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As a cornerstone of sound management, program evaluation makes good public business sense, giving managers valuable insight into the program(s) for which they are responsible. It systematizes what they may already be doing on an informal basis — assessing whether or not the goals of a program have been met, deciding which aspects of the program work and which do not, and considering more efficient ways to deliver the program. Properly executed, program evaluation provides compelling and objective evidence about how well programs work and where improvement can be made.

Program evaluation also helps managers determine whether corporate objectives are being met, and what is needed to ensure that they are met. Evaluation is also undertaken to demonstrate effectiveness, efficiency and value for money. It also identifies best practices and supports knowledge transfer. There is a Provincial Controllership Program Design Operating Policy relating to program evaluation; please see the Ministry of Finance, Modern Controllership website for the current policy.

This guide has been prepared to assist ministries in planning, undertaking and reporting on program evaluations. It provides advice on program evaluation policy and best practice guidelines including specific OPS requirements. This guide replaces the 2003 program evaluation guide and complements the 2005 Performance Measurement Reference Guide.

The Big Picture: Results-based Management, Performance Measurement and Program Evaluation

Transparency is an important part of government accountability and governments all over the world are increasingly expected to demonstrate the results they achieve with taxpayers’ money. It is not enough to know how much the government is spending; decision makers want to know the outcome and impact of government decisions. The process of identifying objectives and desired outcomes, measuring progress and making decisions on the basis of results is called results-based management.

Program Evaluation

“A systematic method for collecting, analyzing and using information/evidence to assess the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability of the program and to inform future programming decisions about design and implementation.”

Evaluation helps to:

- pinpoint what is and isn’t working in a program
- highlight what the program achieves and how it helps people
- identify gaps or areas that need attention
- improve staff’s effectiveness
- expand OPS knowledge about best practices in program management.
Results-based Management is a comprehensive, integrated approach that informs results-based decision-making, ensuring that all government-funded activities are aligned with strategies that contribute to meeting government priorities or serve an important public interest. Under Results-based Management, the focus of Ontario Public Service (OPS) program evaluation is government-wide, looking at the extent to which intended results are being achieved within and across ministries. This includes the evaluation of both specific programs and linked programs across ministries, including enterprise-wide programs.

Results-based management incorporates the following principles:

- government priorities drive planning processes across all government functions
- effective accountability — within ministries and among ministries and third party service providers and broader public sector organizations — requires that expectations are clearly articulated and performance is monitored and evaluated on a regular basis with corrective action taken when necessary

**How are evaluation and performance measurement different?**

**Evaluation** is the systematic collection and analysis of a wide variety of types and sources of multi-faceted information on multiple aspects of a program’s performance.

**Performance measurement** provides the specific data to be collected systematically and then analyzed through evaluation processes.

Consider the example of someone who reports troubling symptoms to a doctor. The doctor uses a number of tools to assess the patient’s condition — takes temperature, runs blood tests, interviews the patient about other factors, etc. This performance measurement data is then analyzed by the doctor in order to diagnose/evaluate the patient’s health status and recommend a treatment plan.

Or consider a school board using standardized test results as part of a performance measurement framework to monitor and report on school performance. They use evaluation to gain a deeper understanding of factors that contribute to test results, such as student profiles, community resources and parent involvement.
horizontal integration of strategies and activities across ministries and the broader public sector improves effectiveness and efficiency of program/service delivery and ensures that wide ranging activities complement each other in achieving government priorities.

demonstrable results drive the development of strategies and activities, policy and legislative agendas, investment decisions, program/service improvements and public accountability.

Results-based management focuses on outcomes, not activities and requires reliable, objective information at all levels of government. While this information is gathered through performance measurement, program evaluation provides the conceptual framework for ensuring that performance measures are meaningful, and demonstrate that the objectives of government-funded services are being met. Program evaluation can guide the development of performance measurement systems, i.e., comprehensive, integrated sets of measures (of various types and levels) that provide a multi-faceted picture of the ministry’s progress toward its targeted outputs (products and/or services) and outcomes. Both program evaluation and performance measurement are essential to implementing results-based management successfully.

**Structure of the Guide**

The guide is organized into six sections followed by seven appendices.

Section B, “Why evaluate? Matching the evaluation purpose with appropriate methodology”, includes a description of the seven main types of evaluation and how to decide which approach is most suitable for the program being evaluated.

Section C describes the OPS Evaluation Framework, which provides a set of evaluation principles and five key domains outlining the primary questions to be answered by any OPS evaluation.

Section D describes the basic elements fundamental to any evaluation.

Section E provides suggestions for presenting and using the evaluation findings.

Section F completes the guide with information on the various pitfalls common to program evaluation and suggests ways to avoid them.
The appendices provide more detailed information on:

- the seven types of evaluation described in Section B
- the Vendor of Record process
- widely accepted standards for and ethical conduct of evaluations
- a glossary of evaluation terms to encourage a consistent understanding and use of terminology among participants in the evaluation process
- methods of data collection
- sample program profiles and logic models
- available resources.

Target Audience

This guide will be useful to policy and program staff at all levels who are involved in evaluation of their programs and services or those involved in developing new programs. While this is not an instructional, “how to” guide, it aims to build on the knowledge and capacity of its readers to conduct evaluations using resources within their organization or by managing the work of an external consultant.
Understanding the Different Types of Evaluation

1. **Evaluability Assessment**

An Evaluability Assessment should be undertaken prior to, or as the first part of, a process/implementation evaluation. It determines whether a formal evaluation of an existing program is warranted or even possible. Formal evaluability assessments are often used for very large programs that are relatively new or in crisis but may also be warranted for older programs that have not been reviewed for some time. The purpose of the assessment is to avoid the cost of a full evaluation when there are indications that the program may not be ready, to inform the program manager whether the program is ready for evaluation, and, if not, what is required to allow a formal evaluation to take place.

An Evaluability Assessment includes:

- determination of the extent to which a program is ready for evaluation and the type of evaluation most appropriate to the program’s stage of development

---

Seven Types of Program Evaluation

1. Evaluability Assessment
2. Needs Assessment
3. Monitoring/Review of Compliance with Standards
4. Implementation/Process Evaluation
5. Impact/Outcome Evaluation
6. Program Review
7. Efficiency Assessment

---

1 Evaluations are sometimes described as either formative (ongoing, process type of evaluation) or summative (focused on results or outcomes of a program at a given point in time). However, this is too broad a classification to be very useful in choosing a particular type of evaluation and planning the evaluation.
identification of the steps to be taken prior to evaluation

identification of the scope of the evaluation

a broad description of the program context including organizational context, funding environment and other related programs.

2. Needs Assessment

A Needs Assessment is most often done before a program is developed, to determine the type of program and services required. It is an assessment of the nature, magnitude and distribution of a problem and the extent to which there is a need for an intervention, (e.g., program), to address it. The assessment should also consider the types of intervention that may be successful in meeting the needs identified and identify the various factors that the intervention should take into account, e.g., cultural and linguistic diversity.

The assessment may include:

- specific needs of existing clients
- trend analysis (comparing results over time)
- clients’ strengths and assets
- existing programs that serve identified needs
- gaps in service.

3. Monitoring/Review of Compliance with Standards

Monitoring evaluations usually involve the development and application of a process that systematically assesses the extent to which a program adheres to pre-determined criteria, procedures, standards and/or plans. It may form part of a more comprehensive evaluation.

Accountability, verification, quality assurance and fund allocation considerations are the focus of this type of evaluation, which may involve developing tools for assessing standards and/or developing the standards themselves. This type of review may also include the assessment of performance measurement systems and practices to ensure that accountability mechanisms are adequate.
### Figure 1: Choosing the Appropriate Type of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Evaluation</th>
<th>Choose this Approach when you want/need to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluability Assessment</td>
<td>• determine program readiness for evaluation, most appropriate type of evaluation (if warranted), scope of evaluation and next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>• determine what type of program and services are required • learn more about the nature, magnitude and distribution of a problem and the extent to which there is a need for an intervention to address it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/Review of Compliance with Standards</td>
<td>• assess the extent to which a program adheres to pre-determined criteria, procedures, standards and/or plans • assess accountability mechanisms • determine regulatory compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation/Process Evaluation</td>
<td>• provide a detailed description of the program design and logic, the operational processes through which it is intended that desired outcomes will be achieved, how well program is functioning and congruity of services with program goals • determine extent to which a program has been implemented as planned and identify barriers to optimal service use • assess effectiveness of existing management systems and service delivery processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact/Outcome Evaluation</td>
<td>• assess extent to which a program contributes to or produces the intended improvements in the condition it is designed to address • assess the impact, merit and relevance of a program, particularly for policy and planning purposes • identify/assess unintended program impacts/outcomes • advance knowledge and increase understanding of causal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review</td>
<td>• determine how to improve program design and delivery in a rebalanced, fiscally constrained environment • find efficiencies, cost savings, opportunities for realignment and/or other service delivery options using clear criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency Assessment (Cost Benefit/Cost Effectiveness Analysis)</td>
<td>• determine extent to which a program achieved sufficient benefits and performance results in relation to its costs or in comparison to other programs designed to achieve the same goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Implementation/Process Evaluation

Implementation/Process Evaluation assesses how and what things are done within a program. It is a systematic approach to collecting information on the extent to which a program has been implemented as planned and identifying barriers to optimal service use. This type of evaluation involves developing a detailed description of the program design and logic, the operational processes through which it is intended that the desired outcomes will be achieved, how well the program is functioning and how congruous services are with the goals of the program. Detailed and accurate knowledge of program operation is needed if program components are to be linked with achievement of client outcomes or if programs are to be replicated.

Implementation Evaluation focuses specifically on comparison of actual events with the program plan or performance standards and provides explanations of why implementation has deviated from the plan.

Implementation/Process Evaluation can help to:

- formulate opinions about what courses of action can be taken to correct, modify or refine process or delivery mechanisms that are identified as not working
- inform continued operation of the program by providing information for program improvement and better management
- provide a basis for explaining program outcomes
- inform decision-making about undertaking impact/outcome evaluation.

5. Impact/Outcome Evaluation

Impact/Outcome Evaluation evaluates the changes made by a program’s actions. It is undertaken for policy and planning purposes, and is designed to assess the extent to which a program or intervention contributes to or produces the intended improvements in the condition it is designed to address. Is the program having the desired impact on its participants?

Impacts/outcomes can be assessed through an experimental or quasi-experimental research design, with control/comparison groups, sampling and standardized performance measurement. It assesses the impacts and relevance of a program, may advance knowledge in a scientific field and increase understanding of causal relationships. Impact/outcome
evaluation may also employ a full range of qualitative methods to “create a picture” of the variety of impacts that a program may have, (i.e. primary and secondary, intentional and unintentional, positive and negative impacts), how these are inter-related and the potential implications for both service recipients and future policy direction.

An Impact/Outcome Evaluation will assist decision-makers in identifying the contribution the program has made within a particular area and the extent to which planned outcomes have been achieved. It generally includes a description of program outcomes, identification of unexpected or unwanted program outcomes, attributions linking outcomes to specific factors or interventions and determination of a program’s merit or worth.

6. Program Review

Program Review addresses the need for continuous improvement of program design and delivery in a rebalanced, fiscally constrained environment. It involves a process of reviewing government programs and services, using clear criteria, usually to find efficiencies, cost savings, opportunities for possible realignment with another level of government and/or other delivery options, and aims to ensure that resources are focused on priority areas.

The program review process is designed to assess whether:

- programs serve the public interest, meet the needs of Ontarians and align with government priorities
- programs are cost effective and maximize revenue opportunities, where applicable
- any risks associated with proposed savings targets are identified
- accountability mechanisms, e.g., performance measurement systems, are in place
- human resources and horizontal implications have been considered.
7. Efficiency Assessment
(Cost Benefit/Cost Effectiveness Analysis)²

Efficiency Assessment is an assessment of program performance, outcomes and expenditures to determine the degree to which a program achieved sufficient benefits and performance in relation to the costs that were incurred, or in comparison to other programs designed to achieve the same goals.

Efficiency Assessment generally includes:

- a description of program expenditures and direct and indirect, tangible and intangible costs, e.g., time, effort, opportunity costs, sustainability costs

- an estimation of the monetary and relative value of specific program outcomes, e.g., high-level outcome achieved for given level of expenditure relative to competing uses for those funds

- a determination of cost savings/cost avoidance

- comparison of value for money, e.g., cost of achieving a given outcome

- further comparison of costs to similar programs designed to achieve the same goals.

² This type of evaluation may also be called Benefit-Cost Analysis.
The OPS Evaluation Framework is intended to provide clear guidelines for any type of evaluation undertaken within the OPS. It includes basic evaluation principles and the key domains for structuring the evaluation and determining the primary questions to be answered through any evaluation process.

**Evaluation Principles**

The following principles are recommended to encourage meaningful and useful evaluation practice.

- **Build a positive evaluation culture** with emphasis on capacity building, learning, sharing and using information to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of programs and services.

- **Encourage an attitude of enquiry** rather than judgment or blame: What do the findings mean? Why does this appear to be working and why doesn’t that work? How do we know this is making a difference?
Ensure the evaluation is useful, cost-effective and accurate. It should be used by stakeholders at all levels for decision-making, continuous improvement and overall management, and also, for internal and public reporting to support transparency and accountability. The data should be valid, reliable, accessible at reasonable cost, comprehensive and transparent, and used for multiple purposes wherever possible. Performance information should be provided to managers and other appropriate stakeholders in a timely manner for effective decision-making.

Involves stakeholders and consult with them to establish clear, agreed-on objective(s) for the evaluation. Their engagement and “buy in” is critical throughout the evaluation process. Identify the decisions that you want to be able to make from the evaluation and use them to guide the development of the evaluation process.

One approach does not fit all. Choose evaluation strategies carefully to address the developmental stage and needs of each program, e.g., conduct an implementation assessment of a pilot project; conduct an evaluability assessment of an established program. There is no “one best way” of conducting an evaluation.

Live it. Build evaluation strategies into the ongoing management of the program. Evaluation need not be a costly “add-on” if built into “day to day” program management.

Practice ethical conduct. Ensure that evaluation strategies follow ethical standards. See Canadian Evaluation Society Guidelines for Ethical Conduct and Program Evaluation Standards in Appendix III.

Encourage knowledge transfer and ensure that evaluation findings are used. Write clear and comprehensive reports, with findings substantiated, methodology explained and transparent analysis. Disseminate evaluation findings widely and arrange for researchers to make presentations. Interpret findings and create recommendations and an implementation strategy in consultation with stakeholders.
Key Domains

The OPS Evaluation Framework is structured around five key domains: relevance; effectiveness; efficiency and affordability; sustainability; and customer satisfaction. The following section highlights the focus of each domain and the questions to be addressed through any evaluation undertaken within the OPS.

1. **Relevance** reflects the extent to which a program contributes to the achievement of a government or ministry priority, result or other public interest.
   - Is the program something the government should be doing?
   - To what extent is the public interest served by the program?
   - To what extent is the program aligned with the policy objectives and fiscal priorities of the government?

2. **Effectiveness** focuses on results, not processes — the extent to which an organization, policy, program or initiative is producing its planned outcomes and meeting intended objectives.
   - What evidence demonstrates the program is achieving its intended objectives?
   - To what extent is the program achieving its expected short, intermediate and long-term outcomes?
   - To what extent is the program meeting its performance targets? Are they appropriate?
   - What accountability mechanisms are in place? To what extent do they support accountability within the ministry and among the ministry and its partners, clients and the public? To what extent are they at the appropriate level to balance achievement of operational objectives and public accountability?
3. **Efficiency and Affordability** are associated with the resources used to produce desired outputs. Efficiency focuses on the extent to which an organization, policy, program or initiative is producing its planned outputs in relation to expenditure of resources. Affordability considers whether there are sufficient resources to produce the outputs.

- To what extent is the program achieving its objectives within established timeframes and costs?
- What steps can be taken to optimize the efficiency of the program? Can unit costs be lowered while still achieving government objectives?
- Are other ministries or organizations delivering the same or similar product or service? Can overlap/duplication be removed?
- Are there alternative delivery methods that achieve the public policy objective more effectively and/or efficiently? What evidence is there to support such methods?
- What are the options for achieving efficiencies in partnership with another ministry or level of government and what are the potential savings?

4. **Sustainability** is about being strategic and looking to the future. Sustainability considerations focus on the extent to which a program can be delivered over the longer term at a consistent and appropriate level of quality/customer service attainable within the expense limit.

- To what extent is the program sustainable in light of current and projected demand and fiscal realities such as role of government (service provider vs. overseer); provincial, federal, and international policy environments; larger social context, demographic change, cultural variation, regional variation; and/or technological change (e-service delivery, technical innovation e.g., wind mills for clean power generation)?
- To what extent does the program have the ability to be responsive to evolving needs, objectives, and/or policy directions? To what extent does the program utilize knowledge of its external environment and the larger
context to anticipate and meet service needs?

- What actions (risk mitigation strategies) have been taken to manage projected future spending pressures and what more can be done recognizing the current fiscal realities? Do the proposed changes avoid or create future cost or program pressures?

5. **Customer Satisfaction** is the degree to which the intended recipients or beneficiaries of a product or service indicate that the product or service meets their needs and expectations. Along with the federal government and other provincial territorial jurisdictions, the OPS has adopted the Common Measurements Tool (CMT) as a standard for customer satisfaction surveying. This survey tool is based on empirical research of the Citizens First studies and its core questions reflect the corresponding key drivers of customer satisfaction.³

- To what extent are clients or customers satisfied with the program’s services?

- To what extent are services accessible?

- To what extent are customers/clients treated fairly?

- To what extent are they informed of everything they have to do to get the service/product?

- To what extent are services delivered in a timely way?

- To what extent are staff courteous and do they go the “extra mile” to make sure customers/clients get what they need?

- To what extent are staff knowledgeable and competent?

- In the end, do customers/clients get what they need?

Ministries are also encouraged to regularly monitor their compliance with established customer service standards, such as the OPS Common Service Standards.

---

³ For more information on Citizens First and the CMT, please see the Institute for Citizen-Centered Service website: www.iccs-isac.org/eng/default.asp
The following elements are generally recognized as best practice and fundamental for any evaluation:

- Terms of Reference
- Evaluation Plan
- Communications Plan
- Program Profile/Logic Model
- Stakeholder Involvement
- Data Collection and Analysis

**Terms of Reference**

The Terms of Reference provide structure and direction as to the focus of the evaluation and how it will proceed. The Terms of Reference may include the following elements:

- A brief overview description of the program to be evaluated, including its history and current status
- Type of evaluation to be done
- Purpose of the evaluation, including the goals and rationale for the evaluation. In addition to the questions set out in the OPS Evaluation Framework, the following questions may be helpful in developing this aspect:
  - Why is this program being evaluated?
  - What questions should be asked and of whom?
  - What information is needed and by whom?
  - How will the findings be used?
  - To whom will the findings be disseminated?
  - What is to be achieved?
  - Roles and limitations of various stakeholders.

- Scope of the evaluation, i.e., which aspects of the program will be examined
- Evaluation project budget

- Evaluation project governance including roles and responsibilities of the various parties involved (e.g., committee mandates, structures and membership) and approval processes. If a decision is made to hire a consultant to undertake all or part(s) of an evaluation, it is recommended that an internal contract manager be appointed to manage quality control and ensure knowledge transfer to ministry staff. Please see Appendix II for more information on the Vendor of Record process.

**Evaluation Plan**

In planning an evaluation, government priorities and directions should be considered, as should the current context for how programs are designed, delivered and overseen. It is recommended that ministries design their evaluations to build on existing work or work underway in their ministry, including:

- broader frameworks in the OPS, such as Quality Management, Controllership and Accountability, and Risk Management

- data gathered from other corporate initiatives, such as Framework for Action.

The evaluation plan sets the direction and provides the framework for the evaluation. It describes the design and type of evaluation planned as well as the information to be collected and the sources of that information. The plan may also indicate how this information will be collected, who is responsible and what the timing of data collection will be. Typically, an evaluation plan includes the:

- purpose of the evaluation
- evaluation questions
- description of the evaluation design to be used
- list of milestones/key tasks and deliverables for the evaluation with expected timelines
- type and sources of data to be collected
- stakeholders to be involved
- data collection methods and responsibility for data collection
- sampling decisions
- data analysis plans
- stakeholder involvement
way in which reliability and validity concerns will be addressed
timeframe for the evaluation including dates of status reports and final evaluation report.

It is necessary to monitor the plan to ensure not only that timelines are met, but also that the essential principles of the evaluation are maintained. Ongoing communication should take place to ensure that all the key internal and external stakeholders are informed of progress. For example, fact sheets could be produced to disseminate information at different points during the evaluation. As well, stakeholders can be used as a point of reference for validation of preliminary results. Staff undertaking the evaluation should be aware of any reporting relationships that are established between their evaluation team and other stakeholder groups.

**Communications Plan**

A Communications Plan should be developed to manage both internal and external expectations related to the evaluation and to ensure regular and positive communications. It may be used to launch the evaluation as it outlines the ministry’s strategy for sharing information about the evaluation process with stakeholders, including the public and bargaining agents. The plan may also include the ministry’s strategy for managing stakeholder response if there are contentious or complex issues.

The following elements may be included in the Communications Plan:

- **objective** — impression/message to be conveyed
- **timing** — start and duration of communication activities or consultations; key events; strategic issues/considerations
- **identification of internal and external stakeholders** — supporters, opponents, neutral stakeholders and their possible issues/reaction
- **contentious issues**
- **expected profile** — high, medium or low
- **issues management activities**
- **stakeholder involvement and considerations** — strategies for communicating process, progress and results.
The Communications Plan should take into account any requirements under legislation such as the *French Language Services Act* and the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act*, e.g., publication of documents in alternative formats for persons with disabilities.

Managers may obtain communications planning advice from their ministry’s Communications Branch. More advice and templates for communications plans may be found at the Cabinet Office communications website at intra.infocomm.cab.gov.on.ca.

**Program Profile/Logic Model**

While not a formal OPS requirement, the development of a program profile or logic model is essential for any evaluation as it provides a conceptually sound description of the program to be evaluated. It can be the first part of any evaluation or can be commissioned separately. It will help to clarify the objectives of the evaluation, ensure the right type of evaluation is selected, and, if done before the evaluation, will reduce the costs associated with having a consultant develop the logic model or profile as part of the evaluation.

Generally, at the outset of an evaluation, few programs are properly conceptualized for evaluation purposes. It cannot be assumed, for example, that program elements are known or consistently understood.

**Example of two “housing programs” with similar generic names but very different services**

*Doors Open Housing Program* offers independent living in apartments owned, operated and monitored by the program. Resident support needs are assessed and case management services provided as negotiated with residents and their caregivers.

*Open Doors Housing Program* offers a Housing Registry service which assists clients to find suitable housing themselves, and, through flexible support services, helps them to maintain their housing. Other components include outreach to landlords, dispute resolution and trusteeship services.

The first program may be more suitable to higher needs clients while those seeking maximum independence may find the second program more helpful.

Any attempt to evaluate and compare these two programs will require a sufficiently detailed description of each one, in order to do so.
by stakeholders, simply from the name of the program. As shown in the example on page 20, programs with similar names often have distinctly different service components while other programs with very different names may have very similar components. Without a clear and commonly understood description of the program(s) for which the data is collected, it will be impossible to determine what the data means or to compare one program with another.

Proper conceptualization should include a description of what the program actually does, why it exists, the population to be served and how success in meeting the needs of these people can be determined. Major service components of the program should be described in sufficient detail, using simple language and avoiding jargon so that anyone can understand how the program is operationalized. The description of the various components should clarify how the components are organized to respond to client needs and that these services relate logically to the program objectives and organization mission. The resulting consistent, clear, and comprehensive program description will provide the conceptual framework within which the appropriate data can be determined, collected and analyzed.

There are many possible variations in the format and content of both program profiles and logic models. In general, a program profile provides a comprehensive, written description of how a program is organized and operates, while most logic models offer a schematic or graphic representation of how the program is intended to operate. Please see Appendix VI for examples.

The information provided by program profiles or logic models will describe the key aspects of a program, such as:

- program name
- stated objectives in clear measurable terms (Why does the program exist?)
- beneficiaries (Who is the target client group? Who will benefit/what will change because of the program?)
- need/problem addressed, purpose and rationale, public interest served by the program
- program origin and history, start and end dates
- relevant sector policies and/or legislative requirements
- scope (local, regional or province-wide)
- organizational structure:
  - inputs (What resources will be used?)
  - major service activities and components (What is undertaken?)

Performance Measurement: A Reference Guide also provides information on logic models. It is can be accessed at:

intra.fin.gov.on.ca/tbo/fscd/pm/docs/PerformanceMeasurementGuide-FullColour.pdf
- outputs (What is produced?)
- outcomes (What are some of the benefits and changes that follow from the outputs in the short and intermediate terms?)
- higher level change: (How does the program link to/support government priorities and the larger public interest?)

- delineation of the relationships between the program’s components/activities and its service delivery/output/outcome objectives
- service providers, if applicable.

Some program profiles/logic models are more detailed and include the overall program or organizational mission and describe how success will be determined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A program profile/logic model should help you to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>clarify the outcomes expected (short-term, intermediate and high level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establish a common understanding among stakeholders about the purpose, scope, and objectives of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determine criteria for establishing whether outcomes have been achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decide how information will be collected to ascertain whether these outcomes have been achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development of such a useful logic model or program profile requires considerable conceptual work by stakeholders through an interactive, comprehensive and iterative process. See Appendix VI for one example of such a process.
Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder involvement in the evaluation process is important for many reasons. Stakeholder input can be an invaluable source of information about program performance. The interaction between stakeholders and evaluator should help to manage expectations and communications concerning the evaluation.

It is usually helpful to identify and address stakeholder issues from the beginning of the evaluation, to ensure the evaluation is relevant to them. In turn stakeholder involvement encourages their cooperation throughout the evaluation, particularly important for data collection, analyzing/interpreting results and developing recommendations. It also improves the likelihood that the evaluation findings will be used and encourages a cultural shift toward the integration of evaluation with ongoing program development and service delivery. Early on in planning an evaluation, ministries should consider how public partners and bargaining agents should be involved or informed, as well as any other implications for labour relations.

Stakeholder involvement — especially in designing the evaluation or drafting recommendations — may create expectations about the management of the project and/or the response to findings. The evaluation terms of reference should clearly outline the role(s) and limitations of stakeholders’ involvement in the evaluation. To summarize, an inclusive approach will, in many cases, lead to a better product that is supported by affected stakeholders.

Data Collection and Analysis

There are many different approaches to the collection and analysis of data, just as there are various types of evaluation. For an evaluation to be successful, it is essential that the design and analysis of the data collected be appropriate to the type of evaluation undertaken. More detail on methods of data collection is provided in Appendix V.

Performance Measurement: A Reference Guide (PM Guide) provides a great deal of information concerning the OPS approach to performance measurement and explains how performance information is used in decision-making and business planning. While performance measurement and program evaluation are different, fundamental evaluation principles were used in developing the PM Guide. When designing and considering how best to collect data for an evaluation, the PM Guide should prove to be a helpful resource, particularly

Possible stakeholders

- Recipients of program services
- Organizations which fund the program
- Partner ministries/branches, other levels of government
- Broader Public Sector and transfer payment recipients
- Community organizations
- Program staff
- OPS peers and colleagues
- Professional organizations and unions
- Media
- General public
- Suppliers
- Competitors

Key Points

- Pre-test all data collection tools and make necessary improvements before standardizing
- Develop training and protocols for all involved in data collection
- Plan the data analysis as data collection tools are developed
- Ensure all involved understand how the data will be used
concerning the different types of measures required within the OPS and Section 3, How to Develop Performance Measures.

The following sub-sections are intended to highlight some key considerations for data collection and analysis. Bear in mind that for many evaluations, not all of the data will be available from the program itself. External data sources may be necessary to complete the evaluation.

Collecting Data: What do you want to know?

When data collection tools are being designed for an evaluation, consideration should be given as to how the information collected will be analyzed and used. What will this information say about the program?

The following questions may be helpful in guiding the design of the data collection instruments:

- How will this information improve or support accountability?
- Will the data sources identified provide comprehensive information?
- How will this information support or improve the program operation/delivery of services?
- How will this information support evidence-based decision-making?

Involving Stakeholders

Wherever possible, the tools used for data collection should be developed in consultation with key stakeholders, particularly the staff responsible for using them and customers/clients who may be the source of the information being collected.
**Pre-test Instruments**
Each data collection tool should be pre-tested, with a small sub-group for a short period of time, to determine the feasibility of using the tool and its quality. Revisions can then be made to improve the tool before it is used routinely.

**Build in Feedback Mechanisms**
To encourage a culture of enquiry, data collection tools can be designed to encourage communication and feedback from customers to staff about their needs and their perceptions as to how well the program is, or is not, assisting them in meeting these needs.

**Design Tools to Serve more than One Purpose**
Where feasible, consider ways of designing data collection tools so that they are multi-functional and serve more than one purpose. For example, a client registration form that formally acknowledges admission to the program may also include key demographic data and information about client needs and interests. The resulting data collection system will be more streamlined and user-friendly.

**Ensure Confidentiality**
Protocols are necessary to ensure appropriate confidentiality of the data collected and to clarify the processes for collecting the data. Is customer/client participation voluntary? Are clients able to access their own data collection records at any time, upon request?

**Ensure Conceptual Consistency**
Conceptual consistency is the identification, organization and consistent use of key program concepts that accurately reflect a program's structure and operation, and is essential to meaningful data collection. The program description developed through a logic model or program profile should identify appropriate core categories of program information to ensure consistency in monitoring and planning for better co-ordination, and effectiveness of service delivery. These conceptual categories are the foundation for a data collection system that accurately reflects program achievements in all relevant areas. The resulting data should link logically with the program objectives, success criteria and desired outcomes.

Conceptual consistency is also important for programs that are part of a broader initiative, for which information is needed at several levels, e.g., client, program, systemic (regional, provincial). Data that is conceptually consistent at every level can be used to inform policy development and public reporting, as it can be rolled up from the client or transaction
level to the program level and then to the regional and/or provincial systemic levels.

**Collect Data Regularly**
Everyone should understand the importance of the ongoing data collection, within the context of program operations and how it will be used. The accuracy and timeliness of ongoing data collection by frontline staff, around carefully conceptualized core categories, will increase the effective use of the data by program managers and other stakeholders at all levels.

**Revise Measurement Tools as Needed**
Encourage regular refinement of measures through a critical review process to ensure that the measures are accurate and relevant, including analysis of how measures are used and which characteristics are most important.

**Build Enthusiasm about Data Collection**
Every effort should be made to minimize any negative attitudes toward collecting data. Program staff should be involved in the development of the data collection process from the beginning and understand why the data is being collected, how it will be used and how it will be useful to them. Staff should be given advance notice of any specific data requirements for which they are responsible, e.g., pulling files for review, setting up interview times, etc. Data should be easily accessible to potential users, including program staff, who have an authorized need and right to know.

Data systems should promote effective and efficient service delivery and support communication, advocacy and decision-making. Data elements, their definitions and data networking protocols should be standardized and compatible with the objectives of the organization.

**Analyzing Data: What does it mean?**
Successful data analysis involves asking the right questions and having the necessary data available to answer them. Again, the type of evaluation undertaken will determine how the data will be analyzed.

Impact/outcome evaluations identify key evaluation questions at the beginning of the evaluation process. Implementation/process evaluations, while identifying some key questions at the beginning of the evaluation, e.g., concerning efficiency, effectiveness and customer
satisfaction, may also use the data to identify additional questions as the evaluation proceeds, such as:

- Why did service X show such positive results while no one even seems to be using service Y?
- Why did X have excellent results with one client group but not with a different group?

While these questions cannot be answered definitively by a process evaluation, they can foster a culture of enquiry and continuous improvement, encouraging program staff to discuss such questions among themselves and with various stakeholders, particularly their clients. Such questions may lead to higher level impact/outcome evaluation or scientific research in the future.

Most evaluations require rigorous statistical analysis to determine if the results are significant or not. Where the samples are too small to ensure statistical validity for the population as a whole, this must be stated in the evaluation.

Implementation/process evaluations may be ongoing but there are usually set reporting periods (monthly, quarterly and/or annual) when it is necessary to analyze and report on the data collected for that period.

For day to day management purposes, data collection forms may organize and display data so that it is easy to visualize the pattern of service or events at a glance. Where the intent is to encourage a culture of enquiry, data collection intended to encourage communication and feedback from customers can be analyzed and used immediately to identify perceptions of what is working well and where improvements are needed.

Regardless of reporting frequency, the use of monthly summary forms for analyzing data routinely is encouraged. Such forms may display key data for that month, the same month the previous year, the current year to date (or average) and the previous year to date. This monthly consolidation allows management to identify trends and patterns early on and to ask questions when something unexpected is identified. Monthly reports encourage regular reviews of the data collected and provide an easily accessible source of data for quarterly and annual reports.
The summary report highlights patterns of events, fluctuations in service and other trends in key areas over time. It suggests comparisons to be made between categories of information and encourages more detailed analysis and interpretation of the data and the formulation of appropriate questions.

After one year, baseline data can be identified and used as part of the regular summary report analysis.

If adequately planned, computerization of the data collection process and analysis can be immensely helpful and efficient. However, it is imperative that there be common understanding and agreement among all involved as to what is being measured/evaluated, why it is being measured, the kinds of questions to be asked, the methods of data analysis and how the data will be utilized. In addition, benefits should warrant the cost of IT development and implementation. See Section F for more cautions on the use of information technology as an evaluation tool.
After the systematic gathering of data and its analysis, the next step is to interpret the evaluation’s findings to support whatever decisions are made concerning the program. Generally, these results are communicated to a broad audience through an evaluation report that explains the methods used, the results, and recommendations for action based on these results.

The findings will form the basis of recommendations, and subsequently, decisions about whether to keep the program unchanged, redesign process, change policy, change the delivery method significantly, or terminate/privatize the program. The findings from the evaluation may also help to identify areas for improvement within programs.

Presentation and Dissemination of Evaluation Findings

The final evaluation report is a comprehensive document, sufficiently detailed to enable readers to assess the quality and rigor of the evaluation and make effective recommendations, based on sound evidence.

A final evaluation report may include the following sections:

1. Executive Summary

The executive summary is used for reports longer than 10 pages. It provides a concise overview of the key components of the evaluation report, including:

- a brief description of the program and its objectives
- purpose of the evaluation and type/method of evaluation chosen
- outline of the main findings
- key qualifications/limitations to the evaluation, data and/or findings
- key recommendations for action.
2. Introduction and Background

This brief introduction to the evaluation report should orient the reader to the structure and content of the report and provide background and contextual information on the program.

3. Management of the Evaluation

This section should describe how the evaluation was managed, including:

- the scope, timing and budget of the evaluation
- accountability structure
- use of consultants
- stakeholder participation.

4. Evaluation Methodology

This section should indicate how the evaluation was conducted, including:

- data collection and analysis techniques
- data sources
- sample size and sampling techniques
- survey tools
- qualifications/limitations of the evaluation, data and/or findings.

Samples of the feedback form, survey tool and/or focus group questions, and reports on customer responses may be appended to the evaluation report.

5. Findings and Analysis

This section presents the findings which may be organized around the five key domains of the OPS Evaluation Framework: relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; affordability and sustainability; and customer satisfaction. The analysis interprets the findings and explains their implications for the program.

Tables, graphs and diagrams are often used to support the findings and clarify the analysis.
6. Overall Conclusions

This section describes the evaluation’s conclusions, providing an overall assessment of the program’s current status. The conclusions may be organized around the five key domains of the OPS Evaluation Framework: relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; affordability and sustainability; and customer satisfaction. This will provide the rationale to support the recommendations and priorities for action.

7. Recommendations for Action

This section sets out the course of action recommended for the future of the program. It should include the rationale for the recommendations, the objectives for proposed changes, and highlights of the change and risk management strategies recommended. The recommendations should be fully based on the evidence of the evaluation and consider the impact on the whole program of any action targeted to address specific concerns. Ideally, a recommendation that improves performance in one or more areas will not weaken results in any other area. Categories of recommendations are as follows:

- maintain status quo
- make process improvements: e.g., enhancements to procedures, application of information technology and/or reorganization
- change in policy: may propose changes in, for example, eligibility criteria and reporting frequency
- significant change in service delivery method: could entail a shift from direct delivery to delivery through an agency, a delegated administrative authority, a public/private partnership or a franchise
- end the program.

8. Appendices

The appendices to the evaluation report may include:

- documentation provided by a consultant
- any other data and analysis the ministry used to develop its report and make its recommendations
- previous evaluation and/or audit findings
- the communications plan, outlining how stakeholder responses to the evaluation report and the recommendations will be managed
an updated risk management plan, including feasibility of implementing the recommendations
- text of jurisdictional/literature review
- acknowledgements.

Dissemination of the Findings

Consider the various stakeholders identified at the beginning of the evaluation process and determine how best to share the evaluation findings with each group. It is possible that one formal evaluation report will satisfy everyone but the evaluation may have more impact if its findings are communicated through a more strategic, targeted approach.

After satisfying all reporting requirements, consider the following options:

- conduct verbal presentations for senior management, program staff and/or program participants
- use in-house newsletters to highlight key findings (with link to full report) to reach a broader audience
- encourage and assist related external agencies and organizations to distribute the report.

If the evaluation process was particularly productive and a positive learning experience, consider ways of sharing what was learned with a broader audience including OPS wide publications, presentations at professional conferences, and articles in professional journals.

Using the Findings

In addition to public and internal reporting, evaluation findings can be used to improve communications and inform decisions about a program, including:

- encourage front-line staff to discuss what they have learned from the data they collect, individually and as a team
- share summary reports with stakeholders to elicit their input as to what the resulting data means — to what extent do they interpret this as success and which areas are identified as needing improvement?
Presenting and Using Evaluation Findings

- use new insights and findings to inform management decisions on program operations, resource allocations, prioritization, efficiency reviews, etc.

- consult with third party service providers, broader public sector organizations and other ministries to identify cross-ministry or horizontal initiatives with a view to aligning performance measures, promoting greater coordination and avoiding duplication.

The findings can be used to raise new questions such as the following about how efficient and effective the program is and what might be done to improve it:

- Who does what, at what cost, why, to what effect?

- Are client needs being met? Identify trends in patterns of service and client response/interaction

- Is the intended target population being served?

- How can resources be used more effectively or reallocated? Should more resources be spent in a particular area? If so, why and with what expected outcome?

- Are resources used to maintain some services that are not being used or may no longer be needed?

Part of the evaluator's responsibility is to encourage utilization of the evaluation findings by working with stakeholders to:

- understand and interpret the evaluation results
- determine actions to be taken based on the results
- encourage ongoing evaluation of program changes.
At the individual client and program levels, ongoing data collection processes can be integrated with day to day program management and used to continually improve services. For example, a monthly summary report brings key information forward on a regular basis for review and input into ongoing management and evaluation processes. Senior management and other stakeholders review and use the key categories of summary data to identify important issues that need to be addressed and to assess and improve program responses to consumers’ needs.

Networking and sharing information on evaluation findings is another effective way of promoting greater understanding and utilization of evaluation processes. Organized forums, communities of practice and other similar gatherings offer opportunities for participants from similar programs in diverse settings to come together for shared training, information and resource sharing and learning.
Avoid Evaluation Pitfalls

There are many ways that evaluations can become confused, unwieldy or appear to be consuming more resources than they are worth. The following list, by no means exhaustive, is intended to provide some cautions for common evaluation pitfalls.

**Asking the Wrong Questions Too Soon**

Many evaluation protocols encourage the development of evaluation or research questions at the beginning of the evaluation process, even if little is known about the program itself. While evaluation frameworks, such as the one used by OPS, provide a generic set of evaluation questions, it should not be assumed that such questions can be addressed without first determining how to ask them within a particular program.

In order to develop the “right” questions, a sound conceptual description of the program and an ongoing data collection/performance measurement system need to be established first. The resulting

---

**The evaluation is complete but unfortunately they asked the wrong questions…**

A Settlement House undertook an evaluation of its Outreach Program to determine if it should continue, be merged with another program or discontinued. A survey of current agency clients and community stakeholders was used, asking their perceptions of how effective and efficient the program was. Most of those who responded to the survey had never used the Outreach Program, did not understand what services were provided and their ratings of its efficiency and effectiveness were very low. When the evaluation recommendation to cancel the program reached the Board of Directors, some of them questioned the findings and the evaluation itself, as they had received tremendous support from the program when they first arrived in the country, a factor that led them to become volunteer leaders with the agency.

A new, more comprehensive process evaluation was then undertaken which led to some restructuring of the program and a public awareness campaign for all the agency services.
information will reduce the likelihood of addressing the wrong questions prematurely, and provide more helpful information for the program. It may also encourage the identification of useful research questions for higher level impact/outcome evaluation or scientific research.

Avoid Cookie Cutter Approaches

The information requirements of those funding a program often influence the way that program activities are perceived and evaluated. If data is required in a particular format, using pre-established categories that are not relevant to a particular program, the response may be to force services to fit these categories, whether they meet customer needs or not. Similarly if “best practices” are identified for the program area, they may be applied with no consideration for the “fit” with existing clients.

In order to use evaluation to continuously improve programs and services and their responsiveness to customers, it is important to focus on the needs of the program customers and how well their needs are being satisfied by program activities, rather than just collecting data about current program activities. Generic data collection, such as customer satisfaction surveys, should be carefully reviewed and revised to ensure that questions relating to specific customer needs, program objectives and how key service components relate to these needs and objectives, are included.

Defining Success as Outputs

Perhaps the most common pitfall is the confusion of program outcomes with outputs, inputs and even milestones. If the outcomes are defined as things produced or done by the program, then it will be relatively easy to count them up and proclaim success. For example, if a public awareness program to decrease bullying in schools describes its outcomes as the distribution of 100,000 pamphlets in 50 schools and training 1000 teachers and then reports this has been done, does this mean the program is successful? The pamphlets and training are program outputs, not outcomes, and do not reflect program success beyond implementation of the program. For this program, an outcome that demonstrates program impact might be the rate of bullying incidents reported to the school principal — one indicator of the extent to which the public awareness campaign made a difference or not.
Assuming Causality

Many evaluations assume a program is effective because outcome data indicates clients have improved in various ways. However, client improvements may be due to other factors, totally unrelated to the program being evaluated. For example, client housing outcomes might improve because new affordable housing becomes available through a major housing industry initiative. Employment outcomes may improve or deteriorate because of changes in the local economy. A variety of reliable indicators are needed to demonstrate that program activities and service components are linked to desired client outcomes.

Premature Computerization: Technology as Quick Fix

While the application of information technology to automate data collection systems can improve the efficiency of collecting and analyzing data, it should not be undertaken prematurely. Before an existing data set is computerized, it is important to ensure that everyone understands and agrees on the program description, the relevance of the data being collected and made available electronically, the kinds of questions to be addressed and how the data will be analyzed and utilized.

Sometimes computerization is used to present a sophisticated looking data set, analysis and report that actually makes it more difficult to understand how the program operates and what is being achieved.

Haste Makes Waste…

The head of a state-wide health and safety program, operated by 16 non-profit agencies, was concerned about accountability. Each agency had developed its own version of the program to fit the unique needs of each community. Now questions were being asked about what was being achieved with the funding flowed to these programs. A new, computerized, minimal data set was developed that each agency was required to report on monthly. Unfortunately, for many agencies, the data requested was not relevant to their services and the software did not allow for reporting on most of their actual achievements.

When the next report to the state legislature (using the new data system) reflected few results, there was a call to reduce spending or possibly cancel the program. A program review was then conducted that identified many program benefits that had not been recognized by the computerized system. This led to a costly redesign of the data collection system and the accompanying software.
This may disguise underlying problems in the program, as the example on page 37 illustrates.

Another concern is that once the data collection and some analytic processes are automated, this may encourage the view that the data is an end in itself, rather than a means to identifying and addressing important issues and questions about program effectiveness.

Before computerizing part or all of the system, careful consideration should be given to the stability of the program and the elements to be computerized. The flexibility of the proposed software should also be considered as it will be necessary to change the computerized system when key service components of the program change.

Lost in the Trees

Some evaluation reports can be long on data analysis but lose focus on key findings. For example, a six inch thick report on an evaluation of health status in East London, England, reported every result of every test and survey completed. However it was unclear what the real issues were for this population, whether the findings were representative or an anomaly. Most people will not read the detailed data so it is important to synthesize the evaluation findings as they are reported, not just provide the analysis.

Wrapping Up… Summary of Key Points in this Guide:

- build a positive evaluation culture and encourage an attitude of enquiry
- ensure the evaluation methodologies that you select are consistent with the purpose of your evaluation
- involve all significant stakeholders
- build evaluation strategies into ongoing program management
- ensure all involved in data collection understand why the data is being collected and how it will be used
- encourage knowledge transfer and ensure that evaluation findings are used through:
  - timely dissemination
  - brief, specific, and targeted presentations
  - plain language
  - clear evidence of the return on public investment.
APPENDICES:
PROGRAM EVALUATION REFERENCE & RESOURCE GUIDE
This appendix aims to provide a fuller description of each type of evaluation, using fictitious examples that illustrate when each type of evaluation is appropriate and the basic steps involved. Please note that these are not intended to be definitive or exhaustive examples of the various types of evaluation. Rather, they are intended to give the reader a better understanding of how such evaluations might proceed and their possible results.

1. Evaluability Assessment

An Evaluability Assessment should be undertaken prior to, or as the first part of, a program evaluation in order to determine the extent to which a program is ready for evaluation and the type of evaluation most appropriate to the program stage of development. Evaluability assessment aims to ascertain the objectives, expectations and information needs of program managers and policy makers and determine whether a formal evaluation of an existing program is warranted. Such an assessment may identify the need for clearer, more outcome-focused objectives, any barriers to a program evaluation, such as availability and sufficiency of data, and provide a plan for correcting these deficiencies early enough to make future evaluations feasible. Such a plan should include identification of the steps to be taken prior to evaluation and the scope of the evaluation.

An Evaluability Assessment will often begin with a review of program documents and consultations with stakeholders to begin to develop a logic model of the program.

Case Example: Evaluation of Pesticide Use in Rural Communities

The Ministry of Environmental Protection, Insect Control Division, has funded many initiatives intended to contain insect infestations without
causing harm to the environment. Recently, there has been increased media coverage of possible dangers associated with widespread spraying of pesticides in rural areas. The Ministry decided to evaluate all the initiatives currently funded to determine their effectiveness, efficiency and address any safety concerns.

An Evaluation Committee was established to organize the evaluation and, since no internal staff had sufficient evaluation experience, they started by hiring an external evaluator. Prior to his first meeting with the Committee, the evaluator reviewed the background documents they had provided — photocopies of newspaper articles, Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with the six agencies that operated the spraying programs in their respective regions, and annual reports from the past three years since the spraying program began. He noted that the agencies appeared to use different insecticides, at different rates of frequency and coverage. Some agencies used additional strategies to contain infestations. No information appeared to be collected about any changes the pesticides might be causing in the sprayed areas.

During the first meeting, the evaluator discussed his concerns about the apparent lack of consistent implementation of the spraying program and insufficient data for immediately determining the impact of the program. He advised that they should begin with an evaluability assessment of the program and provided a draft, five-step plan, summarized as follows:

1. Expand the Evaluation Committee to include one representative from each agency that operates the program. Review and revise the Terms of Reference for the Committee to ensure that everyone understands the purpose and scope of the evaluation, how it will proceed and the role of each stakeholder. Develop a Communications Plan that includes protocols for sharing information and dissemination of reports.

2. In consultation with each agency representative(s), develop a program description of their approach to pesticide use that clearly outlines the program objective(s), the main program activities, key outputs and the desired outcomes. Also, determine what information, if any, is collected routinely about any aspect of the program.

3. Review the collective results of Step 2. Identify similarities and inconsistencies in how the program is delivered in each region. In consultation with the Committee, develop a new, broader program description that reflects the actual implementation of the program.
in the various regions. Note any practices that are unique to one or more regions.

4. Determine what information is needed to assess the environmental impact of the program. Compare this with what agencies and other possible sources are currently collecting and reporting.

5. Review the results of the assessment so far to determine whether a formal evaluation is warranted, and if so, determine the most appropriate type.

The resulting evaluability assessment determined that each agency was delivering three key services consistently — regular inspections to assess degree and type of insect infestation; quick response spraying when infestation found; and twice annual preventive spraying of areas with chronic problems of infestation. However, only one agency monitored air quality before and after each spraying. Another agency provided specialized training to its staff to ensure they understood how to assess weather conditions for optimal spraying effectiveness but little training was offered in the other agencies. While each agency collected some information about the frequency and type of spraying provided, all used different terminology and collected and analyzed the data in different ways. No one thought they had sufficient information to assess the environmental impact of the program in their region.

The Committee agreed to assign Ministry staff to develop a comprehensive and consistently applied Performance Measurement system, in consultation with the operating agencies. They also directed that a sufficiently detailed program description be developed for the program as a whole and within each of the agencies. They requested that this be completed within four months and agreed to meet quarterly to monitor progress and plan next steps. If the new logic models and performance measures were satisfactory, they would proceed with an Impact/Outcome evaluation. However, if more time was required to develop the Performance Measurement system and the required logic models, the Committee agreed to proceed with a Process/Implementation evaluation.

The Committee also decided to expand its membership to include Research Scientists from the Air Quality Division of the Ministry of Environmental Protection and from the Ministry of Agriculture. They are considering conducting additional evaluations of other environmental protection programs.
2. Needs Assessment

The purpose of a Needs Assessment is to determine what the “needs” are of a community, organization or target group, for example, and to make recommendations on how these needs might be addressed. The assessment process usually includes:

- ascertaining the gaps between the current and the desired situation
- identifying priorities
- identifying challenges and opportunities
- strategizing ways to bridge the gap(s) between the current and desired state.

The first stage of a needs assessment often begins with a survey, key informant interviews and stakeholder consultations during which various exploratory questions are asked that may generate long “wish lists” of identified needs. A review of relevant literature, documents, reports and jurisdictional research may also be conducted at this stage to provide an overview of current thinking on the issues and suggest additional considerations for the assessment. A mix of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods are encouraged to increase the reliability of the assessment. These methods may include focus groups, semi-structured interviews, community and/or client surveys and public forums. These methods should be synthesized to minimize the limitations associated with any single method.

The resulting identified needs are then prioritized, using criteria that reflect organizational goals, availability of resources, legislative context, etc. Additional consultations may be held with various stakeholders to inform the prioritization process.

It should be noted that the needs of any community, organization or target group are continually evolving in response to a vast array of environmental factors. This means that some or all aspects of a one-time needs assessment may soon become out-of-date. Also, if unique client needs are not statistically significant, they may not be recognized in the final needs assessment. One approach to avoiding these problems is to develop one or more methods for ongoing needs assessment within the organization or program as described in the following case example.
Case Example: Community Health Centre Needs Assessment

The Main Street Community Health Centre received funding recently to deliver a wide range of health services and programs to a fast-growing suburb of Toronto. The new CEO and Board of Directors were anxious to use their resources as effectively and efficiently as possible and decided to conduct a formal needs assessment to assist them in their program development and service delivery planning. The local health authority agreed to participate in the needs assessment and offered the resources of their Research and Evaluation Unit to support the project. Students from a post-graduate course in Health Administration were also available to assist.

The Senior Consultant of the Research and Evaluation Unit coordinated the needs assessment and provided staff support to an evaluation committee, chaired by the Vice-President of the Health Centre Board of Directors. The first stage involved an analysis of demographic data for the area served by the Centre, followed by meetings with other community agencies and institutions, advocacy groups, Residents Associations, local political representatives, etc. A variety of needs assessment methods were used, including key informant interviews, focus groups, community forums, and electronic surveys. In addition, a rates-under-treatment approach focused on patients of other health institutions who live in the Main Street catchment area to determine their utilization rates and key characteristics. Various social indicators were used to assess the overall health of the Main Street community and identify any significant health risks. For example, the assessment found a high proportion of both frail elderly citizens living alone and new immigrant families living in the area.

A series of reports were written summarizing the results of each stage of the assessment. These reports were shared with key informants and focus groups who provided further input for prioritizing the needs and developing strategies for meeting them. A series of workshops were held with key stakeholder groups to develop the final set of priority needs and recommend specific program strategies. A final report of the full findings and strategic program directions was submitted to the CEO and the Board of Directors.

The report highlighted many high priority needs that had already been identified as part of the original rationale for funding the Centre. The assessment helped to clarify how best to design new services to meet these needs and make the best use of community resources. There were some surprising findings such as the literacy indicator — a higher than expected percentage of the population could not read at the Grade 4 level and had difficulty speaking English. To address this need, in
consultation with the community and some partner agencies, a new program was developed that brought potentially isolated seniors, working as literacy volunteers, together with potentially isolated new immigrants and their pre-school children. The program included a children’s play centre; one-to-one literacy support; Monday to Friday multi-cultural, pot luck lunches; and a weekly social evening. Participants were encouraged to visit the Information-Referral Service at the Health Centre to find out about other programs available to them, both at the Centre and in the broader community. While the focus of the Centre continued to be on the health needs of the community, the broader social risks identified by the assessment were addressed as well.

Following the final report of the Needs Assessment, the Board decided to create a Program Development Committee that included many community members in addition to two Board members. They quickly became aware that parts of the needs assessment were already out of date. Since the opening of the Health Centre, several requests for new services that were unavailable in the area had been received by the Information and Referral Service who passed them on to the Program Committee. One such request was for pre-natal classes for teen Moms. This had not been identified as a priority during the needs assessment, but five requests were made within six weeks of the Centre opening. After consultation with local high schools, School Boards, Public Health and a Youth Services agency, these classes were provided at a high school, and delivered by public health nurses.

The Centre's Information and Referral Service tracked and reported monthly on all new requests for service, the number and type of referrals made internally and externally to the broader community network. Special note was made of any service request that could not be met and these were discussed by the Program Committee and often reported to the Board and the local Health Authority. This ongoing approach to needs assessment helped the CEO and Board communicate more effectively and be responsive to community needs as they used this information to continually improve their programs.

3. Monitoring/Review of Compliance with Standards

Monitoring evaluations usually involve the development and application of a process that assesses the extent to which a program adheres to pre-determined criteria, procedures, standards and/or plans, and may form part of a more comprehensive evaluation.
Accountability, verification, quality assurance and fund allocation considerations are the focus of this type of evaluation that may involve developing tools for assessing standards and/or developing the standards themselves.

The role of standards in evaluation is often misunderstood. Sometimes program managers believe that the development of program standards is sufficient for evaluating the performance of that program. For example, a state health authority developed comprehensive standards for all the mental health programs that they funded. The standards addressed several domains including program governance; financial management and administration; client care; community relations. Teams of health authority staff visited every program routinely and conducted compliance reviews at least once every four years with each program. All findings of non-compliance with the standards were reported back to the state government and the program was required to submit a plan for addressing the deficiencies within three months and resolve the problem(s) within six months.

This approach to monitoring evaluation addresses compliance with program standards only; it does not provide any information on the program’s actual effectiveness, efficiency or client satisfaction. While the administration section of the monitoring tool required the program to have a performance measurement system and some type of annual evaluation, the administration standard, in itself, is not an evaluation. Health authority staff simply reviewed the files and records kept by each program and rated them as compliant or non-compliant with the administration standard.

Case Example: Compliance Review of State Grants Assistance Program

A mid-western state funded a program to assist its four largest municipalities with reducing local welfare rates through innovative employment initiatives and provided new technology to assist them in recovering overpayments to welfare recipients. The state paid for 95 per cent of all program costs, including social assistance, and the cost-sharing agreement required municipalities to return 95 per cent of all overpayment recoveries to the state. After two years, the State Auditor reported that only 10 per cent of the target amount had been collected from municipalities and concluded, from the audit, that the primary reason was lack of compliance with basic financial accounting standards. An external consultant was hired by the state to investigate further through a compliance review which aimed to assess the strength and consistency of municipalities’ expenditure control processes,
provide analysis of significant year over year variances and review the municipalities’ eligibility to continue to receive the grants program.

The greatest challenge for the consultant was obtaining accurate and reliable data. She found that some of the data needed was collected at the state level and some was collected by municipalities. The data across systems was combined and used for many different purposes. Considerable effort was needed to retrieve and reconcile the needed data so that it could be used for the review.

This problem was highlighted in the final report of the compliance review. The municipalities agreed to work together with the state to develop a new financial tracking system for welfare payments to ensure consistency in how the data was collected and meet all financial accounting standards.

4. Implementation/Process Evaluation

Implementation/process evaluation involves a systematic approach to collecting information on how a program is implemented and identifying barriers to optimal service use. It describes the operational processes through which desired outcomes are to be achieved, how well the program is functioning and how congruous services are with the goals of the program. This detailed and accurate knowledge of the program is needed if program components are to be linked with achievement of outcomes or if programs are to be replicated.

An Implementation/Process evaluation may be conducted at any time, not necessarily only in the early stages of a program’s development. There is no guarantee that a longstanding program is operating as intended or achieving the desired outcomes.

Ideally, this type of evaluation includes a description of quantitative and qualitative information/performance measures for assessing the extent to which the program is achieving its objectives, as well as an ongoing data collection system that provides this information.

Case Example: Implementation/Process Evaluation of a Youth Justice Program

After three years of operating an intensive, 10 week, support and rehabilitation program for young offenders (known as FREE), the Ministry of Youth Justice and Senior Management at the sponsoring juvenile detention centre, decided to evaluate it. Since no evaluation had been conducted previously, it was decided to undertake a comprehensive
program evaluation that would start with an implementation/process evaluation, followed by an impact/outcome evaluation.

The purpose of the implementation/process evaluation was to:

- determine the extent to which FREE had been designed and implemented as planned
- describe what activities took place, whether they were planned or unplanned, what obstacles were encountered in the development and implementation of the program and if/how they were overcome
- provide information on “best practices” and on limits of what can be expected in terms of development and implementation of a program of this nature within this setting
- identify significant components of the FREE program from the perspective of both the providers and participants
- identify areas for modification in order to better meet program goals and improve the program.

The initial phase of this implementation/process evaluation was scheduled to take six months and, once the new data collection systems were established, would be ongoing. When the initial outcome data became available at the six month point, the impact/outcome evaluation would start and continue for approximately one year.

The process/implementation evaluation began with a detailed program profile that included the overall goal of the program, program objectives, and a detailed description of program activities, components and anticipated outcomes. Four key program components were identified: Educational support; Health, Fitness and Recreation; Psychosocial support; Community Restitution and Reintegration.

Multi-methods were designed and used to gather information systematically from a variety of sources (e.g., interviews with staff and young offenders, staff and youth completed forms, document review and observation). Each program activity was considered separately to determine what would be measured and how it would be measured. For example, development of strong community partnerships was one activity of Community Restitution and Reintegration and the measures included number of community contacts, number of partnerships developed and number of restitution agreements signed. The methods
for collecting this data included document reviews and interviews with staff and community members.

Another aspect of this evaluation was the identification of specific issues for each program component to compare the planned implementation with the current reality. For the Education Program, for example, several issues were examined, including the extent to which specific topics (managing personal finances, career development, social skills, etc.) were covered, what was considered most relevant and useful by participants, and level of participation. The methods used to collect the data included review of all educational materials, interviews with staff and youth participants and classroom observation.

As the data was collected and analyzed, staff began to identify the key indicators of program performance, the information that would be part of an ongoing data collection system in future.

The results of the process/implementation evaluation indicated that while most program components were implemented as planned, some changes had been made, particularly in the community partnership area. A major obstacle, identified early on, was the lack of local employers willing to hire young offenders. The planned employment registry had not been developed and more efforts were being made to reach out to the community generally to build public awareness and acceptance of the program and its participants. Through the interview process, many suggestions were made about ways to improve employment opportunities for young offenders and these became part of the final recommendations in the evaluation report.

The Implementation/Process Evaluation successfully laid the foundation for the next phase, the Impact/Outcome Evaluation which is described in the next section.

5. Impact/Outcome Evaluation

An Impact/Outcome evaluation seeks to determine the actual effect of a program, its benefits, positive and negative changes and intended and unintended consequences. Central to this assessment is whether perceived outcomes are caused by the program itself or by other factors external to the program. Ideally this is determined by the use of an experimental design where test subjects are randomly divided into a test or experimental group and a control group.
An impact/outcome evaluation generally includes the following components:

- description of program outcomes (e.g., change in condition, status, behaviour, functioning, attitude, feeling, perception), including unexpected or unwanted program outcomes

- identification of unexpected or unwanted program outcomes, for example:
  - a program has the opposite effect than was intended
  - a program has positive side effects that were not anticipated or planned
  - a program has negative side effects that may or may not have been anticipated

- attributions linking outcomes to specific:
  - factors, e.g., demographics, economic conditions, organizational context, resources
  - interventions, e.g., comparisons over time or with other groups, identification of confounding factors that might obscure or enhance apparent effects
  - identification of effective practices/activities
  - identification of ineffective practices/activities

- identification of factors that affect the effectiveness of an intervention, such as:
  - population demographics
  - general economic conditions
  - organizational context
  - available resources

- determination of merit or worth, for example:
  - comparison of actual outcomes with intended outcomes, performance standards or criteria for success
  - comparison with other programs that have similar goals

- review and analysis of performance information in relation to program outcomes.
Case Example: Impact/Outcome Evaluation of a Youth Justice Program

Once the implementation/process evaluation of FREE\(^1\) was developed, the analysis of the impact of program participation began. The purpose of this impact/outcome evaluation was to determine the extent to which:

- key life and social skills knowledge was obtained by participants
- the planned outcomes were achieved, through provider and participant perspectives as well as objective methods
- reduced recidivism was achieved and can be attributed to participation in the program.

A quasi-experimental design using both qualitative and quantitative data was employed. Data was obtained from a variety of sources, including staff and offender feedback, completion of pre- and post-program standardized psychometric measures, observation, and document review. In addition, post-release recidivism data was obtained from the Offender Release Information System.

In all, 12 planned outcomes were identified, ranging from improved physical health and fitness levels to reduced recidivism rates for participants in the program. Multiple methods and measures were designed to assess the extent to which each outcome had been achieved. For example, health and fitness measures included body fat test results, number of laps youth able to run and staff rating of fitness level.

The methods of assessing this outcome included assessment of change on body fat tests, comparison for first two weeks average run with last two weeks, and comparison of staff rating at beginning of program with completion rating.

In order to do a comparative analysis of the program’s impact on participants, a comparison group was used from another juvenile detention centre that had no program similar to FREE. The comparison group was similar to the FREE participants in terms of their assessed risk level, criminal history, nature and length of current sentence and custodial environment.

Each group had 50 youth. In addition to the measures described above, a total of eight psychometric tools were used to measure and compare both groups on several attributes related to the various outcomes.

---

\(^1\) See previous example for background information on this program.
The testing was administered at the beginning of the 10 week program and immediately after the program ended. Recidivism rates were compared one year later. The final evaluation results showed significant differences (.01 confidence level) between the groups, with the FREE participants scoring higher in every outcome area.

While the evaluation concluded that FREE had a significant and positive impact on participants, several areas for improvement were also identified. The Ministry used the evaluation findings to launch planning discussions for similar programs at five other detention centres. Consideration is also being given to adapting and expanding the program to adult facilities as well.

6. Program Review

A Program Review is a systematic overall assessment of a program's operations, processes and systems for the purpose of finding efficiencies, cost savings, opportunities for possible realignment with another level of government and/or other delivery options. It is needed when there is an overriding concern with the program's relevance, operations and/or a need to find savings.

Case Example: Review of Student Tutoring Programs

A southern US state Department of Education had operated student tutoring programs in 20 low performing high schools for 10 years. When the federal government announced 40 per cent cuts to the grants funding these programs, the Department of Education decided to conduct a program review to determine where costs might be reduced, consider replacing the current programs with services from other agencies and/or eliminate tutoring programs altogether.

An outside evaluator was hired to conduct the review. He soon found that only five of the 20 schools had adequate performance measurement systems and maintained consistent records for their tutoring programs. The other 15 schools had very little or no data available, four of which could not even provide student registration lists. Indeed, the evaluator questioned the extent to which the tutoring program had been implemented in these four schools.

In consultation with the state department Program Review Committee, the evaluator decided to review the schools in three groups. For those with sufficient ongoing data, he conducted a survey of teachers and students to determine their perceptions of the program, particularly with respect to key student outcomes such as graduation and qualifying
for post-secondary education. He used their records to determine utilization rates, level of improvement in student grades, and cost of services per student. The review concluded that the tutoring program was very efficient and cost-effective and recommended that the state grants continue at the current level. A few recommendations were made to contain costs, e.g., the use of student teacher volunteers from nearby colleges to assist with the program.

The second group of 11 schools, with insufficient data, was encouraged to develop performance measurement systems similar to those in the first group. The evaluator conducted a more detailed survey of teachers, students, administrators and parents to determine their perception of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and overall satisfaction with the program. In two schools, it was determined that very few students used the program and the recommendation was to discontinue the program there. In the other 9 schools, findings were similar to those in the first group and the same recommendations were made.

The third group of four schools had no records for the program and, after careful investigation, the evaluator determined that the program had never been implemented. Two schools provided strong evidence that there was a definite need for the tutoring program and both were given a six month grant to set up the program under the guidance of the State Education Department. They were also required to develop performance measurement systems similar to the other schools. The last two schools would not commit to developing the program and the Review recommended that these grants be discontinued. Following the Program Review, a forensic audit was conducted at both schools to determine the extent of their financial/administrative problems and recommend further action.

7. Efficiency Assessment (Cost Benefit/Cost Effectiveness) Analysis

Efficiency assessment is used to determine the value or benefit of a program in relation to its cost. The scope of the evaluation will determine whether cost benefit, cost effectiveness or both types of analysis are used.

Cost-benefit analysis seeks to compare the total costs of implementing a program to the total net benefits, while cost-effectiveness analysis pertains to the value-for-money assessment of a program based on the financial costs required to produce each outcome level or instance. This type of evaluation is usually undertaken after the program has operated for some time so that actual outcome data can be used.
Frequently, evaluators are challenged to find the right information for determining the real cost of a program and its benefits. They must decide which factors to include and exclude in cost accounting and whether key social costs and benefits can be monetized. Various approaches to the analysis may be used, including time-series analysis, stochastic and deterministic simulations, micro-economic analysis and micro-economic models.

**Case Example: Efficiency Assessment of a Subsidized Rail Service**

For 35 years, a large southwestern state had subsidized 80 per cent of the operating costs of a rail service that linked several remote communities with the capital city. When a recent census report indicated that the population of the smaller towns had declined by 40 per cent since the rail service started, the state Department of Transportation questioned whether it made economic sense to continue such a large subsidy. They hired a consultant to conduct a cost benefit and cost effectiveness analysis of the rail service, including the effectiveness and efficiency of overall management processes, internal financial controls and the Rail Services Agency Board of Directors' oversight process.

The first phase of the assessment studied ridership in relation to service frequency. The consultant found that little detailed data was available — just the total revenue for each day of service. There was no profile of service users, frequency of use by individual riders and no customer surveys had been done. There was no breakdown available of individual routes to compare their cost and utilization rates. After discussing the need for this data with the Board and Transportation Department, the consultant conducted a two month survey of staff and customers. Staff were instructed to record the number of passengers using each section of each route over this period.

Statistical trend analysis was used to measure demographic changes and identify emerging transit needs, both at the local community level and state level. After meeting with each local Chamber of Commerce, the consultant did an economic analysis of each small town to assess the impact of reduced or withdrawn rail service in these communities.

The consultant developed three business models to assess the impact each would have on the rail service itself, the state Department of Transportation and on each local community. The result of this analysis was a solid understanding of state transportation policy objectives, the extent to which they were being achieved by current rail services and the changes needed to optimize this service but also contain costs.
The assessment identified three towns with significantly higher, more cost-effective ridership rates than the other six. It was agreed to reduce the total subsidy and discontinue the 12 routes with the lowest ridership. One route was expanded as it was very popular with tourists and cost-effective; more frequent service would be provided during the tourist season, including a sunset dinner train. Another recommendation was approved when the state agreed to support a six month pilot project to identify other potential tourist attractions in the area and consider new marketing strategies to create new revenue streams for both the rail service and local municipalities.

The efficiency assessment also led to much improved business practices by the Rail Services Agency. Their quarterly reports became much more detailed, customer centered and provided useful information on emerging needs, feedback from riders and key indicators of the results achieved.
Appendix II: VENDOR OF RECORD

Vendor of Record Arrangement #OSS-074309 for Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement Services is in place from May 8, 2007 to May 7, 2010. Please see the Supply Chain Management, Purchasing section of MyOPS for further information, forms and procurement rules.
Appendix III: CANADIAN EVALUATION SOCIETY (CES) GUIDELINES FOR ETHICAL CONDUCT AND PROGRAM EVALUATION STANDARDS

CES GUIDELINES FOR ETHICAL CONDUCT

COMPETENCE
Evaluators are to be competent in their provision of service.
1. Evaluators should apply systematic methods of inquiry appropriate to the evaluation.
2. Evaluators should possess or provide content knowledge appropriate for the evaluation.
3. Evaluators should continuously strive to improve their methodological and practice skills.

INTEGRITY
Evaluators are to act with integrity in their relationships with all stakeholders.
1. Evaluators should accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge.
2. Evaluators should declare any conflict of interest to clients before embarking on an evaluation project and at any point where such conflict occurs. This includes conflict of interest on the part of either evaluator or stakeholder.
3. Evaluators should be sensitive to the cultural and social environment of all stakeholders and conduct themselves in a manner appropriate to this environment.
4. Evaluators should confer with the client on contractual decisions such as: confidentiality; privacy; communication; and, ownership of findings and reports.

ACCOUNTABILITY
Evaluators are to be accountable for their performance and their product.
1. Evaluators should be responsible for the provision of information to clients to facilitate their decision-making concerning the selection of appropriate evaluation strategies and methodologies. Such information should include the limitations of selected methodology.
2. Evaluators should be responsible for the clear, accurate, and fair, written and/or oral presentation of study findings and limitations, and recommendations.
3. Evaluators should be responsible in their fiscal decision-making so that expenditures are accounted for and clients receive good value for their dollars.
4. Evaluators should be responsible for the completion of the evaluation within a reasonable time as agreed to with the clients. Such agreements should acknowledge unprecedented delays resulting from factors beyond the evaluator’s control.
THE PROGRAM EVALUATION STANDARDS

Summary of the Standards

**Utility Standards**
The utility standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will serve the information needs of intended users.

**U1 Stakeholder Identification** Persons involved in or affected by the evaluation should be identified, so that their needs can be addressed.

**U2 Evaluator Credibility** The persons conducting the evaluation should be both trustworthy and competent to perform the evaluation, so that the evaluation findings achieve maximum credibility and acceptance.

**U3 Information Scope and Selection** Information collected should be broadly selected to address pertinent questions about the program and be responsive to the needs and interests of clients and other specified stakeholders.

**U4 Values Identification** The perspectives, procedures, and rationale used to interpret the findings should be carefully described, so that the bases for value judgments are clear.

**U5 Report Clarity** Evaluation reports should clearly describe the program being evaluated, including its context, and the purposes, procedures, and findings of the evaluation, so that essential information is provided and easily understood.

**U6 Report Timeliness and Dissemination** Significant interim findings and evaluation reports should be disseminated to intended users, so that they can be used in a timely fashion.

**U7 Evaluation Impact** Evaluations should be planned, conducted, and reported in ways that encourage follow-through by stakeholders, so that the likelihood that the evaluation will be used is increased.

**Feasibility Standards**
The feasibility standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will be realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal.

**F1 Practical Procedures** The evaluation procedures should be practical, to keep disruption to a minimum while needed information is obtained.

**F2 Political Viability** The evaluation should be planned and conducted with anticipation of the different positions of various interest groups, so that their cooperation may be obtained, and so that possible attempts by any of these groups to curtail evaluation operations or to bias or misapply the results can be averted or counteracted.

**F3 Cost Effectiveness** The evaluation should be efficient and produce information of sufficient value, so that the resources expended can be justified.

**Propriety Standards**
The propriety standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of those involved in the evaluation, as well as those affected by its results.

**P1 Service Orientation** Evaluations should be designed to assist organizations to address and effectively serve the needs of the full range of targeted participants.
P2 Formal Agreements Obligations of the formal parties to an evaluation (what is to be done, how, by whom, when) should be agreed to in writing, so that these parties are obligated to adhere to all conditions of the agreement or formally to renegotiate it.

P3 Rights of Human Subjects Evaluations should be designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of human subjects.

P4 Human Interactions Evaluators should respect human dignity and worth in their interactions with other persons associated with an evaluation, so that participants are not threatened or harmed.

P5 Complete and Fair Assessment The evaluation should be complete and fair in its examination and recording of strengths and weaknesses of the program being evaluated, so that strengths can be built upon and problem areas addressed.

P6 Disclosure of Findings The formal parties to an evaluation should ensure that the full set of evaluation findings along with pertinent limitations are made accessible to the persons affected by the evaluation and any others with expressed legal rights to receive the results.

P7 Conflict of Interest Conflict of interest should be dealt with openly and honestly, so that it does not compromise the evaluation processes and results.

P8 Fiscal Responsibility The evaluator’s allocation and expenditure of resources should reflect sound accountability procedures and otherwise be prudent and ethically responsible, so that expenditures are accounted for and appropriate.

Accuracy Standards The accuracy standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will reveal and convey technically adequate information about the features that determine worth or merit of the program being evaluated.

A1 Program Documentation The program being evaluated should be described and documented clearly and accurately, so that the program is clearly identified.

A2 Context Analysis The context in which the program exists should be examined in enough detail, so that its likely influences on the program can be identified.

A3 Described Purposes and Procedures The purposes and procedures of the evaluation should be monitored and described in enough detail, so that they can be identified and assessed.

A4 Defensible Information Sources The sources of information used in a program evaluation should be described in enough detail, so that the adequacy of the information can be assessed.

A5 Valid Information The information-gathering procedures should be chosen or developed and then implemented so that they will assure that the interpretation arrived at is valid for the intended use.

A6 Reliable Information The information-gathering procedures should be chosen or developed and then implemented so that they will assure that the information obtained is sufficiently reliable for the intended use.

A7 Systematic Information The information collected, processed, and reported in an evaluation should be systematically reviewed, and any errors found should be corrected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Analysis of Quantitative Information</th>
<th>Analysis of Qualitative Information</th>
<th>Justified Conclusions</th>
<th>Impartial Reporting</th>
<th>Metaevaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Quantitative information in an evaluation should be appropriately and systematically analyzed so that evaluation questions are effectively answered.</td>
<td>Qualitative information in an evaluation should be appropriately and systematically analyzed so that evaluation questions are effectively answered.</td>
<td>The conclusions reached in an evaluation should be explicitly justified, so that stakeholders can assess them.</td>
<td>Reporting procedures should guard against distortion caused by personal feelings and biases of any party to the evaluation, so that evaluation reports fairly reflect the evaluation findings.</td>
<td>The evaluation itself should be formatively and summatively evaluated against these and other pertinent standards, so that its conduct is appropriately guided and, on completion, stakeholders can closely examine its strengths and weaknesses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV: GLOSSARY OF EVALUATION TERMS

Accountability

The obligation to answer for results and the manner in which responsibilities are discharged. Accountability cannot be delegated. Responsibility is the obligation to act whereas accountability is the obligation to answer for an action.

Activity

An activity is the work performed by ministries to implement public policy and provide services to the public. All activities consume resources and produce products and/or services. One or more activities will be critical to the achievement of overall public policy objectives. Ministries must be able to demonstrate a direct causal link between the activity and the outcome(s).

Attribution

The demonstrable assertion that a reasonable connection can be made between a specific outcome and the actions and outputs of a government policy, program or initiative.

Baseline

The level of results at a given time that provides a starting point for assessing changes in performance and for establishing objectives or targets for future performance.

Benchmarking

The process of measuring and comparing one’s own processes, products or service against a higher performing process, product or service and adapting business practices to improve.
Cost-Benefit Analysis

A process that assesses the relation between the cost of an undertaking and the value of the resulting benefits.

Cost Effectiveness

The extent to which an organization, program, etc. is producing its planned outcomes in relation to use of resources (inputs).

Customer

The person, whether inside or outside the organization, to whom services or products are delivered.

Customer Satisfaction

The degree to which the intended recipients or beneficiaries of a product or service indicate that the product or service meets their needs and expectations for quality and efficiency.

Effectiveness

The extent to which an organization, policy, program or initiative is producing its planned outcomes and meeting intended objectives.

Efficiency

The extent to which an organization, policy, program or initiative is producing its planned outputs in relation to expenditure of resources.

Evaluation

The systematic collection and analysis of information on the performance of a policy, program or initiative to make judgements about relevance, progress or success and cost-effectiveness and/or to inform future programming decisions about design and implementation.

High Level Indicator

A measure of changes in social, environmental or economic conditions.
**Indicator**

A quantitative or qualitative ratio or index used to signal and indirectly measure the performance of a program over time.

**Impact/Outcome Evaluation**

A type of evaluation that focuses on the broad, longer-term impacts or results of a program.

**Implementation/Process Evaluation**

A type of evaluation that looks at a program's systems and processes for achieving results with a view to determining the extent to which they help or hinder that achievement.

**Inputs**

The resources (human, material, financial, etc.) allocated to carry out activities, produce outputs and/or accomplish results.

**Intermediate outcomes**

Benefits and changes in behaviour, decisions, policies and social action attributable to outputs to demonstrate that program objectives are being met, e.g., increased employability as a result of a training program.

**Long-term outcomes**

The ultimate or long-term consequences for human, economic, civic or environmental benefit, to which government policy or legislation contributes, e.g., life expectancy rates, overall economic performance.

**Monitoring**

The process of collecting and analyzing information to track program outputs and progress towards desired outcomes.

**Objective**

Achievable and realistic expression of a desired result.
**Outcome**

The actual effects/impacts or results of the outputs. See Short-term Outcomes, Intermediate Outcomes, Long-term Outcomes.

**Output**

The products or services that result from activities.

**Priority**

Higher-order goals of government that reflect its commitment to citizens and contribute to enduring human, economic, civic and environmental benefits.

**Qualitative data**

Non-numeric information collected through interviews, focus groups, observation and the analysis of written documents. Qualitative data can be quantified to establish patterns or trends, e.g., improvement in a child’s reading level as observed by parents and teacher.

**Quantitative data**

Information that is counted or compared on a scale, e.g., improvement in a child’s reading level as measured by a reading test.

**Reliability**

The extent to which measurements are repeatable and consistent under the same conditions each time.

**Result**

A condition (outcome) or product (output) that exists as a consequence of an activity.

**Results-based Management**

A comprehensive, government-wide approach that informs results-based decision-making, ensuring that all government-funded activities are
aligned with strategies that contribute to meeting government priorities or serve an important public interest.

Risk

The chance of something happening that will impact on the achievement of objectives of business operations and legislative or policy agendas and/or on the targeted results contained in strategic plans to reach government priorities.

Risk Management

The active process of identifying, assessing, communicating, and managing the risks facing an organization to ensure that an organization meets its objectives.

Sample

A subset of participants selected from the total study population. Samples can be random (selected by chance) or non-random (selected purposefully).

Short-term outcomes

First-level effects of, or immediate response to the outputs, e.g., changes in compliance rates or degree of customer satisfaction.

Standards

Pre-defined quantifiable levels of performance that are commonly understood and agreed upon and are the basis for judging or comparing actual performance.

Statistical test

Type of statistical procedure, such as a t-test or Z-score that is applied to data to determine whether results are statistically significant (i.e., the outcome is not likely to have resulted by chance alone).

Strategy

Plan outlining how specified ministry activities and programs contribute to a government priority and results or other important public interest.
Target

A clearly stated objective or planned result [which may include output(s) and/or outcome(s)] to be achieved within a stated time, against which actual results can be compared.

Validity

The extent to which a measurement instrument accurately measures what it is supposed to measure. For example, a reading test may be a valid measure of reading skills, but it is not a valid measure of total language competency.

Value for Money Review

An assessment of program outcomes and expenditures to determine whether a program area achieved best return and performance for the money spent.

Vote

A grouping of ministry items (activities) that have a common goal and which either provide services or products to the public or support ministry or government operations, as identified in the Printed Estimates.
Appendix V: METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

Introduction

There are many valid ways to collect data for evaluation purposes. Most evaluations rely on a mixed-method approach that uses both quantitative and qualitative data.

Quantitative methods enable the collection of standardized or structured information from a large number of stakeholders. Data may also be extracted from existing systems. The data gathered through these means can be compared across groups and results can be generalized.

Qualitative methods gather detailed information that is derived primarily from the opinions of groups and individuals with knowledge of the program. If the results are coded, they may be analyzed to produce quantitative information.

The following table shows different types of data collection tools used in quantitative and qualitative approaches:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Type of data collection tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>• Mail or telephone surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Electronic surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Process tracking forms/records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data sets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>• Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In-depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct observation of program activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Open-ended survey questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Diaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consensus building (e.g., Delphi Method)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Forums/discussion groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The choice of how to collect information or data and how to analyze it will depend on the program, the evaluation questions, whether existing data systems can be relied upon and what resources have been allocated to evaluating the program.

In considering what data collection tools to use, ministries should assess the resources required, as well as the pros and cons of one method versus another. For example, there are different costs, as well as various pros and cons, to conducting interviews, surveys, questionnaires, or focus groups, and so on. In selecting a survey instrument, decisions will have to be made about how to administer the survey instrument (e.g., in person, by telephone, by e-mail, via the internet) and the impact on response rate and timing of data collection. It may be possible to collect information as part of regular program operations, or from existing data collection streams. Ministries will need to balance rigor with feasibility and choose between off-the-shelf, standardized tools and customized ones.

Ministries should be able to demonstrate the reliability and validity of their measurement tools. A data collection instrument is reliable when it produces consistent results over repeated observations or administrations of the instrument under the same conditions each time. It is also important that reliability be maintained across data collectors (otherwise known as inter-rater reliability). Validity of a measurement tool refers to the extent to which the instrument accurately measures what it is supposed to measure.

**Sampling Considerations**

When collecting data, ministries should include information about sampling methodology in plans and reports. What is the sample size? Where is the sample taken from? How was the sample selected (e.g., random sample, haphazard, stratified random sample, etc.) and why was this sampling strategy used?

All data gathered should be verified through triangulation — this means ensuring the credibility of data gathered by relying on data from different sources (primary and secondary data), data of different types (qualitative, quantitative and financial/resource information) or data from different respondents (e.g., clients, service providers, staff, or other).

While many sampling techniques are available, ministries will want to ensure that the information collected is representative of the target
population. As noted below, random or purposive techniques are generally more reliable than convenience samples.

Random sampling may be taken either from a predetermined portion of the population (i.e., straight random) or drawn from each of several strata (i.e., stratified). Purposive sampling involves targeting specific individuals (e.g., key informants or experts). Convenience samples are available samples (with the group selected not necessarily being representative of the population).

More information on sampling techniques and statistical significance can be found in the evaluation resources referenced in Appendix VII to this guide.

**Survey tools**

It is a requirement that all OPS customer surveys employ the Common Measurements Tool. This includes all customer surveys targeted at the general public or internal OPS clients. The Common Measurements Tool (CMT) is a ready-made survey tool that has been adopted by the OPS as the customer-surveying standard. The CMT includes a set of Core Questions reflecting the key drivers of customer satisfaction as empirically identified through the Citizens First studies and all organizations are encouraged to include them in their surveys. This will allow for building of internal benchmarks, comparison of results with similar organizations and sharing of lessons learned.

The CMT can be customized for particular client groups and services by selecting pertinent questions from a bank of more than 150 additional questions or by adding customized questions.

The CMT measures:

- customer service expectations
- customers’ level of satisfaction with key aspects of service
- the relative importance of each service aspect
- the priorities for service improvement and identifies service gaps
- the client’s service standards.

There is information about several online tools and related resources available through the Institute for Citizen-Centered Service (ICCS). The ICCS website (www.iccs-isac.org/eng/WebSurveyIntro.htm) offers helpful advice on what to consider when investigating various options for online survey tools.
Some considerations for such resources include being able to:

- target specific audiences and communicate with respondents by e-mail
- collect textual and numerical data
- ask questions in a wide variety of formats
- create and preview the survey using any standard web browser
- track, communicate with and manage respondents
- assure respondents’ anonymity
- reuse prior surveys and/or questions and respondents
- export results into a spreadsheet or statistical software package of evaluators’ choice.

**Existing Sources of Data**

Ministries should always consider what sources of information are already available to them.

Potential sources of data within ministries are outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Domain</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relevance                     | • government statements of priority  
|                                | • vision/mission statements of the program                                  |
| Effectiveness                  | • effectiveness performance measures  
|                                | • historical record of performance measurement                            |
|                                | • forecast of future program outputs                                         |
| Efficiency                     | • efficiency performance measures  
|                                | • financial data such as, actual revenues and costs                        |
|                                | • forecast of revenues and costs                                            |
|                                | • historical information from financial services                           |
|                                | • expenditures                                                               |
| Affordability and Sustainability| • risk assessment studies                                                   |
|                                | • information on service delivery initiatives or proposed initiatives        |
| Customer Satisfaction          | • relevant customer satisfaction measures                                    |

If ministries already have valid and reliable performance measurement systems, the program evaluation may be a snapshot of the current situation using existing data streams and records, and, possibly, new information gathered specifically for the evaluation. If there is no such measurement system, careful consideration should be given to the type of evaluation undertaken and the need for ongoing data collection systems. The cost of a “one off” evaluation may be more wisely invested in the development of an ongoing performance measurement system that can then be used for a variety of evaluation purposes.
APPENDIX VI: PROGRAM PROFILES AND LOGIC MODELS

Key to any evaluation is the development of a detailed description of the program design and logic, including but not limited to the:

- program mission, goals and objectives
- target group
- actual participants
- identification of what is working well, and not, in implementing the program
- identification of client needs to which the program is intended to respond
- identification of stakeholders
- anticipated resources and actual use of those resources (including human resources)
- actual services provided
- expected outcomes
- key activities or major service components — how services are organized to achieve and link logically to the program objectives, desired outcomes and satisfy client needs
- criteria for success
- details of program management systems and processes.

An Iterative Process

The most important part of developing a logic model or program profile is the conceptual work done by stakeholders through an iterative process. It should never be assumed at the outset that stakeholders, even those who have worked together for many years, will describe how the program operates or why it exists, in the same way. The following example shows how the conceptualization of a community support program, (i.e., how its key service components were defined), changed significantly over four iterative evaluation sessions.
Initially, before the evaluation started, program stakeholders identified five key services. After one session, they combined the first three services into one component, changed one and identified six additional services. After a fourth session, the final program description recognized five key components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Evaluation:</th>
<th>After 1st session:</th>
<th>After 4th session:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>Intake</td>
<td>Intake/Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Group Service</td>
<td>• Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One-to-one</td>
<td>• Weekly groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring</td>
<td>• One-to-one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Termination</td>
<td>Volunteer Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Sessions</td>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td>Education/Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-ordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Changes Made over Four Evaluation Sessions:**

- monitoring of clients — not defined as a major service component
- consultation and co-ordination — not defined as major service component for this program but recognized as key component of another agency-wide program (Community Development)
- intake/assessment — made one service component
- orientation — made a support service component
- volunteers — changed from support to separate service component.

**Why is this important?**

The importance of this process is exemplified by the identification of Orientation as a separate service component. Unlike the very brief orientations offered by other programs, this one offered a comprehensive, six step orientation process for first-time program participants. After it was recognized and tracked separately, the
evaluation found that fully one third of program participants’ needs were met through the orientation process alone. Previously, those who did not return to attend group sessions were considered drop-outs.

With more precise service definitions, it was possible to recognize that many of these short-term clients had their needs met quickly by the program and should be counted as successful outcomes, not drop-outs.

Defining the key service components so that they are discrete and accurately reflect the structure of the program is the core of an evaluation’s conceptual framework, ensuring that the right information will be collected about the right things, that the information about program activities will be sufficient, and that anyone can understand what is being evaluated.

**Using Existing Information for Developing Program Descriptions**

There are many documents that may assist in developing a program profile or logic model including strategic, organizational and/or program work plans; manuals; training materials; committee reports and previous evaluation reports. It may also be useful to review existing program level performance measures, key strategic performance measures, performance information included in business cases and the ministry’s Results-based Plan. Literature and/or jurisdictional reviews may also be helpful.

However, it is essential that this type of information be used with a critical eye and discussed with relevant stakeholders to determine its current accuracy and relevance to the program. As a general rule, endless reviews of pre-existing material may not be productive and may delay the actual undertaking of the evaluation.

**Program Profile and Logic Model Examples**

As explained in Section D, there are many possible variations in the format and content of both program profiles and logic models. The following examples are provided to illustrate what such program descriptions may look like.
Sample Program Profile for a Housing Registry/Outreach Program

Sponsor Organization Mission

The HELP organization is dedicated to enhancing, maintaining and promoting the well-being of individuals, families and communities. We strive for excellence in enabling people challenged by disability to live to their fullest potential through consumer involvement, public education, social change and advocacy, rehabilitation and support services.

1.0 Housing Registry/Outreach Program Objectives

To prevent and alleviate homelessness, enhance housing stability, and ensure the basic rights of community residents, particularly those who are homeless, inadequately housed or at risk of homelessness through:

- outreach
- information co-ordination/dissemination
- advocacy
- community support partnerships which maximize the benefits of existing programs and services
- development and implementation of a housing registry model
- HELP resources, including affirmative employment opportunities
- volunteer development.

2.0 Services and Activities undertaken to achieve the Housing Registry/Outreach Program Objectives:

2.1 Outreach, Information and Referral

2.1.1 identify and co-ordinate existing outreach services through a consultative process; identify gaps in outreach services to homeless

2.1.2 reach out to homeless individuals by visiting shelters, soup kitchens and other areas frequented by homeless people

2.1.3 identify potential clients who may need support services and initiate referrals to appropriate services

2.1.4 improve level of awareness of homeless re services available

2.1.5 promote and generate public awareness of program; respond to enquiries about the program.
2.2 Intake, Registration and Referral

2.2.1 assess potential client's housing and related needs, provide information about options available, confirm their interest in program; refer elsewhere as needed; follow wait list procedures as appropriate

2.2.2 complete registration procedures, provide information re: options, housing lists; identify and document client demographics e.g., where clients come from, where they go, sources of income, presenting problems, family histories, reasons for homelessness.

2.3 Housing Registry/Database

2.3.1 database development

- research, assimilate and co-ordinate dissemination of information to all agencies/landlords, tenants, prospective tenants, service providers and community agencies re housing available in the community
- staff become familiar and are current with relevant legislation, information on application procedures and wait lists for specific housing, support services and financial assistance
- from newspaper listings and site visits to potential/existing landlords, staff prepare listings of available accommodations organized by area of city, size and description of unit, detailing relevant information such as rent, accessibility (wheel chair/bus route), whether utilities are included or extra, and whether the unit is furnished or unfurnished.

2.3.2 find/assess/register housing stock

- target landlords, private and non-profit sectors; develop contacts through community partners
- send letters; make follow-up calls; arrange meetings to discuss program
- document all contacts and outcomes in appropriate files; organize followup contacts as appropriate
- develop and implement an assessment tool to appraise housing to a pre-determined standard of safety; determine requirements, acceptability of physical environment
- place on registry with appropriate information; keep registry up to date
- identify and match specific client needs with appropriate housing, cross-referencing client needs with and filling units as available.
2.3.3 housing registry support

- if needed, staff demonstrate interviewing skills and assist clients when viewing/applying for housing
- staff are trained in landlord and tenant relations, develop a knowledge base and impart this information to clients
- prospective tenant makes initial visit to potential housing unit, meets with landlord; if interest expressed, prospective tenant makes application and is accepted or referred elsewhere.

2.4 Community Supports and Partnerships

2.4.1 network, promote and develop community partnerships through HELP Advisory Coalition for Homeless Initiative, Access to Permanent Housing Committee, City Housing, etc.

2.4.2 identify and co-ordinate existing community supports and gaps in consultation with clients and community players

2.4.3 co-ordinate community supports to assist clients to secure and maintain housing

2.4.4 explore feasibility for allocating emergency funds in extreme situations.

2.5 Advocacy Model

2.5.1 develop “Best Practices” advocacy model to be used with other housing agencies on behalf of homeless individuals

2.5.2 staff initiate individual advocacy when it is perceived that an individual is being discriminated against or does not possess the assertiveness to challenge their entitlements; provide client with information and encourage confidence to advocate for themselves; mediate amicable resolution if possible; refer to legal clinic or other applicable resource if specialized advocacy is required

2.5.3 program representatives participate in committees, coalitions, forums to ensure systemic advocacy is pursued on behalf of homeless individuals.

2.6 Volunteer Development

2.6.1 research need for and role of volunteers, e.g., tutoring children/adults in shelters, setting up food/clothing drives, raising public awareness about homelessness

2.6.2 identify volunteer resources already available; develop new resources as needed
2.6.3 in consultation with community agencies and clients, identify and co-ordinate training opportunities for community volunteers who are involved with homeless initiatives.

2.7 Program Planning, Development and Evaluation
2.7.1 hold regular meetings of Advisory Coalition involving staff, community representatives and clients to share information, discuss client and community feedback and plan appropriate changes to the program
2.7.2 provide input to appropriate governing bodies
2.7.3 evaluate potential for revenue generation, including the pros, cons and feasibility.

3.0 Indicators of Program Success/Performance Measures (evidence of program merit):

3.1 Statistical Indicators
- number of and time spent on outreach contacts
- number of referrals to other agencies/organizations
- number of information/service requests
- number of information packages distributed
- number of clients served, placed
- time spent assisting clients
- number of advocacy-related contacts
- number of presentations
- number of contacts made with landlords and potential dwellings
- number of housing units identified, assessed, registered/available and average turnaround time
- number and type of safety improvement measures addressed
- number of volunteer placements and training opportunities identified.

3.2 Client Questionnaire and Other Feedback
- feedback questionnaire, to be used annually or at placement, to include clients’ perception of and satisfaction with the program, staff, etc.
- clients’ perception of improvement in housing situation, quality of life.
3.3 Landlord Questionnaire and Other Feedback
- feedback questionnaire, to be used annually, to include landlords' perception of and satisfaction with the program, staff, etc.
- feedback on impact of fee requirement.

3.3 Referral Source and Community Feedback
- annual feedback questionnaire to include perceptions of the program by key stakeholders, including referral sources, family/significant others, other community organizations
- perceptions to include satisfaction with program, content, effectiveness in meeting client needs, role of program in the community, etc.
- changes in overall size of relevant agency caseloads.

Sample Logic Model of Same Program

**Larger Public Interest:**
Health and Safety of all Ontarians

**Customers: Who Benefits**
Homeless or at risk individuals

**Objectives Of The Program:**
To Prevent and alleviate homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Desired Short-Term Outcomes</th>
<th>Desired Intermediate Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 FTEs Information technology Managerial support Volunteers</td>
<td>Information and referral Outreach Advocacy Community partnerships</td>
<td>Housing database Client registry Volunteer registry Community resource database Advocacy material</td>
<td>Improved housing conditions for homeless or those in substandard accommodation More access to housing resources</td>
<td>Higher quality of life, more stability for previously homeless Improved relationship with area landlords Development of new housing resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VII: RESOURCES


2. Canadian Evaluation Society offers training and professional development opportunities through its Essential Skills Series and intermediate-level seminars on Logic models and Survey Research. They also provide Canadian listings of post-secondary courses on evaluation. www.evaluationcanada.ca


10. Results-based Planning & Performance Management Team, Fiscal Strategy and Coordination Division, Treasury Board Office, Ministry of Finance:

- sets Ontario Public Service policy on performance measurement and program evaluation
- offers portfolio-based advice to ministries on performance measurement and program evaluation
- maintains a database of Ontario Public Service performance measures and coordinates performance measurement reporting
- provides ministries with various resources, guidelines and tools in performance measurement and program evaluation
- coordinates the Performance Measurement and Program Evaluation (PM/PE) Network for ministry staff involved in the above activities.

The TBO website intra.fin.gov.on.ca/tbo/fscd/rbp/index.shtml includes links to this evaluation guide; the Performance Measurement Guide; web links to international PM/PE literature, resources, and cross-jurisdictional comparisons; web links to Ontario Public Service Ministry materials about their own performance management systems.

11. Service Excellence Office (SEO), Modernization Division, Ministry of Government Services. Ministries are encouraged to submit copies of all customer satisfaction surveys to the SEO. The SEO will work with ministries on an individual basis to:

- guide and assist in developing customer surveys
- help ensure compliance with the Common Measurements Tool (CMT) and an appropriate survey methodology
- ensure the survey is not a public opinion poll requiring approval from Cabinet Office
- assist in eliciting the information required
- assist in maximizing the survey response rate.

The SEO can be contacted by calling (416) 212-2063 or by e-mail at Service.Excellence@ontario.ca

www.nao.org.uk/publications/nao_reports/01-02/0102289.pdf


17. Western Michigan University, The Evaluation Center, Evaluation Checklists. www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/checklistmenu.htm