The Collaborative Approach to Evaluation Principles in Practice: Illustrations from a Statewide Evaluation System for a Preventive Family Intervention

Kathryn E. Bruzios, Brittany Cooper, Laura G. Hill, & Louise Parker

IMPACT Research Lab, Washington State University

Department of Human Development, Prevention Science

Washington State University Extension

Table 1. Collaborative Approaches to Evaluation: Principles¹ Illustrated by Examples for SFP 10-14 Additional Examples

| Principle | Contributing Factor | Illustration |
|---|---|--|
| Clarify Motivation for Collaboration | Evaluation and stakeholder expectations | As part of the SFP 10-14 facilitator training, results from the clinical trial of SFP 10-14 were presented and interested facilitators were encouraged to participate in our statewide evaluation. |
| Foster Meaningful Relationships | Structured and sustained interactivity | The university-practitioner-state agency partnership works well in part due to the technical and human resources the context provides – for instance, using graduate and undergraduate researcher assistants to process the data and develop the reports provides a valuable learning experience for the students while at the same time allowing efficient turn-around of evaluation data back to communities and agencies. |
| Develop a Shared Understanding of the Program | | Area the evaluation team aims to improve upon. |
| Promote Appropriate Participatory Processes | Depth of participation | The interagency team was always voluntary and informal, with most of the attendees coming from WSU. This may be an additional area of needed improvement by expanding the invitation to other groups that may be interested as well as community members where SFP 10-14 is being implemented. |
| Monitor and Respond to Resource Availability | Personnel | Our partnership with key state agencies allowed closer coordination and shared funding of ongoing facilitator training, |

¹ Principles and contributed factors were identified by Shulha and colleagues (2016). For more information see: Shulha, L. M., Whitmore, E., Cousins, J. B., Gilbert, N., & al Hudib, H. (2016). Introducing evidence-based principles to guide collaborative approaches to evaluation: Results of an empirical process.

American Journal of Evaluation, 37(2), 193-215. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214015615230

| Principle | Contributing Factor | Illustration |
|---|-------------------------|---|
| | | created efficiencies in the evaluation system for users, and built relationships between university faculty and state agency personnel that led to additional collaborations over time. |
| Monitor Evaluation Progress and Quality | Data collection | It took three years and several revisions to come up with an evaluation that met our goals. Our initial instruments were too long and difficult to implement, and we did not have a clearly-defined system of technical assistance or mode of communication with practitioners. |
| Promote Evaluative Thinking | Inquiry orientation | The centralized evaluation system created a mechanism for ongoing conversation and collaboration between local practitioners and university faculty. Because practitioners were receiving concrete evaluation reports that were of local value, they were more willing to participate in additional research endeavors that created products such as cost-benefit analyses (Suter & Hill, 2015). |
| Follow Through to Realize Use | Transformative outcomes | Collection of implementation data and participant demographics informed strategic planning for long-term dissemination goals. For example, analysis of participant demographics made it easy to see whether we were reaching targeted populations. The collection and analysis of outcome data from local programs across the region facilitated our ability to notice patterns in youth and parent outcomes, which might suggest less than optimal delivery of curriculum content or implementation issues that might interfere with participant learning. |