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“What’s love got to do, got to do with it?”

Literally . . .

\[ \text{NOTHING} \]

Metaphorically . . .

\[ \text{EVERYTHING} \]
Overall goals for this session

• Examine the role of human relations in successful program evaluation studies

• Consider how to apply *Interactive Evaluation Practice* (IEP) frameworks and principles to cultivate human relations for effective program evaluation
Overall goals continued

• Experience selected interactive strategies from an evaluator’s dozen that promote positive relations among evaluation participants

• Explore ways to manage conflict constructively in evaluation
Overall goals continued

• Focus on applying IEP frameworks, principles, and interactive strategies to your own professional evaluation practice
Shape of this afternoon . . .

- Introductions
  - *you, me, we*

- Definitions, Frameworks, Principles
  - *that ground/guide IEP*

- Interactive Strategies
  - *that bring IEP to life*
Laurie’s background . . .

• **Roles** ➤ teacher, consultant, researcher, evaluator, professor

• **Education** ➤ political science, curriculum and instruction, educational psychology, social psychology

• **Specialties** ➤ cooperative strategies, constructive conflict, evaluator competencies, organizational change, inquiry methods

• **Passions** ➤ faith, family, friends, music, art, creativity, collaboration
Seattle, Washington
Home to Starbucks, Boeing, Microsoft . . .
Super Bowl XLVIII Champions
Your background . . .
Strategy #1: Voicing Variables
Where is home for you?

Somewhere in . . .

- Twin Cities
- Minnesota
- Midwest
- USA
- World
Strategy #1: Voicing Variables

In what fields do you work?

• Healthcare
• Education
• Social service
• Government
• Nonprofit
• International
• Other . . .
Strategy #1: Voicing Variables

How long have you been involved with evaluation?

- Less than a year
- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- More than a decade
Strategy #2: Fist-to-Five
What is your experience in conducting . . .

- Single-program/organization evaluations
- Large-scale and/or multiple-site evaluations
- Community development and/or grass-roots evaluations
- Participatory evaluations
Strategy #9: Round-Robin Check-In

Introduce yourself to those at your table—name, role, context in which you work. What type of music best captures the spirit of your evaluation practice?

- Classical
- Country Western
- Rock ‘n Roll
- Rhythm & Blues
- Jazz
Grounding Definitions, Frameworks, Principles, and Strategies

- What is evaluation?
  - What is interactive evaluation practice (IEP)?
    - What frameworks ground IEP?
    - What principles guide IEP?
  - What strategies promote successful IEP?
Program Evaluation

“A process of systematic inquiry to provide sound information about the characteristics, activities, or outcomes of a program or policy for a valued purpose”

(King & Stevahn, 2013, p. 13).
Interactive Evaluation Practice (IEP)

“The intentional act of engaging people in making decisions, taking action, and reflecting while conducting an evaluation study”

(King & Stevahn, 2013, p. 14).
Patton’s (2008) *personal factor*—

“An identifiable individual or group of people who personally care about the evaluation and the findings it generates” (p. 66).

King and Stevahn’s (2013) *interpersonal factor*—

- First, the ability of an evaluator to interact constructively with a variety of players to further the success of an evaluation study.
- Second, the ability to structure activities conducive to promoting mutual success among people who participate in the evaluation (p. 15).
Frameworks for IEP

1. Basic Inquiry Tasks (BIT)
2. Interactive Participation Quotient (IPQ)
3. Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB)
FIRST FRAMEWORK
Basic Inquiry Tasks (BIT)

1. Framing questions (focusing the study)
2. Determining an appropriate design
3. Identifying samples (sources of information)
4. Collecting data
5. Analyzing data and presenting results
6. Interpreting results
7. “Reporting”
What are possible evaluator-client roles and relationships in carrying out BIT?

• A relationship exists between the evaluator and client—i.e., program leaders, staff, funders, community members, other evaluation stakeholders

• Involvement in evaluation decision making and implementation may shift between the evaluator and client/stakeholders during the study
SECOND FRAMEWORK
Interactive Participation Quotient (IPQ)

Evaluator
Program leaders, staff, community members

Evaluator-directed
Collaborative
Participant-directed

Involvement in decision making and implementation
LOW
HIGH
ZONES
Diverse evaluator roles . . .

- **Technical expert** on evaluation research design, measurement, coding, data analysis
- **Facilitator** of group interaction
- **Coach** of others doing their own evaluations
- What else?
THIRD FRAMEWORK
Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB)

- Formative / Summative evaluation study

- Evaluation specifically for building capacity to evaluate

- Evaluation for organization development

Use of single study process / results

ECB = creating capacity to conduct evaluations

Capacity to sustain change / continuous improvement
Participatory Evaluation (PE)

- PE informs IEP
- IEP assumes that all evaluations involve interpersonal interactions to greater or lesser degrees
Participatory Evaluation (PE)

What? Definitions of PE
Where? Some contexts preferred
Why? Ownership, use, ECB
When? Before, during, after. . . forever
Who? Choices for involvement
How? Interactive strategies
What are principles of PE?

- Participants OWN the evaluation
- The evaluator facilitates; participants plan and conduct the study
- People learn evaluation logic and skills as part of the process
- ALL aspects of the evaluation are understandable and meaningful
- Internal self-accountability is valued

(Adapted from Patton, 2008)
Fundamental concept . . .

Participatory forms of evaluation tend to focus more on this purpose.
What are dimensions of PE?

• Control of the evaluation process ranges from evaluator to practitioners
• Stakeholder selection for participation ranges from primary users to “all legitimate groups”
• Depth of participation ranges from consultation to deep participation

(Adapted from Cousins & Whitmore, 1998)
Cousins & Whitmore dimensions

Figure 1.1. Dimensions of Form in Collaborative Inquiry
Types of participant involvement . . .

- Mere awareness
- Passive support
- Minimal input/feedback/participation
- Active participation in the evaluation process—making decisions & implementing
- Commitment to consider and ultimately use the evaluation results—making change
What matters in PE . . .

• Involving people effectively matters—it’s essential to success

• Learning matters—participating can and should be a learning experience

• Building people’s capacity to think evaluatively matters—it happens through engagement
SECOND FRAMEWORK
Interactive Participation Quotient (IPQ)

Evaluator

Program leaders, staff, community members

Evaluator-directed

Collaborative

Participant-directed

Involvement in decision making and implementation

LOW

HIGH

ZONES
THIRD FRAMEWORK

Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB)

Formative / Summative evaluation study

Evaluation specifically for building capacity to evaluate

Evaluation for organization development

Use of single study process / results

ECB = creating capacity to conduct evaluations

Capacity to sustain change / continuous improvement
FIRST FRAMEWORK
Basic Inquiry Tasks (BIT)

1. Framing questions (focusing the study)
2. Determining an appropriate design
3. Identifying samples (sources of information)
4. Collecting data
5. Analyzing data and presenting results
6. Interpreting results
7. “Reporting”
Interactive Evaluation Practice (IEP)

“The intentional act of engaging people in making decisions, taking action, and reflecting while conducting an evaluation study”

(King & Stevahn, 2013, p. 14).
1. **Get personal**—the personal and interpersonal factors matter; find people/leaders/stakeholders who care; involve people meaningfully.

2. **Structure interaction**—facilitate cooperative tasks that create positive interaction among participants.

3. **Examine context**—identify the situational/organizational/cultural context—it will influence the evaluation.

4. **Consider politics**—political forces always are at play, for better or worse—pay attention.

5. **Expect conflict**—it will occur; recognize its virtue when managed constructively; take steps to make it positive.

6. **Respect culture**—know thyself and honor the diversity of others; clarify cultural assumptions, values, perspectives, expectations.

7. **Take time**—interpersonal processes take time; relationships develop through interaction over time; time is required when relationships matter.
An Evaluator’s Dozen of Interactive Strategies

• For responding to set content (# 1-5)

• For generating information (# 6-10)

• For organizing or sharing information (# 11-13)
Strategies for responding to set content

#1. Voicing Variables
#2. Fist-to-Five
#3. Voicing Viewpoints/Beliefs
#4. Dot Votes / Bar Graphs
#5. Corners
Strategies for generating information

#6. Three-Step Interview
#7. Data Dialogue
#8. Making Metaphors
#9. Round-Robin Check-in
#10. Graffiti/Carousel
Strategies for organizing or sharing information

#11. Concept Formation
#12. Cooperative Rank Order
#13. Jigsaw
Strategy #3: Voicing Viewpoints/Beliefs

A. A good evaluator shares control of the study with clients from start to finish.

   1 Strongly Agree  2 Agree  3 Disagree  4 Strongly Disagree

B. Program participants will bias a study if they are involved in planning it.

   1 Strongly Agree  2 Agree  3 Disagree  4 Strongly Disagree

C. Program staff must be neutral during an evaluation study of their own programs.

   1 Strongly Agree  2 Agree  3 Disagree  4 Strongly Disagree
Strategy #4: Dot Voting / Bar Graph

A. A good evaluator shares control of the study with clients from start to finish.
B. Program participants will bias a study if they are involved in planning it.
Strategy #5: Corners

C. Program staff must be neutral during an evaluation study of their own programs.
Strategy #6- Three-step interview

- Three roles create three steps:
  - Interviewer
  - Responder
  - Recorder

- The interview process is structured to build on psychological principles of cooperation
Think of an evaluation you conducted where positive human relations played a significant role in the success of the study.

**Interviewer → seek input (respectfully)**
- *What was nurturing/supporting/influencing relations?*

**Responder → tell your story**

**Recorder → document (key words)**

______________________________

**ROTATE ROLES**
Similarities/Themes

What are the implications for evaluators?!
Strategy #10: Graffiti / Carousel
Strategy #11: Concept Formation

• Can be done on the wall, informally, and is then called graffiti
• Can be done on flipchart paper passed among groups and is then called carousel
Graffiti activity . . .

**Principal 3:** Examine context—
Clues to situational context;
how do you figure out roles, values, norms,
perspectives, operations, etc.?

**Principle 4:** Consider politics—
Common political agendas/forces at play?

**Principle 5:** Expect conflict—
Tensions/Disagreements/Conflicts that you’ve faced or have observed in evaluation?

**Principle 6:** Respect culture—
What respecting culture and diversity looks like, sounds like, feels like?
Strategy #7: Data Dialogue

• A process to use when you cannot afford focus groups

• It takes advantage of some of the processes of the three-step interview

• Can be useful in community settings
**Issue: Electronic Communication**  
*(social media)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Useful when . . .</th>
<th>Problematic when . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategy #13: Jigsaw

1. Home groups divide information/readings (Persons A, B, C each get a different part)
2. Expert groups of two (all A’s, B’s, C’s) read and prepare to teach
3. Back to home groups to present
4. Apply the entire body of information
### Scenario...

- A large multi-site social service organization
- Provides numerous diverse programs for the community
- Evaluates the effectiveness of electronic communication
- "Useful" versus "Problematic" data obtained from...
  - Gold sheet = Program Administrators
  - Blue sheet = Program Staff
  - Pink sheet = Program Recipients
Jigsaw process . . .

- **HOME TEAM** of three—each member gets a different segment (gold, blue, or pink sheet)
- **EXPERT PAIR** of two—find one other person in the room who has your same segment (two golds together, etc.)
- Read “Useful” versus “Problematic” data and identify major themes
- Return to **HOME TEAM** . . .
  - Share major themes from each stakeholder group
  - Compare/Contrast across all stakeholder groups
  - Recommendations for future policy and/or practice?!
Managing Conflict Constructively
Recognize Conflict

“A conflict exists whenever incompatible activities occur”
(Deutsch, 1973, p. 10).

---

- **Interpersonal** . . . goals/aspirations of individuals are blocked by the actions/behaviors of others
- **Conceptual** . . . controversies over policy exist and people with differing opinions want to reach a settlement

---

**NOTE:**

Cooperative Relations and Perspective Taking are key to resolving both types of conflict constructively.
Strategy #12: Cooperative Rank Order

• An interactive social process for reaching consensus on a rank order

• Sequence from **most to least effective, best to worst option, highest to lowest priority**, or some other continuum.

• Colored paper (strips) can facilitate cross-group comparison
Conflict Strategies
(Johnson & Johnson, 2005)

High
↑

Smooth
Problem Solve

Compromise
GOALS

Withdraw
Force

Low ←
→ High

RELATIONSHIPS

© David W. Johnson (1975)
Integrative Negotiation
(Johnson & Johnson, 2005)

1. Express cooperative intentions
   (mutual problem solving)
2. State what you want
3. Express how you feel
4. Explain your reasons
5. Communicate understanding of the other’s perspective
   (wants, feelings, reasons)
6. Invent integrative solutions
   (be creative—the more, the better!)
7. Mutually agree on a solution
   (show commitment in a culturally appropriate way—
   e.g., handshake, bow, etc.)
Strategy #8: Making metaphors

“A Tall Big Magnificent is worth 1000 words.”

Tall

impressive

terrifying

BIG

MAGNIFICENT
Let’s get creative . . .

Find a picture to finish this phrase:

“Evaluators cultivate constructive human relations in program evaluation when _____________.”
Social Interdependence Theory

Cooperative
Positive Interdependence

Promotive
Supportive

Mutual
Joint Benefit/Gain

Goal
Structure

Interaction

Outcome

Competitive
Negative Interdependence

Oppositional
Obstructive

Exclusive
Sole Benefit/Gain
Strategies for responding to set content

#1. Voicing Variables
#2. Fist-to-Five
#3. Voicing Viewpoints/Beliefs
#4. Dot Votes / Bar Graphs
#5. Corners
Strategies for generating information

#6. Three-Step Interview
#7. Data Dialogue
#8. Making Metaphors
#9. Round-Robin Check-in
#10. Graffiti/Carousel
Strategies for organizing or sharing information

#11. Concept Formation
#12. Cooperative Rank Order
#13. Jigsaw
1. Get personal—the personal and interpersonal factors matter; find people/leaders/stakeholders who care; involve people meaningfully.

2. Structure interaction—facilitate cooperative tasks that create positive interaction among participants.

3. Examine context—identify the situational/organizational/cultural context—it will influence the evaluation.

4. Consider politics—political forces always are at play, for better or worse—pay attention.

5. Expect conflict—it will occur; recognize its virtue when managed constructively; take steps to make it positive.

6. Respect culture—know thyself and honor the diversity of others; clarify cultural assumptions, values, perspectives, expectations.

7. Take time—interpersonal processes take time; relationships develop through interaction over time; time is required when relationships matter.
SECOND FRAMEWORK
Interactive Participation Quotient (IPQ)

Evaluator

Program leaders, staff, community members

Evaluator-directed

Collaborative

Participant-directed

HIGH

Involvement in decision making and implementation

LOW

ZONES
THIRD FRAMEWORK
Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB)

Formative / Summative evaluation study

Evaluation specifically for building capacity to evaluate

Evaluation for organization development

Use of single study process / results

ECB = creating capacity to conduct evaluations

Capacity to sustain change / continuous improvement
FIRST FRAMEWORK
Basic Inquiry Tasks (BIT)

1. Framing questions (focusing the study)
2. Determining an appropriate design
3. Identifying samples (sources of information)
4. Collecting data
5. Analyzing data and presenting results
6. Interpreting results
7. “Reporting”
Interactive Evaluation Practice (IEP)

“The intentional act of engaging people in making decisions, taking action, and reflecting while conducting an evaluation study”

(King & Stevahn, 2013, p. 14).
IEP by the numbers . . .

2 definitions → evaluation & IEP
3 frameworks → BIT, IPQ, ECB
7 principles → personal, interaction, context, politics, conflict, culture, time
13 strategies → respond, generate, organize/share
IEP in (other) words . . .

What’s love got to do with it?

If our intention is to cultivate constructive human relations in program evaluation for successful studies, then systematically applying interactive evaluation practice (IEP) definitions, frameworks, principles, and strategies are tools toward getting there.

IEP provides mental models and concrete tools to guide evaluators in strategically engaging people in ways that promote positive relations toward successful program evaluation studies.
... and that’s what love’s got to do with it!

May your evaluation practice produce positive interpersonal relations that support success!

THANK YOU for participating in this session!

Laurie