Sector to identify, understand and report on their effectiveness and results.

Group discussion with a Community Research speaker.
Community Research is a national NGO whose role is to develop research capacity in the Tangata Whenua, Community and Voluntary Sector.
In this discussion
• You will hear about how Tangata Whenua, Community and Voluntary Sector organisations make the shift from knowing what works to doing what works.
• You will hear about the tools and approaches that support NGO’s to do this work, and you’ll hear about their current needs and circumstances.
Community Research will present the following
• ‘Designing a Programme to support non-profits identifying, understanding and reporting on their effectiveness and results’ and the feedback received.(Community Solutions “Thinkpiece”, August 2013)
• Ideas for an online collection to support NGO’s

Group Discussion:
• What resources and tools are useful to NGO’s for evaluation, and why?
• How to maximise the use of these?

Evaluative and Causal Reasoning.

Paper presentation from Jane Davidson, Real Evaluation Ltd and George Julnes, The University of Baltimore.
“Evaluation as a field has become methodologically manic obsessive. Too many of us, and those who commission us, think it’s all about methods. It’s not. It’s all about reasoning.”
This recent quote from Michael Quinn Patton (in reference to the importance of Michael Scriven’s contributions to evaluation theory) is perhaps less true in Aotearoa than it is in the States. Nevertheless, it is an important reminder not to get lost in the methodological details.
In this session, Jane Davidson and George Julnes team up to explore what really underpins validity in both evaluative and causal claims.
Jane will cover the fundamentals of both evaluative and causal reasoning, using examples of causal inference using qualitative and mixed method evidence. George will then outline his framework for understanding validity in causal and ‘valuative’ inference.
An interactive discussion among George, Jane and the audience will follow.

Bridging Community Indicators with Performance Measurements: A Work In Progress.

Paper presentation from Patria de Lancer Julnes, PhD, University of Baltimore.
This presentation will describe the results of a study to understand the process of integration of community indicators with performance measurements (CI-PM) in organizations recognized as exemplars of integration by the Community Indicators Consortium (http://www.communityindicators.net/). Guided by the assumption that this integration can help entities better assess their progress toward improving the quality of lives of citizens and achieving their vision for their community, the research focused on reviewing the extent to which CI-PM integration is advancing and what circumstances seem to support the process. While community indicators refer to quantitative data on the outcomes at the societal level, performance measures are quantitative data about the performance (inputs, outputs, outcomes, etc.) of programs. This difference creates methodological difficulties for those wishing to integrate these two decision-making tools. In addition, our study indicates that integrating the two is an ongoing dynamic process that varies in approach and reported results. These results will be discussed as well as suggestions for the roles that evaluators can play in helping to facilitate CI-PM integration. These include improving (1) the engagement of citizens by bringing in the practices of participatory evaluation, (2) the conceptualizing of programme theories, and (3) the understanding of the complexities of the systems that maintain public problems and the systems by which they are addressed.

Evaluating a community funding strategy across multi-site projects aiming to reduce alcohol-related harm.

Paper presentation from Pauline Dickinson, Jeffery Adams and Lanuola Asiasiga, SHORE & Whariki Research Centre, Massey University.
The Health Promotion Agency in New Zealand has implemented a national community funding strategy to support communities in their efforts to reduce alcohol-related harm. The funding strategy targets three priority population groups: Maori, Pacific and Youth. One of the aims of the strategy is to create a nationally networked community of groups who can share their learning through a range of media including video, websites and face to face meetings.

This initiative was evaluated over three years (2010 – 2012). The evaluators have used a case study approach and identified cases contributing to three levels of outcomes for the funding strategy: awareness of alcohol-related harm, behaviour change and environmental and policy change. This presentation will describe the evaluation methodology, criteria for the selection of cases, and examples of cases. The presentation will identify key learnings that can be used in other contexts and settings to evaluate multi-site initiatives. The success of the funding strategy will also be discussed.

Renovating our ‘evaluation house’ within the house of Ngāpuhi: Exploring the potential for ‘place-conscious’ evaluation design.

Mini-workshop from Maxine Dignan, Education Review Office.

This mini workshop will explore the nature of context in the small, rural, bicultural communities of Aotearoa New Zealand. The people in these communities have often felt under-served by research and evaluation. Delving into the influence and potential of place-conscious, contextually responsive evaluation should help evaluators to understand how evaluation design and practice could improve, in order to better serve these communities.

Evaluation literature emphasises the need to understand the context in which evaluations are undertaken. Fitzpatrick (2012) and Kushner (2000) challenge the evaluation community to think about context in more complex ways, to develop a more sophisticated concept of context, and to consider the extent to which it matters. This workshop uses place-consciousness or place-based pedagogy (Gruenewald, 2003; Manning, 2009) to consider cultural and contextual awareness and responsiveness. Using an evaluation scenario in Te Tai Tokerau, the far north of Aotearoa New Zealand, participants will workshop the implications of increased awareness about place on evaluation design. I am interested in how this discussion could help evaluators working with rural communities and iwi groups across the country, to think differently about evaluation design.


Infographics in evaluation – using infographics with serious data.

Paper presentation from Anne Dowden, REWA and Margaret Stevenson-Wright, NZ Transport Agency.

Developing simple, factual, infographics to present evaluation data is effective. This paper will describe how infographics were used to help educate, persuade and motivate change across a broad range of New Zealand stakeholders.

New Zealand drivers are killed or seriously injured on New Zealand roads every year because they are impaired by drugs or prescription medications. It’s a serious issue but it’s also a complex one.

Using concrete New Zealand data, from more than a dozen sources, the team distilled key evaluation data to be portrayed simply, using infographics.

The presenters will describe the process of developing infographics, tools used, key features of infographics, data selection (the art of communication), some design considerations, and traps to watch for.

The presenters will share the infographics used in the project and describe the positive and negative reactions of audiences to these infographics. These audiences include stakeholders in Government Agencies, in the health sector and local communities.

The presenters will demonstrate how the use of simple and relevant evaluation data in graphic form, can educate, persuade and motivate stakeholders to rethink and reconsider their roles and responsibilities at the national, strategic level and in operational, day-to-day, interactions.
Developmental evaluation, a supporting role promoting change through evaluation using New Zealand data.

Paper presentations from Anne Dowden, REWA and Margaret Stevenson-Wright, NZ Transport Agency.

New Zealand drivers are killed or seriously injured on New Zealand roads every year because they are impaired by drugs or prescribed medications. “There is no evidence!” “The standard data says that we don’t have a problem.” These types of comments are often the starting point of change. The presenters will describe how evaluation has an important role in supporting change when the evidence base appears to be limited.

The presenters will describe the challenges and key learnings of developing a robust evidence base for this project. They will share just how valuable a developmental evaluation approach this has been in contributing towards the project’s success:

- Development evaluation can help to frame concepts, surface issues and track change in ways that inform projects in real time, as well as providing baseline and outcome data.
- Working in a developmental evaluation role, in close partnership with a creative yet determined client and a broad stakeholder group, we identified evidence to inform the policy case for the project, form the project evidence base, confirm the theory of change, and structure the evaluation framework.
- The approach used has resulted in a broad and robust evidence-base of New Zealand data that meets the high expectations and level of rigor that stakeholders require. It has achieved this without being derailed by tight resource constraints.

Integrating qualitative and quantitative data analysis - Mixed methods data analysis techniques in evaluation.

Mini-workshop from Lisa Dyson, University of Auckland and Dr. Sarah Appleton-Dyer, Synergia.

Mixed methods are often used in evaluation, but are perhaps not utilised to their fullest potential. Drawing on Jennifer Greene’s contributions to the mixed methods conversation, this mini workshop will briefly describe mixed methods purposes and designs before discussing data analysis. While Greene (2007) has argued that analysis is “the heart of the investigative and interpretive process”, integration during analysis has been described as “difficult to do” (Bryman, 2008).

The primary focus of the presentation will be mixed methods data analysis, specifically techniques that integrate qualitative and quantitative data. The workshop will offer:

- A brief presentation on mixed methods
- Interactive group discussion on data integration
- A practical exercise using case examples
- Handouts and a reading list to support use after the workshop

Strengthening the ‘evaluation whare’ to better address inequity.

Paper presentation from Carolyn English and Ruth Nicholas, Education Review Office.

The challenge for the education system is to lift more students to a higher level of achievement, with a broader range of skills and less inequity of outcomes than ever before. Primary schools’ contribution is to have more students achieving at or above the national standards – the reference points for the NZ curriculum’s goal of confident, connected actively involved lifelong learners. In 2012, approximately 70 percent of Year 1 to 8 students were achieving at this level. The overall achievement of Māori and Pacific students was lower. What some schools have done hasn’t worked for some students. Schools need to evaluate the impact of their actions so they know what works and what doesn’t and adapt their practice accordingly. During a national evaluation in 2013 ERO supported school leaders to be more evaluative by asking: “Let’s explore where you have supported students to accelerate progress and evaluate why this worked” This presentation will describe the use and impact of ERO’s methodology to strengthen the pou of our ‘evaluation whare’ so that:

- schools and ERO can better serve students, especially those who have not experienced success
- the wider evaluation community can draw insights when focusing on issues of equity.

The role of the internal evaluator: A perspective from inside the house.

Paper presentation from Sally Faisandier, ACC.

This presentation will draw on my personal experience of working for research and evaluation teams inside four government agencies as an internal evaluator. Common tasks for internal evaluators are to advocate for research and evaluation input across the business; negotiate the scope of projects and then contract some out
to external providers; undertake research and evaluation projects ourselves; and ensure that findings are utilised.

The focus of this presentation will be to make visible the inside workings of a typical government agency so that contract evaluators will be more knowledgeable and understanding of the challenges faced by their in-house project manager. This may assist participants to write successful proposals; mitigate risks that the in-house evaluator is trying to manage; and ensure that their evaluation findings are utilised.

Typical challenges for the internal evaluator will be covered, including the following:

- the political context, such as the impact of election year, and the influence of a minister
- negotiating the scope of an evaluation with internal stakeholders
- managing relationships and the expectations of internal stakeholders
- the evaluation budget, and the implications of the government financial year
- what is expected of external contractors
- report requirements and the dissemination of evaluation findings.

**Evaluating Health Promotion in Primary Health Care: Balancing Passion and Pragmatism.**

*Paper presentation from Dr. Adrian Field, David Todd, Gerardene Goode, Synergia Ltd.*

In this paper, we reflect on an 18-month evaluation of a PHO-led health promoting practice initiative, based on developmental evaluation approaches. The evaluation worked alongside a team who were passionate about their role and contribution, but who worked within a professional setting where performance is often understood on the basis of a narrow range of metrics.

The presentation will focus on the contribution of a developmental approach to support learning and improvement, and in bridging different professional world views.

The project posed a range of opportunities and challenges for the evaluation team. In many respects there was an abundance of data and perspectives to draw on, but there was also a fragmented understanding of the role of health promotion within primary health care, both within the organisation and in care delivery settings.

The presentation will explore the learnings from a pragmatic integration of existing and evaluator-led data collection, and online resources to capture and review practice engagement across multiple activities. The application of a rubric in setting some clear parameters of performance was particularly important in bridging the different frames of thinking in this setting.

A further aspect of the presentation will be the extent to which the evaluation approach supported adaptations and refinements in the delivery of the initiative, and in communication with internal and external stakeholders.

**Building evaluation into new projects - a developmental evaluation journey with a Māori and Pacific NGO - Lessons Learnt.**

*Paper presentation from Debbie Goodwin, Louise Were and Pale Sauni, Tuakana Teina*

In this paper we discuss a developmental evaluation process utilised within Māori and Pacific contexts to build the awareness and tools for evaluation. We will present our reflections and learnings (both evaluators and NGO providers) on our work developing the monitoring and evaluation frameworks alongside pilot Māori and Pacific youth mental health projects. The paper will discuss what we did, what worked and what didn't work, and where we got to? It will reflect on what it takes to build strong cultures and systems of evaluative thinking and practice into programmes, as well as the benefits and challenges of doing this (from evaluators and provider perspectives).

**‘Hangaia te anga arotake’ - Building an evaluation design with whānau in Kura Kaupapa Māori.**

*Paper presentation from Angie Hamiora and Gipsy Foster, Education Review Office.*

This presentation discusses the application of the Te Aho Matua methodology - an indigenous evaluation methodology utilised in kura kaupapa Māori (Māori immersion schools) across New Zealand. The Te Aho Matua evaluation methodology was developed in collaboration with Te Rūnanga Nui o Ngā Kura Kaupapa Māori (TRNKKM), the Māori authority with responsibility for the Te Aho Matua philosophy and approach to indigenous education in Aotearoa.

The presenters will share the key principles that underpin Te Aho Matua and talk about the unique, powerfully designed ‘evaluation architecture’ of the methodology. They will also discuss the key role of ‘adaptive
expertise’ in undertaking evaluations that are culturally inclusive and responsive. The importance of deep cultural knowledge (te reo, the language and tikanga, the customs) and methodological flexibility will be highlighted.

Participants will gain an inside view of the ‘evaluation architecture’ of Te Aho Matua, focusing on the design process and how it responds to context specific cultural values and practices. The key evaluation principles and practice learnings that can be applied in other Iwi/Māori and Māori speaking evaluation contexts and settings will be considered.

“"The House of Hope"

Paper presentation from Marge Jackson and Sarah O’Connor, Kites Trust Ltd

This presentation will outline key learning from a three year project in which community mental health and addiction services have worked alongside evaluators to build the foundations of an evaluative culture.

Through a co-research process, peer service providers and expert evaluators have generously shared their knowledge with each other. In our presentation we will show how this collective knowledge has set the foundations in "The House of Hope" and show which parts require renovating for evaluative capacity.

At the foundations of the house are evidence based principles. From these principles, peer support operates at all its levels; from delivery and quality of services to effectiveness and outcomes for service users.

The results of our project indicate how valuable peer services are to the people who use them and why people call them “The House of Hope”. The outcome of this project is that service providers have developed their evaluative capacity and providers and service users have grown in confidence to contribute more to the peer support community and the wider community.

The New Zealand Treasury’s Living Standards Work Programme – Aligning Public Policy Advice with the Way New Zealanders Want to Live.


It has long been recognised that a society’s well-being cannot be adequately represented only by material measures such as income (or GDP). The OECD’s Better Life Index is one of the most prominent broader measures of well-being that has been replicated for many countries around the world. There is a need not only to use such broader measures to assess an economy’s performance, but also to operationalise them – i.e. to pursue policies that promote broader well-being.

The New Zealand Treasury has been promoting a broader Living Standards Framework (LSF) as a basis for thinking about good economic / social policy. In addition to economic growth, the Framework also includes sustainability, equity, social cohesion, and risk management, as key dimensions of social well-being. In recent times, the Treasury’s focus has been on working with other government agencies to operationalise its LSF by formulating policies that promote wider well-being.

The LSF is all about aligning public policy advice with the ways in which New Zealanders want to live. Since we do not know how individual New Zealanders want to live, nor do we have a view on how they should be living, we conceptualise good public policy as one aimed at enhancing the opportunities, capabilities and incentives of individuals to live the kinds of lives they have reason to value. Good public policy aims to achieve this aspiration by working with private institutions of all sorts, in a supporting and enabling capacity, to expand, shape and protect the aggregate stock of capital available to society. In doing so, it is cognisant of the rights of future generations, and of distributional aspects towards enhancing social cohesion. The key policy question is this: what can the government, as our representative agent, do towards helping us extract maximum value (in a wider well-being sense) from the existing stocks of capital, as well as helping us shape and grow these capital stocks for the benefit of future generations.

Integrating stakeholder values into evaluation goals and objectives: Evaluation of a mental health and social sector partnership.

Paper presentation from Heather Kongs-Taylor, Te Pou o Te Whakaaro Nui.

Across New Zealand, health and social organisations are forming new partnerships to better meet the needs of individuals experiencing mental health issues. These cross-sector and cross-discipline partnerships present some unique challenges, such as developing shared values to inform partnership goals and agreeing upon
ways of working within the partnership. Reviewing the language of stakeholders’ goals offers a glimpse of these challenges. Using a mental health evaluation as the case example this presentation steps through the process for integrating the different values and priorities of the Ministry of Social Development, general practices, and a specialist employment support provider, into clear evaluation goals and objectives. Heather will identify lessons learned - what worked well and what didn’t - for use in other evaluation contexts and settings.


*Paper presentation from Richard Leilua, Education Review Office.*

The Education Review Office (ERO) supports the ongoing improvement of early childhood centres and schools to improve learning outcomes for Pacific children and students. With ERO’s continuing renovation of its fale, its evolving methodology aims to be culturally aware in promoting Pacific engagement and success in learning.

The presentation will focus on the kawa of ERO’s house in enacting culturally inclusive evaluation and encouraging school’s to develop self-review. ERO’s kawa promotes participatory and transparent practices to develop effective and inclusive evaluation with schools and early childhood centres. Evaluators will hear about and be encouraged to consider the relevance for them of this kawa which features collaborative design, shared observations and indicators of desired practice, expectations of culturally responsive self-review through a Pacific lens, community engagement and collaboration to encourage a culture of innovation. The presenter will also reflect on how evaluators work within the demands of regulatory requirements to improve the capability of centres and schools to promote Pacific students’ engagement.

The presentation will suggest areas for development in continuing to progress the positive influence of evaluation in cultural contexts. Participation will be encouraged with time for discussion.


*Paper presentation from Kate McKegg and Nan Wehipeihana, The Kinnect Group and Jenny Gill and Moi Becroft, ASB Community Trust.*

Social entrepreneurship is the process of pursuing innovative solutions to society’s most pressing social problems; identifying what’s not working, solving the problem by changing the system, spreading the solution; and persuading others to do things differently. In 2006 ASB Community Trust set aside $20 million for a Māori and Pacific Education Initiative (MPEI), to do something about the serious problem of educational underachievement facing Māori and Pacific communities.

In this presentation we discuss the coming together of philanthropy and evaluation, to support Māori and Pacific social entrepreneurs with innovative and visionary ideas to raise Māori and Pacific educational achievement. The paper will discuss the challenges of breaking new ground in philanthropic investment, as well in evaluation, using a developmental evaluation approach to support program and initiative development, and to generate credible evidence for projects, as well as for funders who were interested in evidence of impact across multiple projects. The presenters will share their learning about the developmental journey of evaluation and philanthropy, that has been undertaken to generate evidence based principles that can be applied in other situations and contexts using a developmental evaluation approach.

Evaluative reasoning: How are we doing? Can we do better? Does it matter?

*Paper presentation from Heather Nunns, Analytic Matters.*

The bottom line for evaluators is producing an evaluation report with evaluative conclusions that are valid and defensible. Evaluative reasoning is a shorthand term to describe what’s involved in getting to such conclusions. Evaluative reasoning is the crux of quality evaluation. Unless an evaluation is based on sound reasoning, other efforts to enhance quality will be compromised.

The presenter will summarise the key findings of a meta-evaluation of 30 evaluation reports commissioned by New Zealand public sector agencies. The aim of the meta-evaluation review is to understand how evaluative reasoning is practiced in public sector evaluation using a framework drawn from the evaluation literature. The presenter will share some thoughts about where we could do better in our evaluative reasoning practice and invite the audience to contribute their ideas. Finally, the question ‘does it matter that we do better?’ will be addressed with reference to recent developments in the public sector evaluation space.
The potential for success when evaluation, facilitation and culture connect.

**Paper presentation from Kataraina Pipi, FEM 2006 Ltd.**

As a facilitator with over 20 years’ experience, this presentation explores the utilisation of facilitation as an enabling tool and a cultural connector in evaluation. In evaluation involving Iwi and Māori there is a dance that occurs when bringing together the combination of knowledge and skills in evaluation and facilitation with indigenous ways of knowing and being.

In this presentation, I will share facilitation tools and approaches that I use in evaluation work and evaluation tools that I use in facilitation. I will also discuss kawa (customs); tikanga (rituals) and ritenga (behaviour) that I have used in my facilitation and evaluation work in cultural contexts.

**Whanau Ora Action Research - an opportunity and challenge for building strong evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand.**

**Panel discussion with Kataraina Pipi, FEM 2006 Ltd, Maria Baker and Shaun Akroyd - Takitini Collective and Terri Cassidy – Te Hau Āwhiowhio ō Ōtangarei**

Whanau Ora Action Research work over the past two years has called upon Māori evaluation expertise to come to the forefront to provide support and evidence of the experience of whanau and the work being undertaken by Whanau Ora Provider Collectives and Te Puni Kōkiri in achieving Whānau Ora aspirations.


This discussion will focus on the following:

- Key learning about evaluation theory and methods that have contributed to Whānau Ora Action Research
- Evaluation tools and approaches that have and have not worked well
- Opportunities and challenges (for whanau, for action researchers, for contract management and commissioning agency) that Whānau Ora Action Research has revealed
- Reflections on the application of ANZEA evaluator competencies in the Whānau Ora Action Research space

A panel providing different perspectives (commissioning agency, action researchers, contract manager) will share their experience and views.

**Toka Tū- Standing strong and finding ways to ensure Māori participation in an evaluation project.**

**Paper presentation from Tane Rangihuna, Kites Trust and Debbie Goodwin, The Kinnect Group.**

Ten mental health and addiction peer support services operating within non-government organisations in Aotearoa New Zealand have been participating in a three year project. The project has two aims;

1. To identify the resources and procedures needed to undertake ongoing evaluation and
2. To identify the outcomes that Tāngata Whaiora (people seeking wellness) value and that are supported by peer support services.

Participation from Māori is essential in this mahi and this presentation will share some of the approaches in which Māori participation and leadership was sought and gained.

The audience will gain knowledge into the challenges faced, ways in which they were overcome and the benefit of Māori participation and leadership to the project. Challenges included identifying Māori service providers and finding ways in which they would feel comfortable participating, engaging Kaumatua from around the country and interpreting results shared by Tāngata Whaiora.

**Strengthening our workplaces and connecting our neighbourhoods to support quality evaluation.**

**Mini-workshop from Ben Ritchie and Penny Salmon, Inland Revenue Department.**

Working as an evaluator in a large organisation presents a number of challenges for evaluators and evaluation. This interactive workshop is inspired by Penny and Ben’s experiences working for a large government organisation. They will put forward a series of conversation starters including scenarios and questions to explore the strengths and weaknesses of large organisations in nurturing and supporting quality evaluation. Participants will have the opportunity to continue the conversations by sharing their experiences and thoughts on how to strengthen our respective evaluation whare. The conversations will draw on Durie’s Whare Tapa Wha model of well-being:

- Community and colleagues (Whanau health)
- Values, purpose and beliefs (Wairua/spiritual health)
- Resources, skills and tools (Tinana/physical health)
- Distractions and stress (Hinengaro/psychological health)

Penny and Ben are looking forward to the opportunity to share with - and hear from fellow evaluators - experiences and insights on how to strengthen our respective evaluation whare.
Participants will leave the session with new perspectives on their evaluation practice, new connections to fellow evaluators and some concrete steps to refresh and strengthen their workplace.

'Fireside chat with ANZEA Taumata' – the role of evaluation in New Zealand's public policy landscape

Panel discussion with ANZEA Taumata – Neville Robertson & Robin Peace with support from Mark Dalgety.
This panel discussion will provide an opportunity for conference participants to listen and engage with ANZEA Taumata on a key issue for evaluation in 2014 and beyond.
In this year's fireside chat, ANZEA's Taumata will reflect on the role and influence of evaluation in wider public policy development and decision making by the public sector and government. They will consider the following questions:
- What role does evaluation currently play in public policy development and decision-making?
- What role should it play?
- What's hindering evaluation from becoming a core part of the machinery of government?
- What would it take for evaluation to have an equivalent role in public policy decision making to economics, or finance, or law, for example?
- What role should the association take?

What are good criteria? Investigating the requirements for defensible evaluation.

Paper presentation from Mathea Roorda, Evaluate Research.
Read the methodology section of evaluation reports and you will notice there is rarely explicit explanation of how criteria have been identified, developed and justified. Criteria provide us with the dimensions on which performance is rated and ought to be explicit and transparent in every evaluation we do. They are critical to the development of strong, sustainable and relevant evaluation (Fournier, 1995; Henry, 2002). This paper will present and discuss current approaches to developing criteria based on a review of international evaluation resources and a set of consultations with 10 evaluators working in Aotearoa New Zealand and Australia. The findings raise questions about current practice and what is required to build strong evaluative conclusions.

References:

Using Action Design Research to Improve Evaluation Practice.

Paper presentation from Nick. L Smith, Syracuse University.
Can research improve your evaluation practice? If so, what kind of research? Much of the research on evaluation practice involves large scale descriptive studies of general practice and therefore has little to offer the individual practitioner trying to improve local performance. Evaluation is best understood as a case-based activity in which differences in context, problem, client, purpose, and resources play a significant role in determining best practice – generic solutions have to be contextualized to be useful. What is needed, then, is a form of research that enables the practitioner to improve performance while conducting evaluations and at the same time contribute to a more general understanding of how to conduct effective evaluations. This paper proposes Action Design Research as one possible approach. It combines field-based investigation with systematic development and implementation of solutions to address practical problems. Studies are conducted in applied settings in order to develop usable and effective solutions, but the research is also structured to produce theoretical knowledge for use by others. This paper reviews the need for, basic principles and procedures of, and potential contributions of Action Design Research as a means of increasing our understanding of evaluation in general while simultaneously improving local practice.

How inclusive and relevant is evaluation practice in my house?
Lessons and learning from evaluation practice in multicultural, multi-ethnic Papua New Guinea society.

Paper presentation from Beatrice Tabeu, RMIT University.
In a country of more than 800 cultures and languages such as Papua New Guinea (PNG), how do we ensure that evaluation practices are inclusive and relevant in the researched community?
This paper draws on my eight years’ experience assisting in evaluation studies in PNG. On the one hand there is some involvement of PNGuineans in planning evaluations and their physical presence during the studies; more needs to be done to improve inclusive-local participation to ensure relevant practices are employed because the use of inappropriate practices in PNG communities can be disempowering. On the other hand, I am also aware of the challenges of conducting evaluation in multicultural communities and acknowledge that there is no one correct approach to doing it better or effectively in such communities. This paper suggests greater involvement of PNGuineans in the selection of tools and methods and deciding the language and approaches to be used to ensure evaluation more closely captures and reflects the views, values and perspective of PNGuineans. This paper will also highlight the synergies and transferrable learnings for the conduct of evaluation with multiple cultures and in multiple languages in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Title: Te Kupenga: Statistics NZ survey of Māori Wellbeing.  
Presentation from Atawhai Tibble.  
Te Kupenga is a Statistics NZ’s survey of Maori wellbeing. It measures social, economic and cultural aspects of wellbeing, and provides national, regional and some iwi estimates of Maori adults 15 y and over. Atawhai Tibble is the principal architect and designer of the survey. Now based in Bangkok, Atawhai has been brought back by Statistics New Zealand to present the national and regional results to Iwi and Maori communities and other interested organisations.

Update on the development of the Evaluation Standards project.  
Mini workshop from David Turner, Chief Advisor Families Commission, Kate McKegg, ANZEA Convenor and Robyn Bailey, Director Evaluation Works.  
This workshop will be an opportunity for participants to hear from ANZEA and the Families Commission about the progress to date of evaluation standards in Aotearoa, and to contribute their perspectives on the work so far, as well as how ANZEA and the Families Commission might support recognition and use of the evaluation standards.  
The Aotearoa/New Zealand Evaluation Association is working in collaboration with the New Zealand Families Commission to develop evaluation standards for application in the New Zealand context. Evaluation standards address the issue of what constitutes good quality in evaluation practice. They will complement the existing ANZEA evaluation competencies and future guidelines for ethical evaluation practice.  
The evaluation standards development process has been designed to ensure there are opportunities for widespread engagement of people involved and interested in evaluation within New Zealand. This workshop will be an opportunity for engagement, feedback and input into the development process. Participants will be invited to contribute and provide feedback on:
- the material produced so far
- their perspective on evaluation quality
- how they would use evaluation standards in their own practice
- what might be needed to ensure uptake and use of the standards.

The many Pacific fale: which one are we talking about?  
Paper presentation from Violet Tu’uga Stevenson and Janet Pereira, Education Review Office.  
There are many fale in the village. This presentation explores some of the challenges evaluators face when carrying out an evaluation in a cultural context they are not so familiar with. Recent research emphasises the need for evaluators to adapt their practice and to work in culturally appropriate ways. This presentation describes some of the strategies that evaluators and evaluation teams can use to help them better understand and adapt to the cultural context they are working in. Throughout the evaluation process, as they move through the village, evaluators endeavour to work within cultural frameworks, respect core cultural values and use culturally preferred ways of interacting. A range of examples will be presented and the tensions between Pacific values, beliefs and ways of being and the principles of ‘good’ evaluation will be discussed. Culturally determined contextual factors raise challenging moral questions, conundrums and challenges which require continuous adaptation of the evaluation process. There are many fale in the village and evaluators need help from the ‘locals’ to recognize them and to understand their purpose.
Collaboration in Evaluation between evaluators and funders. How we jointly solved our evaluation issues.

**Paper presentation from Jenny Whatman, NZCER and Christina Thornley, NZ Teachers Council.**

Our evaluation of the Teachers Councils’ *Guidelines for Induction and Mentoring and Mentor Teachers* has spanned three years (2012-14). Jenny as evaluation project leader and Chris as project manager for the Council have worked in a collaboration that fostered joint problem solving and shared wonderings. For this presentation, Jenny and Christine will discuss, using an interviewer-interviewee format, some of the issues they explored, changes they made and new discoveries that arose. They will describe their use of programme logic and activity theory to design, manage and interrogate the evaluation methodology and findings as well as the systems they established to maintain ongoing inquiry within a fruitful relationship.

The project is in its final stages and their conversation with each other and the participants will facilitate reflection on the extent to which they have through their collaboration met their evaluation objectives.

Better Together by Building Strong Relationships: Reflections on MBIE and ACC working together to deliver a robust cross-agency evaluation.

**Paper presentation from John Wren, ACC and Will Bell, MBIE.**

Cross-agency evaluations can be challenging, particularly when one agency is evaluating another’s activity in an area important to them. Tensions can arise with competing priorities, unspoken and competing agendas, and uncertainties over co-ordination of activities, resourcing and capability to deliver. From the outset, the respective MBIE and ACC evaluation and research teams have worked hard to manage these risks and to help build a strong evaluation that is methodologically robust, insightful, relevant and owned by both agencies. This presentation will provide a brief overview of the evaluation as context for the wider discussion. It will identify the critical factors such as project governance, evaluation team composition, project management and ways of working that have been integral to the effective implementation of a cross agency evaluation.

The focus of the presentation is on sharing lessons learned – what worked well and what they would do differently to support future cross agency evaluations.

“There are three types of lies -- lies, damn lies, and statistics” (Benjamin Disraeli).

**Seminar from Zong-Pei Zhao, NZQA.**

“Figures often beguile me, particularly when I have the arranging of them myself” (Mark Twain).

The power of numbers can be phenomenal (Mark Twain). In practice however, statistics can also be confusing, misleading and downright deceptive to the unsuspecting and untrained eye.

This seminar will explore the dark arts of statistics with the participants. From simple manipulation of the term “average” to complex meta-data analysis, as well as different methods of presenting numbers, statistics, time series and trends – the purpose is to share as much experience with the audience so that they do not fall into traps the presenter once fallen in (or once set for others to fall in, depending on the case may be).

This seminar will focus on statistical analysis for approximately 25 minutes and presentation of statistical information for 15 minutes. No background in mathematics required.