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ABSTRACT

There are various evaluation methods that recognize the importance of working with stakeholders. Under the premise that stakeholders will improve the quality of the evaluation results, there is a growing trend towards participatory evaluation approaches. While contested by some, many in the evaluation community accept the idea of stakeholder participation (Cousins 1998; Whitmore 1998). “The evaluation coordinator collaborates with program stakeholders to define the evaluation objectives; to develop the evaluation methodology; to collect and interpret information; and to develop conclusions and recommendations (Aubel 1995).” Involving various stakeholders, participatory evaluation (PE) is a learning process that can be used for capacity building, empowerment, conflict negotiation, collaboration, accountability and governance (Estrella et al. 2000). Continuously developing as a methodology in the United States, participatory evaluation is a vital part of any participatory development process.

As the most ambitious housing policy to date (Popkin 2002, 2004b; Buron 2002), HOPE VI is a HUD federal funding program for transforming distressed public housing communities into vibrant mixed-income communities where people can live, shop, work, and play. Although residents and community members are required to participate during the planning phase, there is no implicit requirement for the evaluation phase. It’s critical that housing programs involve citizens more closely throughout the development process in project planning, decision-making, implementation, and evaluation. In view of the growing importance that’s attributed to participation, the purpose of this thesis is to present participatory evaluation as a viable
option to evaluate HOPE VI sites. An effort is made to explore the benefits and major
challenges of PE and identify guiding principles and key decisions to recommend an evaluation
framework.
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CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Context

Since its inception in the 1930s, public housing has been a contentious debate among all levels of government. The housing policy has evolved through the years as legislators have tried to address the concerns of providing affordable housing: who should benefit; the design and cost; the impact of the social and economic isolation of public housing residents; and the spillover effects into the surrounding communities. Legislators have often expressed that housing issues are predominantly local issues. “The nation is too large and too diverse to lump under any federal solution (HUD.gov).” The current policy for housing the poor has been shaped by devolving decision-making authority from the federal government to state and local governments (HUD.gov).

In response to the perceived failures of public housing policies, in 1989, Congress established the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing (NCSDPH) to identify and study distressed public housing and recommend an action plan (NCSDPH 1992a). According to their definition, the NCSDPH found that 6 percent, an estimated 86,000, of the nation’s 1.4 million public housing units were severely distressed (GAO 1997; NCSDPH 1992a). These public housing sites suffer from physical deterioration, severe isolation, lack of job opportunities, inadequate services, high crime rates, concentration of minorities and extremely poor residents, high rates of welfare dependency, and large numbers of single parent families (Collins 2005).

Created in 1992, the HOPE (Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere) VI program was established to address the issues of severely distressed public housing (HUD.gov).
The HOPE VI program has five main objectives: (1) change the physical shape of public housing; (2) reduce concentrations of poverty; (3) provide support services to public housing residents; (4) establish and maintain high standards of personal and community responsibility; and (5) form private/public partnerships for project implementation (GAO 1997, HUD 2000a, Turrov 2005, Popkin 2004b). HOPE VI combined grants for physical revitalization with funding for management improvements and social services. In 1995, the HOPE VI program emphasis expanded to include mixed-finance tools and the development of mixed-income communities (Popkin 2002). Mixed-income communities have been accepted as a method for providing affordable housing while de-concentrating poverty in inner city neighborhoods and increasing property value.

In its first ten years, HOPE VI existed as a demonstration program. HOPE VI has leveraged billions of dollars to transform public housing sites into healthy neighborhoods changing the urban landscape. At both the local and national levels, there was uncertainty about the utility of Community Supportive Services (CSS) programs to original residents. The pressure from Congress created the urgency to demonstrate the effectiveness of HOPE VI initiatives in meeting objectives. While many anecdotal reports suggested that HOPE VI initiatives were successful in implementation, HUD recognized the need for empirical evidence to fill the gaps of knowledge about which services had a great impact, which residents experienced change in their lives, and in what manner.

Initially the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) did not require evaluations of HOPE VI projects. In 2000, Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) mandated that HOPE VI grantees must meet certain standards set forth by HUD such as hiring an outside
evaluator and demonstrating attainment of the HOPE VI goals and objectives (Moschetti 2007). HUD’s evaluation mandate sought to generate qualitative data that include a range of values, reflect people’s realities, and tells a story about the overall program.

Evaluation is the use of social research methods to systematically investigate the effectiveness of social intervention programs. It is intended to be useful for improving programs and informing social actions aimed at ameliorating social problems (Rossi 2004). There are various evaluation methods that recognize the critical importance of working with community-based organizations and residents in both the research design and execution in areas experiencing change.

There have been significant conceptual and methodological developments in participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) in the context of participatory approaches to evaluate program development and community-based initiatives. In the 1980s, numerous international organizations began to discuss the importance of utilizing participatory approaches to monitoring and evaluation (Aubel 2004). This thesis will discuss the practicality of implementing PM&E in the context of a local HOPE VI site City West.

1.2 Overview of Thesis

The background and context of this study is established, introducing the current housing program HOPE VI in chapter one. This chapter discusses the mandate for HOPE VI grantees to conduct an evaluation and the purpose of an evaluation. Chapter two explains the problem statement and discusses the methodology. Chapter three discusses the evolution of public housing in the United States. This chapter also reviews the goals and objectives of HOPE VI and the current context of the program. Chapter four is a literature review about the emergence of
participatory evaluation and five case studies. It explores tools and strategies that can be used to monitor and evaluate a program, the benefits and challenges as well as guiding principles and key decisions. In chapter five, I use City West HOPE VI site to hypothetically illustrate how PE can be used to monitor and evaluate HOPE VI sites. Chapter six provides conclusions and recommends an evaluation framework.
There is greater “recognition that monitoring and evaluation of development and other community-based initiatives should be participatory (Aubel 2004).” There are various evaluation methods that recognize the critical importance of working with community-based organizations and residents in both the research design and execution in areas experiencing change. The growing interest in participatory evaluation parallels concepts such as empowerment, democratization, partnership, and sustainability which in one way or another, attempts to give a voice to the poor and disenfranchised whose voices have not been adequately heard (UNDP 1997). Experience has shown that participation improves the quality, effectiveness and sustainability of development actions (UNDP 1997). Participation can be used as a means or as an end or both. If residents are more involved in the design, implementation, management, and evaluation of housing development programs, they will be empowered and there is a much greater chance that their needs will be met.

2.1 Problem Statement

Upon the tenth anniversary, in 2002, HUD HOPE VI staff, housing policy makers, public housing residents, and public housing authorities (PHA) wanted deeper insights into the operations of HOPE VI services. There was uncertainty about the impact of community support and service plans at the local and national levels. Knowledge about academic critique was readily available but not enough about how residents actually experience the program. HUD as well as others saw the need to critically assess what HOPE VI had accomplished, if communities were rebuilt, and if public housing residents have been empowered. Both proponents and
critics wanted to know the experiences of individuals, groups, and communities who had been affected by the program. HUD did not offer formal guidance to HOPE VI grantees concerning which questions to ask or how to form or focus an evaluation (Moschetti 2007). In recent years, there has been a growing interest in participatory approaches in program evaluation. There is a greater acknowledgment of the major contributions of program beneficiaries and other stakeholders (Campilan 2000).

Participatory evaluation has emerged as a dynamic educational process through which beneficiaries and key stakeholders produce action-oriented knowledge about their reality, clarify and articulate their norms and values, and reach consensus about further action. PE is known as a method that obtains qualitative data while engaging a wide range of stakeholders as it opens the door to innovative measures of success. It attempts to build the knowledge and capacity of communities to conduct their own evaluations as well as utilize the lessons learned to improve the implementation of programs locally and nationally (Cousins 1998; Gaventa 1998).

2.2 Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to present participatory evaluation as a viable option to evaluate HOPE VI sites. As I seek to answer how participatory evaluation can capture and engage the voice of those individuals most affected by the implementation of the HOPE VI program, the following sub-questions will be considered:

i. What have people’s experiences been with using a participatory approach?

ii. What are the major benefits and challenges in pursuing an approach that involve/engage multiple community stakeholders in the evaluation process?
What is the current context of HOPE VI?

Do the guiding principles of participatory evaluation align with HOPE VI goals?

What are the steps for implementing participatory evaluation for a HOPE VI site?

2.3 Methodology

A wealth of literature has been written discussing alternatives to conventional evaluation approaches. In recent years, there has been a growing interest to engage stakeholders in community development interventions. To complete this study, the following steps were followed:

i. Conducted a thorough literature study of the concept of participatory monitoring and evaluation including characteristics, guiding principles, core steps, and benefits and challenges. Identified five case studies to illustrate the application of participatory evaluation.

ii. Conducted a literature review of the history of public housing and its policies.

iii. Conducted a thorough literature study of HOPE VI including its national goals and objective and theories that support “New Urbanism” (mixed-income developments).

iv. Compared participatory and conventional evaluation models.

v. Reviewed characteristics used in participatory evaluation approaches.

vi. Proposed a participatory evaluation framework.

2.4 Significance of Study

This thesis will conclude with a participatory evaluation framework for the City West HOPE VI program as well as other HOPE VI sites. This study can be used to assist public housing
authorities with selecting an evaluation methodology that places greater emphasis on residents’ and stakeholders’ participation throughout the evaluation process (e.g., planning, design, implementation). Results of this study will be helpful in that it recommends a participatory evaluation framework that is reflective, action-oriented, and seeks to build capacity. The outcome will provide a framework that illustrates who should participate and in what capacity throughout the evaluation process; an understanding of the benefits and challenges; and how PE can be utilized as a tool to build capacity, accountability, and democratic processes. It is my desire that this thesis will contribute to the discussion of how to evaluate residents’ and stakeholders’ satisfaction of the City West development.

2.5 Limitation of Study

This thesis proposes an evaluation framework that may not be suitable for all HOPE VI sites. HOPE VI is a program that allows for flexibility. Each site will have to determine if a participatory evaluation is appropriate. The consideration for using a PE will be driven by relationships between PHAs, residents and other stakeholders. A certain level of trust among each group must exist to implement the evaluation.

The City West evaluation is hypothetical. Time would not permit me to speak with anyone from the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority or the Community Builders.
CHAPTER THREE: PUBLIC HOUSING & HOPE VI

3.1 History of Public Housing in the United States

Public housing has been a contentious debate among all levels of government and stakeholders. Through the years, Congress has enacted well-intentioned laws that have been criticized as creating more problems than they have solved including disinvestment and blight, concentrated poverty, high incidence of crime, and lack of funds to maintain public housing. The federal government used various means to provide affordable rental housing. The public sector has attempted to produce or stimulate the construction of public housing by providing support to financial institutions, through tax incentives, by regulating the private market, and through direct subsidies for production (Bratt 1989).

There are three distinct periods in the history of public housing that reflect the political philosophies of different presidential administrations: (1) federal production program 1930s to 1950s, (2) federal demand side rental assistance 1960s to 1970s, and (3) demolition and replacement of distressed public housing 1980 to current.

Over the decades, public housing has been targeted to serve different populations in need of affordable housing, including the temporarily unemployed, the working poor, worst-case households on welfare, the homeless, and the disabled (Varady 1998). Public housing was conceived to create housing with no debt service and requiring that project operations be covered by rental income. The debt free housing allowed PHAs to offer rents lower than market rent. Public housing was desirable to working families. To obtain a unit, families were required to provide proof of employment, be married, and pay rent.
The roots of public housing can be traced to the Great Depression and the Roosevelt Administration New Deal policies (von Hoffman 2000; Orlebeke 2000; Bennett 2006). The public housing program was initially established with the mission of employment generation. Slum clearance and the welfare of low-income families were added later. Housing reformers during the Roosevelt administration believed that by providing affordable and adequate housing, slum communities created by the Great Depression would be cleared.

The public housing program was created by the United States Housing Act of 1937 (P.L. 75-412, 50 Stat. 888) also known as the Wagner-Steagall Housing Act of 1937. This legislation allowed the Federal government to support the housing industry, reduce unemployment, and provide decent affordable housing to poor citizens while clearing slums. A permanent federal agency was established to deal with subsidized housing; a method for transferring federal money to local authorities; slum clearance as a public function; the principle of charging rent relative to income; the principle of using federal subsidies to make up the differential between operating costs and rents paid by low-income tenants; a policy of local tax exemption of property to further subsidize rents; and the principle that planning, building, and managing was the responsibility of local government (Bennett 2006).

Public housing has always been controversial. Proponents of the housing act desired to remedy the unsafe and unsanitary housing conditions for the poor. Some reformers argued that substandard housing contributed to crime, poor health, political corruption, and immorality. Opponents of the housing act including the chamber of commerce, business organizations, the building industry, the banking industry and real estate interests, criticized the program stating that the provision of housing subsidies was inappropriate; undermine the
private housing market; diminish homeownership incentives; and would be a form of socialism. Due to the opponents’ criticism, public housing was isolated from the private market. To ensure that a government program would not interfere with the private sector real estate interest or diminish incentives to purchase a home, President Roosevelt stipulated that only the poorest would qualify to live in public housing (Schwartz 2006). In other words, only families that had incomes far below the level necessary to secure decent housing in the private market was eligible for the program.

The Housing Act of 1949 pledged a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family through urban redevelopment. Without competing with private real estate markets, the legislation was tied to urban renewal programs and emphasized new construction with an ambitious goal of building 810,000 public housing units within six years (Orlebeke 2000; Bennett 2006; von Hoffman 1996, 2000). The act allotted $100 million for slum clearance activities (von Hoffman 2000) which was justified on the basis that public housing in many older cities was deemed unsafe and inhabitable according to different measures of slum and blight.

While some public housing was built, the amount was well below the goal of 810,000 units. Many housing experts contribute the shift in public housing design from low-rise multifamily buildings and townhouses to high-rise buildings to the 1949 Housing Act. With limited funding from Congress, high-rise construction was presumed to offer means to meet the ambitious production goal. The high-rise design made it possible to build more units on the same amount of land. High-rise construction was presumed to be cost-effective and would be able to accommodate more families being displaced by slum clearance (Bennett 2006).
The Housing Act of 1954 provided funding for the urban redevelopment program which expanded the public housing policy focus to include rehabilitation and conservation of slums, blighted and deteriorating areas. The aim was to rehabilitate and upgrade existing structures, enforce building codes, relocate displaced inhabitants, and encourage citizen participation in renewal plans (von Hoffman 1996; Orlebeke 2000). While the Act saved taxpayers money and preserved housing structures, it contributed to the decline of neighborhoods and high concentrations of poverty. The real estate industry supported urban renewal but opposed public housing. This influenced decision makers to restrict new public housing developments to impoverished and racially segregated communities thus creating distressed communities.

Due to political participation and activism, the federal government made efforts to combine civil rights with housing in the 1960s. For the first time in 20 years, social services were offered to public housing residents. Legislation was introduced that expressed the social concerns of providing decent and sanitary housing and ensuring equal opportunity in housing to all (Orlebeke 2000). The housing acts of the 1960s were full of trial and error, looked at subsidy alternatives to augment the public housing program, and engage the interest of the private sector. The 1960s ushered in a new method to developing low-income housing. The federal government promoted subsidized mortgages for private developers to build or rehabilitate multifamily housing for low- and moderate-income families.

Addressing urban issues was a focus of the Johnson administration. President Johnson desired to eliminate poverty and share the benefits of wealth with all. The Johnson Administration enacted the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 which created the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development which succeeded the Housing and Home
Finance Agency (HHFA) as a cabinet level agency (Orlebeke 2000; von Hoffman 1996). The Act extended urban renewal programs established by the 1949 Housing Act. New targets, timetables, subsidy programs, and planning requirements were formed. A rent supplement program was created to make privately owned housing available to low-income families.

Compared to the 1950s, the years leading up to the Housing Act of 1968 were full of activism and innovation but low production (Orlebeke 2000). Housing opportunities were expanded for minorities and the poor with the passage of the Fair Housing Act of 1968. The focus of federal housing policy was shifted from dispensing aid to local housing authorities for building public housing to providing direct supply-side subsidies to the private sector to stimulate homeownership for the poor. Two new programs were enacted: Section 235 which provided mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and Section 236 provided 1 percent interest mortgages insured by FHA which enabled private developers to offer below-market rents to low- and moderate-income renters (von Hoffman 1996; Orlebeke 2000; Schwartz 2006).

To provide adequate maintenance, while keeping rents low, operating subsidies were authorized by Congress in 1961 to fill the gap between tenant rents and operational costs (von Hoffman 1996). Faced with the fiscal crisis of escalating operating cost, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (NAHRO) advised Congress that public housing could not continue to provide affordable housing to low-income families. Public Housing Authorities faced two choices: continue with the existing structure of limited federal subsidies and increase rents to cover operational cost; or maintain affordable rents by revising the federal subsidy framework with adequate federal operating subsidies.
In 1969, Congress enacted the Brooke amendment which capped public housing tenants’ rent at 25% of their income and provided federal subsidies to close the gap between tenants’ rent and the cost of operation. While preserving affordable rent, housing authorities were not able to provide adequate maintenance and services for tenants. PHAs began to defer maintenance allowing buildings to fall into disrepair which added to capital cost (Orlebeke 2000; Schwartz 2006).

In 1973, President Nixon’s moratorium on subsidy commitments led to the examination of the federally administered subsidy program which resulted in three policy tools: vouchers, the transfer of program control from federal to state and local governments, and tax incentives (Orlebeke 2000). During the same year, the Experimental Housing Allowance program (EHAP) was established as a five year study to assess the feasibility of tenant-based rental vouchers as an alternative to public housing and its economic impact. Without waiting for the results of the EHAP, Congress established the Section 8 program that consisted of project- and tenant-based components (Orlebeke 2000).

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 replaced categorical grants with the community development block grant (CDBG); created the Section-8 housing assistance program for new, existing, and rehabbed rental housing; and provided funding to assist the private sector with building affordable housing (Orlebeke 2000; Bennett 2006; von Hoffman 1996, 2000).

The CDBG program provided funding for housing and community development annually using a needs based formula. The objectives of the program was to assist low-to moderate-
income persons with affordable housing; prevent or eliminate slum or blight conditions; and address urgent community development issues.

Originally known as the Section 8 Exiting Housing program, the housing voucher program is known by various names, housing allowances, rent certificates, housing payments, and direct cash vouchers. The housing voucher program was the first program to emerge and is thought to be the most useful, cost-effective form of subsidy. As the first large scale housing allowance program, Section 8 Exiting Housing program was created in 1974 “subsidizing low-income households in existing units through rental certificates (Bratt 1989).” Certificates were provided to low-income households with incomes up to 80% of the area median (Schwartz 2006) enabling them to afford a unit in the private rental market. Private landlords negotiated leases with local housing authorities to guarantee rent payments (Bratt 1989). The certificates paid the owners the difference between 25% of adjusted family income (latter increased to 30%) and fair market rent.

The Freestanding Voucher program emerged in 1983 as a variant of the Existing Housing Program. Slightly different than the certificate program, housing authorities could establish the maximum allowable rent by designating a payment standard. Secondly, households had the choice to spend more or less than 30% of their income on rent (Schwartz 2006). The program paid the difference between the payment standard and 30% of tenant income. Participants were allowed to occupy units that cost more than the payment standard and required to pay the additional rent. Tenants that occupied units costing less than the payment standard were allowed to pay less than 30% of their income on rent by retaining a portion of the savings.
The certificate and voucher programs were merged through the enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (Schwartz 2006; HUD 2000c). The legislation: authorized public housing authorities to establish payment standards from 90% to 110% of fair market rent not to exceed 120%; established tier level payment standards within the same metropolitan area; allowed participants to spend more than 30% of their income on rent, but not to exceed 40%; and it allowed voucher recipients to use their voucher anywhere in the United States (HUD 2000c). The legislation mandated that 75% of vouchers must be issued annually to households earning less than 30% of the area’s median family income. As of 2008, the voucher program was assisting more than 2 million households annually (HUD 2008).

Replacing Section 236, which authorized interest rate subsidies, (Bratt 1989) the Section 8 New Construction and Rehabilitation Program (NC/SR) enacted in 1974, was more generous and flexible. The program provided direct rental subsidy for tenants (Schwartz 2006). In other words, the federal government subsidized the difference between a HUD established fair market rent and 25% of tenant income (later increased to 30%) (Schwartz 2006; Bratt 1989; Orlebeke 2000; Bennett 2006; von Hoffman 1996, 2000). The mixture of deep rent subsidies and generous tax advantages captured the attention of developers and investors. The accelerated depreciation allowances enabled investors to reduce their federal tax obligations (Schwartz 2006). Terminated by the Reagan administration in 1983, the program subsidized more than 850,000 new or rehabilitated housing units (Schwartz 2006). The concentration of Section 8 buildings and households, have been blamed for the decline of neighborhoods.

Tax incentives were created to promote the production of low-income housing in the private sector. The Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program was created under the Tax
Reform Act of 1986, as an alternative method to finance housing for low-to moderate-income households. Developers are provided an indirect federal subsidy that is used to finance new construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition and rehabilitation of affordable rental housing units (Schwartz 2006). Credit allocations are based on the percentage of units that the owner agrees to maintain as low-income housing during the required eligibility time period of 15 years. The LIHTC program does not require every unit to be affordable. At least 20% of the units must be occupied by residents whose incomes do not exceed 50% of area median income or 40% of the units must be occupied by residents whose incomes do not exceed 60% of the area median income (Orlebeke 2000; Bennett 2006; von Hoffman 1996 and 2000).

The Housing Act of 1990 is marked by a diminished federal leadership role and an increased state and local role in controlling majority of the aspects of the housing program. The Federal Home Investment Partnership program (HOME) was created under the Housing Act of 1990 to produce and rehabilitate affordable housing for low-income renters and home owners. The act declared a national goal that every American household be able to afford a decent home in a suitable environment (Schwartz 2006). Instead of federal officials, local officials were responsible for administering the HOME program and determining the application mix.

3.2 National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing

For years, Public Housing Authorities have been burdened with problems such as high density, high incidence of crime, poor original design, and oppressive social and economic conditions. Policy makers and the public began to realize that the design and management of public housing contributed to the decline of neighborhoods and challenges faced by low-
income individuals. In the mid 1980s, national efforts focused on preserving the existing public housing stock. HUD funded a study performed by Abt Associates in 1988 which indicated that the majority of housing stock was in good condition, requiring only minor modernization (Varady 1998).

The estimate for physical improvement only to modernize all the developments was $29 billion. It was determined that it would take more than a decade to address the 1992 modernization needs without addressing the needs in following years. Abt Associates’ study found that the bulk of the public housing stock was in good condition and that only five to eight percent was in need of substantial renovation and redesign due to physical deterioration. While HUD and housing advocates debated the study’s methods and the amount of money needed to address the problem, the deteriorated developments and low-income families became distressed.

In 1989, Congress established the blue-ribbon National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing (NCSDPH), by enacting Public Law 101-235, “to identify the factors contributing to structural, economic, and social distresses” (GAO 1998); assess strategies for remediation; and propose a National Action Plan to eradicate conditions that contribute to severely distressed public housing by the year 2000 (NCSDPH 1992a; Popkins2004b; GAO 1998; HUD.gov). The Commissioners represented a bipartisan group from various backgrounds and professions from many parts of the country.

To identify the most severely distressed public housing and assess various strategies to improve living conditions, an 18 month study was conducted. The Commission and staff visited public housing developments in more than 25 cities; held 20 public hearings; spoke with public
housing development residents; and conducted interviews with the board of directors and staffs of public housing agencies and with industry leaders. The research yielded many findings:

- Residents afraid to move about in their own homes and communities because of the high incidence of crime;
- High unemployment and limited opportunities for meaningful employment of residents;
- Programs designed to address distressed conditions with too little, too late;
- Programs designed to assist residents of public housing that provide disincentives to self-sufficiency; and
- Families living in physical conditions that have deteriorated to a degree that renders the housing dangerous to the health and safety of residents (NCSDPH 1992a).

Major residential concerns identified by the Commission were lack of involvement and active participation in decision making concerning their communities; security services and building facilities that do not enable residents to protect themselves; lack of sufficient social and supportive services; and lack of economic opportunities and assistance (NCSDPH 1992a). Residents were found to be severely distressed and in many households in need of extensive support services. Severely distressed public housing is defined as having the presence of one or more of the following conditions:

- Families living in distress
- Incidence of serious crimes in the development or surrounding neighborhood
- Barriers to managing the environment
- Physical deterioration of buildings and uninhabitable conditions (NCSDPH 1992a).
Released in August 1992, the *Final Report of the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing* made many useful recommendations to address the social and community needs of residents; to address the capital improvement programs and physical conditions of housing stock; and address the management and operation needs to improve distressed conditions. Table 3.1 illustrates the national goals of the NCSDPH. The NCSDPH called for increased funding as well as recommended nontraditional strategies such as housing authorities collaborating with private and nonprofit developers to leverage additional resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1 The National Commission for Severely Distressed Public Housing National Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To improve the living environment of public housing residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To revitalize severely distressed sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To contribute to the surrounding neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To decrease housing that concentrates very low-income individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To create partnerships with local agencies for support and funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To build sustainable communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NCSDPH 1992a

The National Action Plan proposed a 10 year strategy to support a program that would reduce and eliminate severely distressed public housing through the revitalization of 86,000 distressed units. To accomplish this goal the Commission recognized that severely distressed public housing is not a problem of bricks and mortar but the solution must be comprehensive and coordinated with working partnerships. “Together, public housing residents; Federal, State, and local governments; housing authorities; and other public and private community-based organizations can change the landscape of severely distressed public housing developments. Separately, at best, each group could only make such housing more palatable (NCSDPH 1992a).”
The National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing final report is a testament to the public failure to recognize the needs of individuals and families living in distressed conditions; invest in public housing infrastructure; and address the complex and serious problems created by distressed communities that housing authorities have to address. “Many factors contributed to the physical problems in severely distressed public housing including poor design, shoddy construction, inadequate federal funding for ongoing maintenance and modernization, and managerial neglect (Popkin 2004b).”

3.3 HOPE VI

Created October 6, 1992, the HOPE VI (Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere) program, originally known as the Urban Revitalization Demonstration, is the direct result of recommendations by the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing (HUD.gov). The NCSDPH concluded that approximately 86,000, or six percent, total units was identified as severely distressed and uninhabitable (NCSDPH 1992a; Popkin 2004b; Schwartz 2006; Salama 1999; HUD.gov). The Commission recommendations included revitalization in three general areas: physical improvements, management improvements, and social and community services to address residents while promoting self-sufficiency (HUD.gov; Popkin 2004b). The total cost to eradicate public housing in severe distress was estimated at $7.5 billion by the Commission. The Commission recommended that Congress fund a ten year effort at $750 million a year. HUD established a goal to demolish 100,000 housing units by fiscal year 2002 (U.S. GAO 1997; HUD.gov).

Established as a demonstration program, Congress made the HOPE VI program more comprehensive and flexible than previous approaches to revitalizing public housing. HOPE VI
combined grants for physical revitalization (capital improvements) with funding for management improvements and social services (GAO 1998; Popkin 2002). This allowed PHAs to apply for housing revitalization grants; those who demonstrate the most urgent need and propose an innovative design are awarded funds for revitalization. Required to work with residents and local government during the planning stage, PHAs have the flexibility to determine which capital improvements would be most effective and in the best interest of the community (GAO 1997; Salama 1999).

In 1995, HUD created the mixed-finance development strategy and encouraged PHAs to demolish instead of rehabilitate obsolete housing. PHAs entered into partnerships with private developers by combining HUD funding with private financing to integrate public housing units with tax credit and market rate units. As the HOPE VI program emphasis expanded to develop mixed-income communities, new design concepts and other themes like new urbanism and broader neighborhood-wide redevelopment strategies emerged as well as homeownership opportunities. Public housing authorities were encouraged to pursue revitalization through a variety of approaches. As a result many PHAs revised their plans and incorporated new changes delaying the implementation of their projects.

### 3.3.1 HOPE VI Guidelines

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development is responsible for the oversight of the HOPE VI program. HUD did not spell out specific regulations within the first five to six years due to the absence of HOPE VI authorizing legislation. As a demonstration program, HOPE VI was exempt from existing public housing regulations. It was intended to be comprehensive, flexible and experimental (Turbov 2005). HOPE VI operated under a
patchwork quilt of evolving laws, regulations, and HUD legal opinions until the passage of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act (QHWRA) in 1998. The bill deregulated the operation of public housing authorities; authorized the creation of mixed-finance public housing projects; removed disincentives for residents to work and become self-sufficient; provided rental protection for low-income residents; and gave more power and flexibility to local governments and communities to operate housing programs (U.S. GAO 1997, 1998). HUD utilizes the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) and the Grant Agreement to govern grants (HUD.gov).

3.3.2 HOPE VI Goals and Objectives

Six major goals are outlined in HUD documents and NOFAs (Salama 1999; HUD 1999, 2000):

- Lessening the concentration of low-income residents in a neighborhood
- Creating partnerships for leveraging additional funds from alternate investors
- Implementing cost-effective plans
- Providing opportunities for family economic self-sufficiency
- Building sustainable units that include physical design that blends into the urban landscape
- Ensuring that residents are involved in planning and implementation of the HOPE VI development

Building on the original goal of the public housing policy to address the housing needs of low- to moderate-income families, the following key elements must be included in a HOPE VI program 1) mixed-income communities, 2) de-concentration of poverty, 3) resident participation, and 4)
community and supportive services. These goals are achieved by combining physical revitalization with management improvements and supportive services for public housing residents.

**Mixed-income Communities**

Mixed-income developments have become a popular means of revitalizing urban areas and transforming public housing (Popkin et al. 2000, 2004; Joseph 2006). Advocates of mixed-income developments draw conclusions from social networks, social control, culture and behavior, and political economy of place theories to support their hypothesis of how mixed-income development might improve the quality of life for low-income families. The assumption is that low-income residents can benefit from the social networks of higher-income residents; the presence of higher-income residents will lead to higher levels of accountability for safety; higher income residents will influence constructive behavior such as seeking work and respecting property; and higher-income residence influence will generate market demand and political pressure, thereby leading to higher quality goods and services (Joseph 2006).

**De-concentration of Poverty**

Forces including decentralization of American cities, global industrial restructuring, policies that favor suburbanization, and disinvestment associated with racism and classism have contributed to the drastic changes of urban neighborhoods. Concentrated poverty is often found in public housing and surrounding areas. As a result of inner city decline, public housing developments have become physically and socially isolated from the mainstream dominant culture (Wilson 1987). Neighborhoods with high poverty are plagued by crime, drugs, and health disparities. Concentrated poverty did not receive a lot of attention prior to the 1990s.
Federal housing policy has embraced the idea of de-concentrating poverty. During the demolition and rebuilding of HOPE VI sites, residents have the option to 1) relocate to another public housing development temporarily or permanently 2) opt out for a Section 8 voucher, or 3) stop receiving public housing assistance (Turbov 2005; Popkin 2004; Bennett 2006). It is assumed that the de-concentration of poverty will dramatically reduce crime and violence (Joseph 2006).

**COMMUNITY AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES**

“A community service program is organized, administered, overseen or funded by a public housing authority or its designated representative, engaging individuals in meaningful service on a volunteer basis or through limited stipends to address unmet human, environmental, educational, and/or public safety needs through youth service and conservation corps, residents’ associations, community-based organizations, k-12 schools, institutions of higher education, churches or other religious entities . . . and other such similar organization (Commission on National and Community Service Abt and Association Inc 1996).”

Every HOPE VI program is mandated to develop a Community and Supportive Service Plan (CSS) approved by the Commission on National and Community Service (CNCS) (Abt Associates Inc 1996). The CSS program must serve all original residents. HOPE VI guidelines allow PHAs to allocate up to 20 percent of their grant to develop a CSS program which must be implemented before the relocation of residents and demolition begin (U.S. GAO 1997). This component of the HOPE VI program was designed to address the socio-economic conditions prevalent in distressed public housing such as disadvantaged households mainly headed by females; lack of educational attainment; lack of employment opportunities; generational cycles
of poverty; and limited economic development. The CSS plan is a means to a sense of collective ownership and self-sufficiency which will help sustain the revitalized community. Community service programs can adopt several strategies: (1) CNCS corps model (2) Community Assistance Program (CAP) (3) incentives for volunteer efforts.

The corps model targets two groups; those 18 to 22 years and seniors. Residents 18 to 22 are provided education and training to engage in projects that support HOPE VI revitalization. Healthy seniors are encouraged to be companions to frail seniors or children through the Foster Grandparent program (Abt and Association Inc 1996). Another option to this model is to target youth and young adults to participate in crime prevention and neighbor to neighbor outreach projects (Abt and Association Inc 1996).

The objective of the CAP model is to identify and train residents to become peer counselors to other residents that are in need of volunteer peer assistance.

A third strategy is to offer incentives for volunteer efforts. Examples include offering scholarships for youth volunteers and free rent for adult volunteers that complete the specified community service hours.

Through CSS, a variety of supportive services are provided including child care services, basic education, technology learning centers, employment counseling, job training, transportation health care services and counseling (GAO 1997; HUD.gov; Brazley 2002). See table 3.2 for options open to HOPE VI grantees. The primary goal is to increase self-sufficiency by assisting residents with finding employment.
Table 3.2 Supportive Services Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs for all residents</th>
<th>Health care services, HIV &amp; AIDS prevention programs, alcohol and drug abuse prevention and treatment services, and crime prevention programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for preschool children</td>
<td>Day care and Head Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for school-age children and youth</td>
<td>Tutoring and mentoring programs, computer learning programs, after school recreational programs, arts programs, programs addressing problems of youth (e.g., gang prevention, dropout prevention, and conflict resolution), volunteer programs, and pre-employment programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program for school dropouts and those over 18 years of age</td>
<td>Continuing education (e.g., basic education, GED programs and computer training), life skills (e.g., budgeting and household management), volunteer programs, vocational education, job training, small business management training, employment placement, and small capital loans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for parents</td>
<td>Teen-age pregnancy prevention, special education programs (e.g., teacher-aid training, food buying, child care, and parenting), family counseling, and family self-sufficiency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Abt and Associates Inc 1996

**RESIDENT PARTICIPATION**

The requirement for resident participation is established in the HOPE VI guidelines. HOPE VI requires that housing authorities and developers engage public housing residents in the design and implementation and planning of services that will be provided (HUD 1999; Popkin 2004b). During the planning stage, PHAs and developers must collaborate with residents and the government to ensure their concerns are addressed (GAO 1997; HUD.gov). Defining participation and establishing levels of participation have been a source of contention and conflict between residents and PHAs.

### 3.3.3 Current Status of the HOPE VI Program

Through fiscal year 2003, HOPE VI was funded at an average of $550 million dollars per year. Although HOPE VI was reauthorized through FY 2006 by Congress, the Bush
administration reduced funding dramatically and proposed to eliminate funding. In its FY 2004 and FY 2005 budget submissions, the Bush administration sought to terminate the program by not requesting funding and proposing to rescind funding from the previous year’s appropriation citing long delays between the awarding of grants and the completion of projects at many of the sites (Popkin 2004b). By FY 2006, funding was below $100 million and no funds were allocated for FY 2007 (Joseph 2006).

The 110th Congress passed the HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2008. A total of $600 million was authorized to be allocated from FY 2008 through FY 2013 (Govtrack.us 2008). As of 2006, HOPE VI awarded 558 grants totaling $6.3 billion (HUD.gov 2009).

3.4 HOPE VI and Evaluation

Because of its perceived similarities to urban renewal, HOPE VI has engendered a heated debate about the efficacy of the program. Upon the 10th anniversary, housing advocates, academia, proponents, and critics began to critique HOPE VI. Proponents often suggested the program was effective and successful, while opponents argued that HOPE VI was legal gentrification and that families were being displaced (NHLP 2002). Policy makers, PHAs, housing advocates and critics recognized the need for qualitative research to understand the local and national implications of HOPE VI (Moschetti 2007).

In 2000, HUD implemented the evaluation requirement without establishing a standard of measurement and consistency in evaluation methods. The 2000 NOFA mandated that all HOPE VI grantees work with local university(ies) and/or other institutions of learning to evaluate the performance and demonstrate the impact of HOPE VI goals and objectives (HUD
There was no explicit requirement for resident’s participation in the evaluation process. Because HUD did not offer formal guidance concerning which questions to ask or how to form or focus an evaluation, evaluators faced the challenges of constructing an evaluation that would: meet HUD requirements, strengthen the HOPE VI program, and offer critical feedback to PHAs concerning the efficacy of their social services (Moschetti 2007).

Prior evaluation studies have focused on the redevelopment efforts and successes, and challenges of implementing HOPE VI (Collins 2005). Prior evaluations conducted by Jerry Salama in Atlanta, Chicago, and San Antonio identified three main factors contributing to the success of redevelopment efforts: the characteristics of the housing market, the characteristics of the public housing stock and the performance of public housing authorities, and the characteristics of the particular housing sites being redeveloped (Salama 1999; Collins 2005).

There are some constraints as well as obstacles to evaluating the HOPE VI program. Challenges identified from previous evaluations include the following:

- Public housing residents are moved to other projects or private market housing; often dispersed throughout the city making it difficult to track the residents.
- Public housing residents can opt out of the public housing system.
- There are major time delays between initial relocation and rebuilding housing.
- Many neighborhood stakeholders face transportation, telecommunication, and literacy barriers that keep some residents from getting critical information from the local housing authority.
- Public housing authority has inadequate information system to track the relocated residents.
• Neighborhood stakeholders are perceived as generators of information and not creators of information.

• HOPE VI evaluations are typically started after the relocation process is well under way (Hyland 2005).

3.5 Chapter Conclusion

HOPE VI was established as a result of inefficiencies from previous housing program. Since 1993, funds have been awarded for planning, demolition, Main Street, and revitalization grants. HOPE VI differs from earlier public housing programs, funds can be allocated towards rehabilitation, new construction, other physical improvements, demolition, acquisition, and community and supportive services. The program has received bipartisan support and has been reauthorized through 2013 but at a substantially lower level of funding in contrast to preFY 2002 annual appropriation for grants. Current evaluations tend to be conventional, focusing on community development structural variables that were quantifiable. Examples including change in property values, income levels, employment levels, and crime incidence.
CHAPTER FOUR: Participatory Evaluation

In his book, “The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, The Underclass, and Public Policy” William J. Wilson argues the causes and possible reasons for inner city poverty. Forces including decentralization of American cities, global industrial restructuring, policies that favor suburbanization, and disinvestment associated with racism and classism have contributed to the drastic changes of urban neighborhoods. As a result of inner city decline, public housing developments have become physically and socially isolated from the mainstream dominant culture. Wilson’s study has spurred critical thinking about the causes and possible remedies for inner city poverty and the decay of public housing.

Funding and human resources for community development and/or community building or quality-of-life change interventions have been provided by federal agencies such as HUD, national institutions like Fannie Mae, and national foundations like Ford, Aspen, and Rockefeller (Hyland 2005). Government, private and non-profit sectors interest in program improvement and accountability continues to grow as funding and human resources are provided. Innovative approaches to integrate evaluation into program development have emerged to measure program outcomes. Community development literature discusses national efforts to evaluate factors contributing to community development in inner city neighborhoods such as HOPE VI.

A wealth of literature has been written discussing the limitations of expert driven conventional monitoring and evaluation and alternatives to conventional evaluation approaches. Participation is a buzz word in program research and development. In recent years, the use of participatory methods has emerged in the monitoring and evaluation of development and community-based initiatives. The core hypothesis of participatory evaluation
is that stakeholder participation will enhance evaluation relevance, ownership, and utilization (Cousins 1998; Aubel 1999).

Since the 1980s, many international development organizations began to discuss the significance of using participatory approaches to monitoring and evaluation. Robert Chambers asked whose reality counts? and argued that the implementation of development programs must begin with the priorities of poor and marginalized people. Another pivotal question is who counts reality? in other words, whose voices are used to define success and who benefits and learns from the process of monitoring and evaluating change (Estrella et al. 2000)? The growing interest in participatory evaluation parallels concepts such as empowerment, democratization, partnership, and sustainability which in one way or another, attempts to give a voice to the poor and disenfranchised whose voices have not been adequately heard (UNDP 1997). PM&E is inclusive and flexible allowing those most directly affected to participate in the (1) design process (2) negotiate what will be monitored and evaluated and collected and analyzed and (3) use lessons learned to improve programming (Cousins 1998; Gaventa 1998; Suarez-Herrera 2009; Campilan 2000). Experience has shown that participation improves the quality, effectiveness and sustainability of development actions (UNDP 1997).

In this chapter, I will state the purpose of an evaluation; explore the criteria that has been used to evaluate housing programs; and review the criteria customarily used in housing evaluations. The literature review addresses issues such as the development of participatory monitoring and evaluation methods, including the four common principles; highlight the strengths and challenges that a participatory evaluation proposes; the skills required to effectively use PM&E tools; and the institutionalization of PM&E. It also includes case studies
to illustrate how to use participatory evaluation tools to obtain qualitative as well as quantitative data.

4.1 What Is An Evaluation?

Evaluation is a process that critically examines a program. It involves systematically collecting, analyzing, and using information to answer questions about a program’s activities, characteristics, and outcomes. It is intended to improve a program’s effectiveness and/or inform social actions and programming decisions (Weiss 1998; Patton, 1987). The concept of evaluation is a description of performance and the identification of standards or criteria for judging the performance. There are five key elements to evaluation procedures: (1) systematic assessment (2) operation of the program (3) analysis of outcome and effects (4) standard for comparison (5) the purpose for the evaluation (Weiss 1998; Rossi 2004).

Evaluation is the production of knowledge about the effectiveness and efficiency of development intervention. As a means to constructively examine the strengths and weaknesses of a program initiative or project, the lessons learned from an evaluation are used to improve planning and implementing.

4.1.1 Emerging Approaches to Evaluation

In their book “Fourth Generation” 1998, Guba and Lincoln identify four traditions or ‘generations’ of project evaluation as measurement-oriented, description-oriented, judgment-oriented, and negotiation-oriented.
Emerged in the 1900s, the first generation is associated with education research and scientific management in business and industry. Tests were used to determine more efficient and effective methods. The role of the evaluator was generally technical (Guba 1989).

With a focus on description, second generation implemented program evaluation. Emphasis on achieving objectives and analysis of program strengths and weaknesses were utilized to guide refinements and revisions. Retaining technical functions, the role of the evaluator became a describer.

Third generation evaluation integrated judgment. Goals became the subject of the evaluation thus “standards against which the judgment can be made assumed prominence (Guba 1989).” Assuming the role as judge, evaluators helped clients establish standards for judgment.

The most recent tradition is the fourth generation which emphasizes a process of negotiation which incorporates various stakeholders. Recognizing diverse perspectives and interests within a specific context (physical, psychological, social, and cultural), a course of action is identified for stakeholders. In negotiating the process of design, implementation, and interpretation with stakeholders, the role of the evaluator becomes that of a facilitator (Guba 1989; Estrella 1998).

Traditional approaches have emphasized program effectiveness and practical utility. Externally oriented, traditional approaches are “geared towards enhancing cost efficiency and accountability, and usually require quantitative methods for overall program assessment (Guba 1989).” To enhance objectivity, an outside evaluator conducts the evaluation which limits input (e.g., questions asked and type of information obtained or reflecting on and using findings).
from the main beneficiaries of the program/project. Drawing on scientific investigation, the variations of conventional approaches to monitoring and evaluation can be described as: focused on measurement; oriented to the needs of program funders and policy makers, rather than participants or local people; striving for objectivity, and distance between evaluator and participant; and conducted for the purpose of making judgments rather than empowerment (Guba 1989; Estrella 1998).

There has been a growing dissatisfaction with conventional approaches. The interest in PM&E draws from various limitations and constraints associated with conventional monitoring and evaluation approaches led by expert evaluators. Table 4.1 summarizes some of the major criticisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1 Criticisms of Conventional Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They have proven too costly and ineffective in terms of meaning and assessing project achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have failed to involve actively project beneficiaries and others who may be directly affected by M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project evaluation has become an increasingly specialized field and activity, conducted and controlled mostly by outsiders and removed from the ongoing planning and implementation of development initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They serve primarily as control and manage programs and resources, alienating intended beneficiaries and others involved in program planning and implementation from taking part in project appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on quantitative measures tends to ignore qualitative information which helps provide a fuller understanding of project outcomes, processes and changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to fully consider the dynamics of a program implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited utility resulting in limited uses and serves the needs of limited users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given its predetermined and highly structured approach, it lacks the flexibility to adapt to changing field situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not promote institutionalization of and capacity development for evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Estrella 1998; Campilan 2000
In response to concerns about conventional approaches to monitoring and evaluation, a new school of thought has gradually evolved which recognizes the importance of including beneficiaries and other stakeholders (Estrella et al. 2000; Campilan 2000). Reflecting on ‘grassroots-based’ experiences and ‘bottom up’ strategies, innovative approaches aim to make participatory evaluation responsive to peoples’ needs and real life context. See table 4.2 for the differences between participatory and conventional evaluations. Emphasis is shifting away from a scientific, technical, and managerial approach, towards a process that gathers, analyze, and utilize information that is relevant to the local context; social, political, and value systems (Estrella 1998; Weiss 1995; Aubel 2004). In general, the main arguments made for participatory approaches to monitoring and evaluation are:

- The importance of taking local people’s perspectives into account especially beneficiaries, M&E helps improve understanding of the development process itself;
- Enhanced participation especially of beneficiaries, M&E helps improve understanding of the development process itself;
- Increased authenticity of M&E findings that are locally relevant;
- The shift within organizations, particularly in private sector, towards reflecting more on their own experiences, and learning from them;
- Improvement of the sustainability of project activities, by identifying strengths and weaknesses for better project management and decision-making;
- Increasing local level capacity in M&E, which in turn contributes to self-reliance in overall project implementation;
• Moves toward capacitating and empowering communities to take charge of processes that affect their lives contributing to self-reliance in overall project implementation;

• Sharing of experience through systematic documentation and analysis based on broad-based participation;

• Strengthen accountability to donors; and

• More efficient allocation of resources (Estrella 1998; Campilan 2000; Aubel 2004).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Participatory Evaluation</th>
<th>Conventional Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For whom evaluation is being done?</td>
<td>Stakeholder groups</td>
<td>Program management, donors, policy group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who evaluates?</td>
<td>Mainly internal groups</td>
<td>External groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the focus?</td>
<td>Is on learning</td>
<td>Is on accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What methods are used?</td>
<td>Rapid appraisal methods</td>
<td>Formal methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the design?</td>
<td>Is adaptive, semi-structured, qualitative and quantitative</td>
<td>Is predetermined, structured quantitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to evaluate?</td>
<td>Criteria discussed and negotiated, focusing on program processes and outcomes</td>
<td>Externally defined criteria, focusing mainly on program outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who determines indicators of program progress?</td>
<td>Members of community groups, project staff and other stakeholders; evaluator</td>
<td>Professional evaluators and outside experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and preparation of final reports?</td>
<td>Shared responsibility of evaluator and participating stakeholders</td>
<td>Professional evaluators and outside experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of the local evaluator?</td>
<td>Coach, facilitator, negotiator, “critical friend”</td>
<td>Expert, leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| When is this type of evaluation most useful? | • There are questions about program implementation difficulties  
• There are questions about program effects on beneficiaries  
• Information is wanted on a stakeholder’s knowledge of a program or view of progress | • There is a need for independent judgment  
• Specialized information is needed that only experts can provide  
• Program indicators are standardized, rather than particular to a program |
| What are the costs?           | • Time, energy and commitment from local residents, project staff and other stakeholders  
• Coordination of many players  
• Training, skills development and support for key players  
• Potential for conflict | • Consultant and expert fees  
• Loss of critical information that only stakeholders can provide |
| What are the benefits?        | • Local knowledge  
• Verification of information from key players (validity)  
• Builds knowledge, skills and relationships among community residents and other stakeholders | • Independent judgment  
• Standardized indicators allow comparison with other research findings |

Source: Zukoski 2002; Campilan 2000; USAID 1996

### 4.1.2 Contrasting Approaches to Evaluating Neighborhood Change

There are various evaluation methods that recognize the critical importance of working with community-based organizations and residents in both the research design and execution.
in areas experiencing change. Community development literature offers two major approaches and one less used approach to evaluating neighborhood change.

The first approach has primarily focused on the tracking of structural neighborhood change variables. Traditional community development target categories that are tracked include but are not limited to the following categories: physical characteristics; aggregate demographic characteristics; other neighborhood-level/aggregate quality-of-life characteristics; and investors and institutional stakeholders (Hyland 2005). Table 4.3 below includes examples of tracking variables within these categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3 Examples of Community Development Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hyland 2005

The second approach, process evaluation, has been devoted to the documentation and analysis of community building and social capital as process variables. Variables observed by this approach include community vision and pride, community leadership, participation in local activities, social networking, connectedness to external groups, community information sharing and their significance in revitalizing neighborhoods (Hyland 2005).

A third approach, which is the less-used, is participatory evaluation/empowerment evaluation. Residents are integrated into the evaluation process affecting both the structural and community-building outcomes through information sharing (Hyland 2005). This dynamic collaborative process seeks to include multiple realities and experiences that encourage
intentional change. It is a partnership approach that provides for active engagement in evaluation and all phases of its implementation (USAID 1996; Zukoski 2002; Estrella et al. 2000, 1998). PE is becoming common with the growing awareness of participation and benefits such as empowerment and capacity building. As the focus of this paper, the strengths, limitations, and processes of PE will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

Each approach has been found to have similarities, differences, limitations and challenges. While the structural approach is excellent for providing quantitative outcomes, it does not capture the dynamics of how the neighborhood residents are affected by change. The community building and social capital approach captures the volatility of change but falls short of “providing objective, measurable outcomes that can be used for comparative and policy making purposes (Hyland 2005).” The participatory evaluation approach involves residents in the evaluation process but does not provide policy makers with the quantitative and comparative data of the policy/program impact (Hyland 2005).

4.2 Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

“Participatory evaluation is people-centered: project stakeholders and beneficiaries are the key actors of the evaluation process and not the mere objects of the evaluation” (United Nations Development Program 1997).”

In recent years, there has been a call for stakeholders to participate in development and community-based initiatives to counter traditional top-down approaches to evaluation (Estrella et al. 2000). Participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) is an intended catalyst to intentional change (Suarez-Herrera 2009). Participatory approaches are reflective, action-oriented, and seek to build capacity. It attempts to build the knowledge and capacity of
communities to conduct their own evaluations as well as used the lessons learned to improve the implementation of programs locally and nationally (Cousins 1998; Gaventa 1998). It is implied when doing an evaluation, researchers, facilitators, or professional evaluators collaborate with key stakeholders (Cousins 1998). Stakeholder groups include all of those who have a vested interest in the program outcome and have the means to help or hinder the progress: key decision makers, beneficiaries, funders, program sponsors, collaborating organizations, directors, managers, program field staff, residents, researchers, community members, local people, local and central government and policy makers (Estrella et al. 2000; Cousins 1998; Weiss 1995, Burke 1998). These persons will make decisions and use the recommendations generated by the evaluation.

The concept of PM&E is not new and has been taking place since the 1970s which primarily involved development practitioners and social researchers in a variety of fields (UNDP 1997). PM&E reflects participatory traditions including Participatory Action Research (PAR), Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) and Participatory Learning and Action (PLA), Farming Systems Research (FRS) or Farming Participatory Research, and Self-Evaluation and Beneficiary Assessments (UNDP 1997; Estrella et al. 2000). Over the past 30 years, many nongovernmental organizations (NGO) have researched PM&E and developed tools for use in development programs. Additionally, PM&E roots can be traced to the private sector’s growing appreciation for individual and organizational learning (Estrella et al. 2000).

Participatory monitoring and evaluation, is one label that has been used as a descriptor of collaborative work (Cousins 1998). For the purpose of this paper, I will use participatory
evaluation. See table 4.4 for a few terms that have been used interchangeably to refer to approaches associated with participatory monitoring and evaluation.

|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|

Source: Estrella 1998; Gaventa 1998; Estrella et al. 2000

Participatory evaluation has emerged as a dynamic educational process “through which social groups produce action-oriented knowledge about their reality, clarify and articulate their norms and values, and reach consensus about further action” (Cousins 1998; Suarez-Herrera 2009) that insist that stakeholders are more engaged in the process of monitoring and evaluation. Rationales for choosing a participatory evaluation are coupled to participants’ values, assumptions, and interests. Two common rationales that reflect on the connection between participatory evaluation and HOPE VI are utilization and empowerment.

**Utilization**

An ongoing concern for evaluators is the utilization of findings. It has been suggested that “many evaluation findings are misused or even unused by stakeholders (Suarez-Herrera
It is a common belief that conventional reports have no impact on project beneficiaries or development practice either in the field or at headquarters because reports are shelved or sit on desks therefore knowledge is not shared (UNDP 1997). Participatory evaluation is concerned with providing a platform for the voices and decisions of the least powerful and most affected stakeholders, the beneficiaries. The dialogue among various stakeholders is a holistic approach to understanding the program and the needs that need to be fulfilled. Because stakeholders are assumed to hold critical knowledge about the dynamics of a program, they can make significant contributions at various stages of the evaluation process. Thus PE is not only concerned with stakeholders using the findings but using the evaluation process in an efficient manner (Suarez-Herrera 2009).

**Empowerment**

The empowerment rationale’s central mission is social emancipation and development of individuals and communities. The evaluation process must acknowledge and deal with inequities of power and voice between stakeholders. The evaluation process and techniques are used to transform power relations and to promote social action and change (Suarez-Herrera 2009). The belief is that if beneficiaries (those affected by the program) control and take ownership of making evaluation decisions and implementing them, the approach will build confidence and pride in the community and among participants (Hyland 2005; UNDP 1997; Cousins 1998). Participants empower themselves by not focusing only on data collections, analysis, and dissemination but also on learning the process and any actions that may result (Cousins 1998).
4.2.1 Participatory Evaluation Functions

In their article *Who Counts Reality? Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: A Literature Review* 1998 Marisol Estrella and John Gaventa identified the purposes for which PM&E is used, and in what types of projects and settings. Based upon case studies and key literature review, five general functions which will be described in depth below were identified: (1) impact assessment (2) project management and planning (3) organizational strengthening or institutional learning (4) understanding and negotiating stakeholder perspectives and (5) public accountability (Estrella et al. 2000). The objectives and information needs of the project or program initiative will determine the uses and purposes of PM&E. The functions are co-dependent and overlap.

A common function of PE is to assess and reflect on the impact of a program initiative or project (UNDP 1997; Cousins 1998; Guba 1998; Aubel 1999). With an emphasis on comparison between program objectives and actual achievement, an impact assessment can distinguish if a project intervention has achieved its stated objectives, if the program objectives are relevant and sustainable, and if the best strategies have been pursued (Estrella et al. 2000).

Participatory evaluation results can be used to improve project planning and implementation. As a project management tool, stakeholders can analyze and reflect on their experiences to make critical decisions for future goals and activities (Estrella et al. 2000; Suarez-Herrera 2009).

A third function is to create a “learning process to strengthen organizational and institutional learning (Estrella et al. 2000).” Participatory evaluation enables people to evaluate the objectives of the project and to assess their own organizational capacities. Through the
self-evaluation approach, stakeholders track their progress, provide solutions, and build
capacity.

Another function of PE is to be utilized as a process which allows stakeholders to share
their individual perception and express their needs, interests, and expectations. Stakeholders
negotiate their differences to identify evaluation objectives and indicators (Cousins 1998;
Estrella 1998).

A last common function of PE is public accountability. PE is used to hold project
beneficiaries and program recipients accountable as well as a means for stakeholders to
monitor and evaluate the performance of donor and governmental institutions.

4.2.2 Practical vs. Transformative Participatory Evaluation

In their article “Framing Participatory Evaluation” 1998 Cousins and Whitmore
cancel and explicate participatory evaluation as two streams based upon their central
goals, functions, and historical and ideological roots. Acknowledging the political nature of the
evaluation process, practical participatory evaluation (P-PE) advocates organizational learning
while transformative participatory evaluation (T-PE) “is concerned with social action towards
change, as well as transforming power relations in order to empower the marginalized (Suarez-
Herrera 2009).”

P-PE supports program or organization decision making and problem solving “by
involving stakeholders in certain aspects of the evaluation process (Cousins 1998).” P-PE is
linked to the rationale of utility. It aims to increase the usefulness of the knowledge that is
created. The core principle of P-PE is that stakeholder participation will enhance relevance,
ownership, and thus utilization (Cousins 1998; Smits 2008). Empirical evidence has been
provided by various researchers that indicate that various forms of P-PE enhance the utilization of both evaluation findings and process (Cousins 1998; Smits 2008). In other words, stakeholder participation can enhance utilization without compromising technical quality or credibility. The effects of the process include empowerment and self-worth, acceptance and appreciation of evaluation, and the development of sustainable skills.

Most of the literature on transformative participatory evaluation relates to participatory research and later to participatory action research. The T-PE framework is within the context of power and transformation. The key theories are: who creates and controls the production of knowledge; how the evaluation is conducted; and critical reflection (Cousins 1998). T-PE is reliant on the rationale of empowerment through participation. Stakeholders are encouraged to participate in the creation of sustainable network of communicative actions and supportive partnerships. Participants are taught to respect their own knowledge and to understand the linkages between knowledge, power, and control (Suarez-Herrera 2009). It’s implied that dialogue among all participants will lead to understanding and respect; all participants are contributors working collectively. Thus requiring participants to “question, to doubt, and to consider a broad range of social factors, including their own biases and assumptions (Cousins 1998).”

Although there are distinct differences among the two streams of participatory evaluation in their primary functions, overlap does exist. The differences and commonality of the two streams, as well as other forms of collaborative evaluation and inquiry, are compared in table 4.5 based upon control of the evaluation process, stakeholder selection, and depth of participation. Control of the evaluation process – relates to technical decisions regarding
evaluation processes and conduct - can range from decisions being completely controlled by
the researcher to complete control by practitioners. Stakeholder selection can “range from
restriction of primary users to inclusion of all legitimate groups (Cousins 1998).” Participation
can vary from consultation, no decision making control or responsibilities, to deep
participation, involvement in the design, data collection, analysis, and dissemination of results
(Cousins 1998; Zukoski 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.5 Approaches to Collaborative Evaluation and Inquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Participatory Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Participatory Evaluation (P-PE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative Participatory Evaluation (T-PE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Other Forms of Collaborative Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder-Based Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Based Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other Forms of Collaborative Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Action Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5 Approaches to Collaborative Evaluation and Inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Scientific Knowledge</th>
<th>Participants in Research</th>
<th>Beneficiaries and Others</th>
<th>Extensive Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emancipatory (Participatory)</td>
<td>Political: empowerment, emancipation, amelioration of social conditions</td>
<td>Practitioner: exclusive control; research as resource person</td>
<td>Unspecified: most often stakeholders who are disenfranchised or in some way marginalized by the system</td>
<td>Participation in all aspects of the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Inquiry</td>
<td>Philosophical: root propositional research knowledge about people in their experiential and knowledge</td>
<td>Practitioner: participants are both co-researchers and co-subjects with full reciprocity</td>
<td>Unspecified: most often participants are members of an inquiry group with all of the problems of inclusion, influence, and intimacy</td>
<td>Participation in all aspects of the research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cousins 1998

4.2.3 Current Issues and Debates

Like other participatory approaches in evaluation practice, PE models are subject to critical questions and reflection by proponents and skeptics. The most critical debates current among PE practice and challenges proposed by skeptics are concepts of participation, objectivity and bias, technical quality, power and empowerment and the role of the evaluator, appropriate methodologies, developing capacity building, and promoting institutional learning.

**Concepts of Participation**

Participatory monitoring and evaluation is distinguished from conventional approaches in its inclusion of a wide range of stakeholders (Cousins 1998; UNDP 1997; Aubel 1999). Defining who stakeholders are is a difficult task. Ambiguity exists when identifying who participates and to what extent or depth they can or desire to be involved. PM&E practitioners and advocates “believe that the stakeholders who are involved in development planning and implementation should be involved in monitoring changes and determining the indicators for success (Estrella et al. 2000).”
**OBJECTIVITY AND BIAS**

Critics argue that not taking an objective stance and allowing diverse perspectives, negotiation of the different values represented prevents evaluators from fulfilling their professional obligation. Critics believe by forsaking objectivity the criteria of judgment are not relative to the evaluation but that of each individual stakeholder. Thus individual beliefs, values, and knowledge will influence the process with little check on self-perception.

Some P-PE proponents believe that “evaluators should not remove themselves from value conflicts; standards, interest, worth, and merit are all value-based concepts while others advocate a value-honest, influence-neutral position with an understanding of pluralistic values (Brisolara 1998).” Evaluators should encourage dialogue and negotiation to ensure that no one voice has excessive influence. T-PE proponents argue that awareness of and reflection on values, opinions, personal histories, and power dynamics should be explicit from the inception to provide a basis for later reflection to understand how their personal bias affects the process and results (Brisolara 1998).

**TECHNICAL QUALITY**

At the same time, many evaluators support finding alternative means for evaluation practice and advocate the importance of maintaining technical quality. P-PE proponents have adopted means similar to non-participatory evaluators such as maintaining the role as expert evaluator and responsibility for the quality methods and evaluation activities (Brisolara 1998). Some evaluators claim that the use of stakeholders to conduct evaluation results in the loss of rigor (Moschetti 2007). T-PE proponents question the standard definitions of quality and argue
that different measures are equivalent such as the ownership of the decision making process, usefulness, and the increase equity in the distribution of resources (Brisolara 1998).

**POWER AND EMPOWERMENT**

Frequently associated with participatory evaluation, all PE practitioners do not promote empowerment as a goal of the evaluation effort. Those who do not promote empowerment believe that using it as a goal confuses evaluation with social work and community development activities. Empowerment is viewed as a potential result of involvement but not as a legitimate goal of the evaluation. Practitioners, who view empowerment as a separate entity, advocate instead democratic pluralism, dialogue among participants, or evaluation as a resource for program improvement (Brisolara 1998). T-PE proponents view empowerment as a key element. They recognize that evaluation is inherently a political process which addresses the issues of who benefits from an evaluation and who loses.

Evaluators should question if power is an issue or how it should be used by individuals. Some people exert more power than others based on factors such as formal education, profession, class, race, and gender.

**ROLE OF THE EVALUATOR**

The traditional role of evaluators has been that of a detached observer who has been charged with seeking facts about a program and producing a report based upon inputs, processes, and/or outcomes. Social scientists acknowledge that truth is contingent and conditional. They no longer believe in the existence of single truth acknowledging that people construe knowledge, truth, and relevance in different ways and each of them are legitimate and worthy (Weiss 1998). The role of the evaluator will vary significantly depending on the type of
evaluation and the level of involvement of donors, stakeholders, and beneficiaries (UNDP 1997; Weiss 1998; Cousins 1998; Suarez-Herrera 2009).

A traditional role of technical expert and final judge is often advocated by P-PE supporters. Like conventional evaluations, the evaluator may have ultimate responsibility for technical quality but not definitive power or the final say about the evaluation process. “An evaluator must be able to train participants, facilitate groups, and reconcile divergent perspectives (Brisolara 1998).”

Practitioners utilize their knowledge, skills, and abilities in the evaluation to ensure that resources and power are shared and different perspectives are valued. T-PE professionals embrace the knowledge, skills, and abilities that stakeholders bring to an evaluation. Promoting social action for change and transforming power relations, the evaluator is often involved in activities which resemble social movement instead of evaluation efforts.

**APPROPRIATE METHODOLOGIES**

Implementing participatory approaches raises methodological issues including developing indicators, establishing new standards of rigor, and maintaining flexibility. The involvement of stakeholders with different priorities and needs increases the difficulty in developing indicators. PM&E is rapidly be applied in different contexts requiring new types of indicators to monitor important aspects of development that are not traditionally assessed namely participation, empowerment, transparency, and accountability (Estrella et al. 2000).

It is assumed that conventional approaches are more quantitative, therefore achieving a certain level of rigor (Crishna 2006b). In contrast, participatory approaches obtain more
qualitative data that is context-specific which is perceived to be subjective. Thus raising the issue if rigor can be established when a participatory approach is chosen (Estrella et al. 2000).

Ensuring flexibility in PM&E raises the issue of being able to provide uniform information to allow for comparability and to make generalizations. Especially when tracking large scale programs/projects.

4.2.4 Guiding Principles

My literature review revealed many different terms for participatory approaches to monitoring and evaluation and a wealth of experiences in various disciplines. While there are many variations, there are four common key principles that can be characterized within the participatory process: participation, flexibility, learning, and negotiation.

The Principle of Participation

Participatory approaches acknowledge that there are several stakeholders who are or ought to participate in the evaluation (Crishna 2006a; Estrella 1998; Cousins 1998; Jackson 1998). A core feature of participatory evaluation is recognizing who actually participates. As defined earlier, a stakeholder is any organization or person who controls resources that are needed to accomplish an action or who can mobilize resources to prevent the action from occurring including beneficiaries, project or program staff and management at local, regional, national, or international levels, researchers, government agencies, and donors (Estrella et al. 2000; Jackson 1998). Stakeholders become directly or indirectly involved in agreeing on what a project or program should or should not achieve.

Although the emphasis is on collaboration, the concept of participation has different meanings for different people. The level and degree of participation being sought varies among
stakeholders. Participation can be characterized by whom it is initiated and conducted and whose perspective is emphasized. Who distinguishes between externally led, internally led, or jointly led evaluation. Whose distinguishes between which stakeholders are emphasized – all major stakeholders, beneficiaries, or marginalized groups (e.g., the very poor, women, children, and people with disabilities) (Estrella et al. 2000; Jackson 1998).

Externally led PM&E is generally organized and initiated by (outsiders) individuals and groups thought to have no direct involvement or direct personal or institutional interest in the program or project outcome (Estrella et al. 2000). The project donor and supporting agencies commissions an external evaluator to serve as a facilitator to present an objective and unbiased point of view. Using knowledge from his/her experience the facilitator helps stakeholders determine and conduct their own PM&E process (Estrella et al. 2000; Jackson 1998).

Internally led PM&E efforts are mainly implemented by (insiders) those directly involved including local people and program/project staff members. Some view it as an ideal form of PM&E because of the major role that community members play in initiation and implementation. Internally led efforts are perceived as contributing to local capacity building and organizational strengthening and are most likely to become an integral part of community activities (Estrella et al. 2000). Insiders bring intimate knowledge about the program to the process as well as their commitment to learn how to improve their program (Aubel 1999).

Jointly led PM&E combines the approaches of external- and internal-led efforts to include the viewpoints of both insiders and outsiders. “The objective is to achieve a more holistic perspective and involve a more diverse set of stakeholders (Estrella et al. 2000).” In theory, all major stakeholders, beneficiaries, and marginalized individuals and groups should be
inclusive categories but in practice this is not necessarily the case because of the emphasis given to the involvement of different groups. For example, projects that emphasize major stakeholders should include beneficiaries but the role for direct beneficiaries may be small. Some programs may focus on beneficiaries excluding marginalized groups.

Literature review indicates that there is a continuum between internally and externally-led forms of PM&E. Some approaches emphasize the involvement of all major stakeholders. The involvement of all relevant stakeholders is expected to result in catering to the information needs of a variety of user groups within and outside the program or project (Estrella et al. 2000). Others highlight the involvement of beneficiaries to take control of the evaluation process. This approach attempts to redefine programs and projects as a bottom-up, people-centered, and people-controlled process and not a technocratic, top-down intervention (Estrella et al. 2000; Jackson 1998). Yet, other approaches call attention to the importance of involving marginalized groups such as the very poor, women, children, and people with disabilities. This perspective seeks to engage the least powerful, visible, and assertive actors from planning to data collection, to findings, to implementation (Estrella et al. 2000). See table 4.6 for the suggested roles of insiders and outsiders in the development and implementation of participatory monitoring and evaluation.
### Table 4.6 Roles of “insiders” and “outsiders” in development and implementation of participatory monitoring and evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps in development and implementation of PM&amp;E strategy</th>
<th>Externally-led</th>
<th>Jointly-led</th>
<th>Internally-led</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Planning the PM&amp;E process and determining objectives and indicators</strong></td>
<td>O: determine stakeholders to be involved; develop the M&amp;E framework, including objectives, indicators; and choose and develop data collection instruments</td>
<td>O &amp; I: Jointly identify stakeholders to be involved; develop the M&amp;E framework including objectives and indicators; choose and develop data-collection instruments</td>
<td>I: determine stakeholders and outsiders to be involved; develop the M&amp;E framework, including objectives and indicators; choose and develop data-collection instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I: provide feedback on proposed M&amp;E framework; learn how to use the data collection tools</td>
<td></td>
<td>O: provide technical support to insiders when called upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Gathering data</strong></td>
<td>O: coordinate data collection</td>
<td>O: coordinate data collection</td>
<td>I: coordinate all data collection activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I: participate as data collectors and/or as interviewees</td>
<td>I: participate as data collectors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Analyzing</strong></td>
<td>O: analyze raw data; summarize findings; formulate recommendations and prepare for presentation/discussion</td>
<td>O &amp; I: jointly analyze raw data; discuss results; summarize findings and develop recommendations</td>
<td>I: analyze raw data; discuss results; summarize findings; formulate recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I: no role to play</td>
<td></td>
<td>O: provide technical advice on data analysis when called upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4: Sharing the information and defining actions to be taken</strong></td>
<td>O: present findings and recommendations</td>
<td>O &amp; I: present findings and recommendations to wider stakeholder group and elicit discussion of actions to be taken</td>
<td>I: present findings and recommendations to wider community and elicit discussion of actions to be taken; present recommendations to outsiders and elicit discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I: discuss findings and recommendations and provide feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>O: provide suggestions on recommendations and actions to be taken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I = Insiders  
O = Outsiders

Sources: Aubel 2004

**The Principle of Learning**

With an emphasis on ‘practical’ or ‘action-oriented’ learning, participatory evaluation is an educational experience for participants as well as a means for local capacity building (Estrella et al. 2000). Characterized as a process of individual and collective learning, PE enables
participants to acknowledge their strengths and weaknesses, their social reality, and their visions and perspectives of development outcomes (Suarez-Herrera 2009). “Understanding the various factors that affect the conditions and dynamics of their program/project, the basis for their successes and failures, and the potential solutions or alternatives actions” (Estrella et al. 2000), participants develop skills which enable them to plan, solve problems, and make decisions.

PE is conceptualized as a learning cycle. Collectively, participants learn from experience, gain the abilities to evaluate their own needs, analyze priorities and objectives, and assume action-oriented planning (Jackson 1998). Reflection is an essential element for the learning cycle. Continuous reflection allows stakeholders to assess the impact of the evaluation and the direction of the process as they learn from their own successes and mistakes. Active participation of stakeholders can result in new knowledge or a better understanding of their environment. Thus evaluation becomes an ongoing process of community learning and capacity building. Conditions that are conducive to change and action are created through this learning process.

THE PRINCIPLE OF NEGOTIATION

Literature review suggests that participatory evaluation and monitoring is “increasingly perceived as a social process for negotiating between people’s needs, expectations, and world-views” (Estrella et al. 2000). Stakeholders will have different claims, issues and concerns based upon their social values which are influence by their realities.

An objective of PE is to include multiple realities. The negotiation process allows participants to gain a better understand of their own and other’s interest, perceptions, and
roles in the evaluation. The inclusion of multiple stakeholders in the evaluation and monitoring process, is perceived by practitioners as contributing towards the building of trust and changing of perceptions, behaviors, and attitudes among stakeholders to improve the outcome for all (Campilan 2000; Jackson 1998).

The negotiation process, which is highly political, address issues of equity, power, and social transformation. The politics of negotiation can enfranchise or disenfranchise stakeholder groups through the selective involvement of stakeholders in the design, implementation, and use of information (Estrella et al. 2000). Thus, negotiation can become an empowering or disempowering process.

“Empowerment is defined in the terms of the degree to which ‘full participative’ involvement in every aspect of design, implementation, interpretation and resulting action is achieved (Estrella et al. 2000).” Elaborating on the issues of power with the focus of who creates and who controls the production of knowledge, Cousins and Whitmore suggest that the evaluation process is used to empower people through transforming power relations and eradicating social inequities by promoting social action and change. Through an educational, learning process, stakeholders produce knowledge about their reality, clarify and articulate their norms and values, and reach consensus about further action (Estrella et al. 2000; Cousins 1998; Suarez-Herrera 2009).

**THE PRINCIPLE OF FLEXIBILITY**

Many practitioners concur that there is no prescribed blueprint to participatory approaches. Flexibility is essential since factors (e.g., external environment, number, role and skills of stakeholders) change over time. Design issues are decided throughout the
participatory process (USAID 1996). Participatory evaluations are context specific (socio-cultural, economic, political, institutional), rooted in the concerns, interests and problems of beneficiaries; local conditions influence and determines the evaluations purpose and direction (UNDP 1997). Practitioners view the PE process as continually evolving and adapting to local conditions specific to the development. To integrate flexibility into the design and practice of PE, the process must be responsive and relevant to the needs, concerns, interests and problems of program end-users. Flexibility is illustrated in the evaluation chakra or wheel. The chakra represents a cyclical repetition of reassessment and self evaluation to demonstrate the evolving and adaptive process (Estrella et al. 2000).

4.2.5 Characteristics and Process of Participatory Evaluation

Several authors including Beverly Burke supports the idea that “PE is a set of principles and a process, not a set of tools or techniques.” In her article “Evaluating for a Change: Reflections on Participatory Methodology” 1998 Burke draws on her own experience and that of other PE practitioners, from various disciplines, to highlight a list of principles and key elements. Burke acknowledges that all practitioners would not apply the same principles and some principles are more appropriate to specific forms of PE than to others. Amidst diversity, participatory evaluations typically share characteristics that distinguish them from conventional approaches.

1. The evaluations must involve and be useful to the program’s end users. Key stakeholders are identified as the group whose interests are directly and ultimately influenced by the objectives of the evaluation;
2. The evaluation must be context-specific, rooted in the concerns, interests, and problems of the program’s end users. The evaluation must address the fundamentals of the economic, social, political, and cultural context to be effective;

3. The evaluation methodology values and uses the knowledge and experience of the key stakeholders. Throughout the PE process, capacity is built enabling participants to understand their roles and strengthen skills to reduce dependence on outside experts or evaluators;

4. The evaluation is not and cannot be disinterested. Evaluation must be interested in the process and its results. The evaluator cannot have a detached, uninvolved role in the evaluation;

5. The evaluation favors collective methods of knowledge generation (Burke 1998). Evaluation practice must reflect on critical multiplism recognizing the different stories, paradigms, interest, and values that collectively represent the evaluation situation and integrate methods to develop a holistic understanding of a program or problem (Brisolara 1998); and

6. The evaluator (facilitator) shares power with the stakeholders. The evaluator must be willing to acknowledge the ability of stakeholders to conduct the evaluation. The participatory evaluator continuously and critically examines his or her own attitudes, idea, and behavior (Burke 1998).

The following key elements must be included in the PE process to ensure that the above mentioned principles are a part of the methodology: the process must be participatory, with the key stakeholders actively involved in decision making; the process must acknowledge and address inequities of power and voice among participating stakeholders; the process must be
explicitly political; the process should use multiple and varied approaches to codify data; the process should have an action component in order to be useful to the program’s end users; the process should explicitly aim to build capacity, especially evaluation capacity, so that stakeholders can control future evaluation processes; and the process must be educational (Burke 1998).

4.2.6 Implementing a Participatory Evaluation

Participatory evaluation tries to explicitly address several issues: stakeholder participation, evaluation utilization, evaluator role, the objectivity-subjectivity continuum, critical multiplism, and the importance of values within an evaluation. There are no prescribed set of approaches to carrying out PE, the freedom from textbook definition allows stakeholders and program beneficiaries to define for themselves which principles are appropriate (UNDP 1997; Cousins 1998; Moschetti 2007). The following are key moments and decisions in the evaluation process:

1. **Decide if a participatory evaluation approach is appropriate.** Who decides and under what conditions are questions that should be answered at the beginning of the process. If key stakeholders request the evaluation, the evaluator needs to encourage the stakeholders to think about what it is they want to learn from the evaluation. If the request is made by the donor agency, the evaluator should verify that the stakeholders are in agreement with the decision and encourage negotiation about the terms and process of the evaluation between the funder and stakeholders;

2. **Identify who should and wants to be involved.** The relations between evaluators and stakeholders must be changed with an emphasis on power sharing. In addition to the
role of technical expert, an evaluator may assume the role of an educator, learner, facilitator, coordinator, arbitrator, or negotiator;

3. **Collaborate on creating an evaluation plan.** Using a workshop format, the “terms of reference” must be developed to make the decision making process transparent, establish who will do what, address issues of confidentiality and control of data, and emphasize the significance of team ownership of the process (Burke 1998). The evaluation team must finalize their goals and objectives as well as continue to reflect on who wants to know what and why;

4. **Conduct evaluation.** PE adapts data collection strategies to fit the skills and resources of involved participants. Stakeholders define the questions, consider data collection skills, methods, and commitment of time and labor required. Rapid appraisal techniques are often used because they are simple, faster, and less costly than conventional data collection methods (see table 4.7 for rapid appraisal methods);

5. **Gather information.** The external evaluator will need to use his/her technical expertise to determine who will be involved in collecting data and what methods will be used. The choice of data collection methods is influenced by whose interests are emphasized. The chosen methods ought to empower the stakeholder and help them take ownership;

6. **Synthesize and analyze data, build consensus.** Evaluators present the collected data back to participants for verification and collective analysis. Data are verified in workshop settings, reports from group meetings and workshops are transcribed, and triangulated to mention a few;
7. **Prepare an action plan.** During the evaluation process, possible areas for future work are discussed and presented to key stakeholders in a feedback session generating broad action plans. The action plan is prepared to improve program performance;

8. **Controlling and use outcomes and reports.** Participatory evaluation approaches address whether the report was used, how it was used, and for whose benefit. It is essential in the planning phase that stakeholders are precise about how they wish to use the results and what form the report should take (USAID 1996; Zukoski 2002; UNDP 1997; Burke 1998).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.7 Rapid Appraisal Methods Used in Participatory Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Informant Interviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Groups Interviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mini-surveys</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Mapping</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flow Diagrams</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photographs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral Histories and Stories</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Group Interviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Observation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Studies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village Imaging</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USAID 1996; Zukoski 2002
The UNDP designed a participatory handbook, “Who Are the Question-makers?: A Participatory Evaluation Handbook” 1997, to provide examples, tools, and case studies to help put theory into practice. The following framework was identified to be incorporated into UNDP programming to be used by staff. For each phase, there are suggested steps to make the four basic phases participatory (UNDP 1997). Indicators should be identified to measure progress and to assist with the process of collecting data (e.g., simple, measurable, attributable, realistic, time-bound, and objective) (Anatole 2005).

1. Pre-Planning and Preparation
   a. Outline conceptual framework
   b. Define what can and cannot be achieved
   c. Assess constraints and resources
   d. Identify the participatory evaluation facilitator, team members and stakeholders
   e. Negotiate the purpose and objectives

2. Generating Evaluation Questions
   a. Facilitate workshops
   b. Collectively identify the primary focus of the evaluation

3. Data-gathering and Analysis
   a. Provide necessary training
   b. Gather data collectively
   c. Analyze data collectively

4. Reflection and Action
   a. Prioritize questions to be solved or questions to be answered
b. Coordinate resources for resolving problems identified during the evaluation

c. Take collective action

4.2.7 Goals for Increasing Participation in Evaluation

Three primary goals that have been identified by researchers who have studied both domestic and international application of participatory evaluation are: to improve program planning and functioning; to promote learning and to strengthen the capacities of both participants and organizations; and to affect larger policy. Additional goals include increasing the accountability of program administrators; building upon existing community strengths; enhancing self-sufficiency; and understanding social phenomena and program theory (Moschetti 2007). The primary goal of an evaluation establishes which PE approach to apply. As mentioned above, the practical approach focuses on the relevance and utilization of the evaluation outcome while the empowerment approach focus is on values of democracy and self-determination. PE is a time consuming venture that requires the commitment of many. It empowers program providers and beneficiaries to act on knowledge. There are many advantages as well as disadvantages to PE.

4.2.8 Why Conduct a Participatory Evaluation?

Proponents believe that the involvement of stakeholders is more likely to ensure the use of information. “Experience has shown that participatory evaluation improves programs” (USAID 1996). Participatory evaluation offers groups the chance to:

1. Improve program performance. The opportunity exists for stakeholders to reflect and generate knowledge resulting in an action plan. Listening to and involving program
beneficiaries and other stakeholders who can express why a program is or is not working is significant to making improvements (USAID 1996; Zukoski 2002). Including various stakeholders achieves a more well-rounded perspective of the program/project (Campilan 2000).

2. **Examine relevant issues.** The evaluation seeks to accommodate the diverse interest of those involved (Campilan 2000). Relevant issues are examined by involving key stakeholders who determine the evaluation questions that will affect and improve their work (USAID 1996; Zukoski 2002).

3. **Empower participants.** As a bottom-up approach to evaluation, local people control and take ownership and sharing of responsibilities in the evaluation process. Participating in an evaluation from start to finish gives participants mostly affected more control over decision making which builds confidence and pride in the community (USAID 1996; Zukoski 2002). Participants also recognize how ethically sound the evaluation is (Campilan 2000).

4. **Build capacity.** PE promotes participant learning which can result in new knowledge and a better understanding of other stakeholders’ point of view. The new or enhanced evaluation skills provide participants with tools to advocate for policy change to transform their environments (USAID 1996; Zukoski 2002).

5. **Develop leaders and build teams/Mobilize stakeholders, enhance teamwork, and build shared commitment.** Through collaborative inquiry, stakeholders are mobilized; teamwork is enhanced while building a share commitment. Acknowledging local leadership skills, a range of stakeholders are engaged in leading different parts of the
process which can lead to “stronger, more organized groups, strengthening the community’s resources and networks (Zukoski 2002).”

6. **Sustain organizational learning and growth.** As a learning process, PE allows participants to gain knowledge together to take corrective actions to improve programs. There is a broader base of knowledge, expertise, and resources. Techniques and skills acquired can lead to self-sustained action which can be applied to other programs and projects as well (USAID 1996; Zukoski 2002).

4.2.9 What are the challenges?

1. **Time and commitment.** A participatory approach requires considerable time and commitment to identify and engage a wide array of stakeholders. It can be challenging to participants as it takes them away from ongoing activities (USAID 1996; Zukoski 2002; UNDP 1997).

2. **Resources.** Since the process requires investment in evaluation training for participants, it is important to allocate funds and resources realistically (USAID 1996; Zukoski 2002; UNDP 1997).

3. **Conflict.** Conflict can hinder teamwork which is required for PE. Because PE involves stakeholders with an array of experience and from diverse backgrounds, conflict resolution processes should be established. “Conflict can arise because of cultural, language, class and other differences that exist among and within groups” (Zukoski 2002).

4. **Reliability and validity.** The process may be viewed as less objective because an array of stakeholders with a vested interest participate (USAID 1996; Zukoski 2002).
The following table highlights some of the advantages and disadvantages of participatory approaches to evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May be less expensive than hiring an external evaluator</td>
<td>Require considerable time and resources to identify and involve a wide array of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives participants more control over decision-making</td>
<td>Demands more coordination and is often more challenging to facilitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants feel responsible for the results and are more committed to the success of the program</td>
<td>Requires investment in evaluation training for participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative process builds and strengthens participants’ relationships</td>
<td>Requires committed and motivated participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine relevant issues by involving key players in evaluating design</td>
<td>Staff turnover at inopportune time would be very disruptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote participants’ learning about the program and its performance and enhance their understanding of other stakeholders’ points of view</td>
<td>May be viewed as less objective because program staff, customers, and other stakeholders with possible vested interest participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve participants’ evaluation skills</td>
<td>Less useful in addressing highly technical aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilize stakeholders, enhance teamwork, and build shared commitment to act on evaluation recommendations</td>
<td>Take participating staff away from ongoing activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase likelihood that evaluation information will be used to improve performance</td>
<td>May be dominated and misused by some stakeholders to further their own interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Zukoski 2002; USAID 1996)

4.3 Current Housing Program Evaluation

Typically in housing evaluations, the kinds of questions asked and the measures used have had a quantitative focus. The criteria presently used to evaluate the public housing program and other multifamily subsidize housing programs derived from the types of questions
asked in evaluations conducted during the 1970s and 1980s (Bratt 1989). The following are

some of the most frequently asked questions in evaluations performed in the 1970s and 1980s:

1. How much does the program cost the federal government in both direct and indirect
   expenditures, per subsidized household?
2. What percentage of the eligible population has been served?
3. What percentage of the subsidy dollars is channeled to those who are in the greatest
   need, as opposed to households with lesser need or to administrative costs?
4. How has the program been administered in terms of adequacy of underwriting,
   processing applications, and so on?
5. What is the racial composition of program participants, and how does the program
   influence patterns of racial segregation?
6. Within the privately owned subsidized stock, what is the rate of default and
   foreclosure?
7. What percentage of the subsidized stock is in need of repairs, and how much would it
   cost to bring the entire stock up to certain specified standards?
8. How do benefits to tenants compare to costs borne by the public sector?
9. What impact have the subsidy programs had on employment and local property taxes?
10. What impact do housing programs that intervene in private market operations, such as
    rent control, have on various kinds of housing market activity, such as rent control, such
    as rates of abandonment and levels of investment?

Following is a set of housing criteria that has been adapted to assess the public housing
program:

1. Characteristics of tenants and tenant perceptions
2. Physical characteristics, condition, and design of developments
3. Management of developments
4. Accessibility of developments
5. Impact on racial integration
6. Costs to the federal government  
7. Financial viability of developments  
8. Ability to accommodate the neediest households

While these questions are excellent for providing quantitative outcomes, they do not capture the dynamics of how the neighborhood residents are affected by change.

4.4 Case Studies

Participatory evaluation concepts and methods are being applied in just about every sector (e.g., agriculture, forestry, natural resource management, community development, organizational development and local governance). The approach is being used for institutional accountability, organizational development, and for strengthening processes of democratic participation. Until recently, there has been little documentation and analysis about PE in program development. PE is less common and not widely promoted in the U.S. particularly in the context of government programs or initiatives (Cousins 1998) thus case studies from different countries are explored to gain an understanding of how PE works in practice, its dynamics and impacts, successes and failures. An effort is made to use five case studies that illustrate the guiding principles and key moments for participatory evaluation identified in the literature review. Through the following case studies, we are able to understand the PE process through various practitioners’ different perspectives, contexts, and settings. Some of the case studies illustrate the PE process at a local community level, while others such as the Empowerment Zone case study show that PE can be used on a larger scale with governments, institutions, and donors. All case studies are arranged to state the issue, the PE strategy, and the results.
Strengthening Citizen Participation and Democratization in the Philippines: ELF’s Impact

Evaluation 1997

Roy V. Abes

The Issue

The Education For Life Foundation (ELF) is a non-governmental organization that works to strengthen grassroots organization to encourage greater citizen participation and democratization to increase local government accountability to community needs. ELF’s main project is the Philippine-Danish Folkschool (Paaralang Bayan) which has a focus on democracy and local governance, agrarian and asset reform, sustainable development, gender equality, and environmental protection. The main components of the program that supports leadership include life history workshops; general leadership courses (GLC); special leadership courses; short courses on specific needs identified by the community; and a new distance educational program. ELF also supports an economics program and established a research and evaluation program (REP). The REP was established to develop participatory evaluation methodologies and to strengthen research skills of leader graduates so that they can become researchers and learn from their communities.

The case study focuses on the process of designing the participatory impact evaluation during the first year including the methodology and data gathering tools; and the development of indicators to use for subsequent evaluations. During the informal evaluation and two systematic evaluations, there were no baseline information thus ELF could not compare reflections of progress from leader graduates to community leaders who did not attend ELF’s
leadership courses to determine if the leader graduates made a difference to their organizations and communities. Thus an evaluation needed to be developed which established baseline data and comparison areas as well as develop research skills of leader graduates so that they would have a key role in subsequent evaluations.

ELF evaluated its program both as a learning tool for participants and as a means to identify if trainings were appropriate and addressed their needs. Early informal evaluations lacked systematic measurements. Early efforts to evaluate the program consisted of group reflections immediately after training, during staff visits or reunions, and through anecdotes describing the positive impacts and how they influenced leader graduates. From the informal evaluations, ELF could not gauge if the impacts were widespread, valid, and representative.

**Strategy**

1. Initiated a three year longitudinal impact evaluation from 1995 to 1998.
2. Build leadership capabilities through involving leader graduates.
3. Involved other stakeholders including ELF staff, Philippine Psychological Research and Training House (PPRTH), community leaders who did not participate in any ELF courses.
4. Planning and training of leader-researchers to design the PE process.
5. Select comparison groups. Selected 24 leader graduates and their communities and 24 community leaders who did not attend any of the courses. Seven groups total participated in the evaluation process (ELF, PPRTH, leader researchers, leader graduates, leader graduates communities, non-leader graduates, communities of non-leader graduates).
6. Selected criteria for evaluating ELF’s leadership training program.
7. Received training on participatory principles and Sikolohiyang Pilipino (SP) as well as the participatory methodology to be used during the evaluation.

8. Linked data gathering to Filipino psychology. Three techniques were used: Pagtatanong-tanong (asking questions); Ginabayang talakayn (GT) (guided discussion usually about eight people); and Pakikipagkuwentuhan (story-telling).

9. Data collection and analysis. Leader researchers had to discuss and reach consensus on the findings.

10. Data validation. After collecting data, community meetings were held in both leader graduate communities and communities with no ELF training. Clustered data from pagtatatanong-tanong, pakikipagkuwentuhan, and ginabayang talakayan were presented to the community for validation. Community members determined if the clustered information and indicators adequately reflected their realities and perspectives.

11. Report writing and sharing. Compare findings to the indicators and baseline data that were established in the first year of the project.

Results

The PE process was regarded as training and capacity building for leader graduates. Leader graduates were provided a theoretical background on evaluation research. They were involved in planning, design, and implementation; hands on training included understanding SP methods, qualitative data gathering, documentation, and analysis. This training provided them the opportunity to discuss taboo issues such as democracy and gender. As a result of ELF working closely with PPRTH to select the sample size, leader-researchers, indicators to be
monitored, data gathering methods, and baseline data, lessons and findings have been shared by ELF and leader researchers at an annual Conference on Grassroots Leadership sponsored by ELF and its partners (NGOs, POs and academia). The information was used as part of their community profile and as learning material for improving leadership.

Leader researchers viewed their new competencies as contributing to their development as individuals and as leaders of their organizations and communities. Training enabled leader researchers to easily integrate into new communities allowing them to understand the issues, concerns, and opinions of community members. Future plans included minimizing constraints on data collection by providing training for leader researchers on facilitation, small group discussion, and an exercise on writing, summarizing, and synthesis.

**Scaling Up: Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation of a Federal Empowerment Program** 1998

*John Gaeta, Victoria Creed, Janice Morrissey*

**Issue**

Established by the Clinton Administration, the rural Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Communities (EZ/EC) program was signed into law August 10, 1993 authorizing tax incentives and block grants to revitalize 104 distressed urban and rural communities. This comprehensive program key element was community participation that would foster continuous learning and improvement. As a community development initiative, responsibility was devolved to local communities to develop their own strategic vision with a focus on economic opportunity, sustainable development, and community-based partnerships gaining skills to improve implementation in the community.
Tennessee’s Community Partnership Center (CPC) was approached by several communities seeking assistance in strategic planning and application process. The CPC was asked by an official in Washington to submit a proposal to pilot new approaches to document and evaluate the rural part of the EZ/EC program that would be consistent with its participatory, bottom-up principles. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Ford Foundation collaborated to provide financial support to establish the CPC Learning Initiative in early 1996 to pilot a participatory evaluation (PE) approach in ten rural EZ/EC sites. It was evident from the beginning that evaluation of the program would present numerous challenges. The thirty-three communities scattered across poor rural areas in the United States were extremely diverse and was reflected in their strategic planning process.

In order to receive funding, designated communities were required by Washington to develop and negotiate measureable benchmarks. Many of the goals for community revitalization were social and qualitative in nature including empowerment, capacity building, participation, and cultural pride. Communities and technical staff were challenged to develop a systematic, community-driven process for local documentation and learning. The new approach would need to recognize the diverse contexts and goals of each community; the intangible and non-quantifiable nature of many of the goals; and the difficulties of using standardized, traditional indicators to track the program. On a national level, some officials responsible for the program implementation did not support a participatory approach. They were interested in a traditional evaluation design that would measure tangible outputs such as jobs and infrastructure; and needed outcomes that proved evidence of accountability to obtain additional program funds. The participatory evaluation approach represented the grassroots
empowerment and participation elements of the EZ/EC program while others believed that the participatory methodology would not provide effective information to be awarded additional funding from Congress. Important outcomes are learning and capacity building.

Strategy

1. CPC Learning Initiative regional researchers and citizen learning teams conducted site visits at ten rural EZ/EC sites to gather baseline data and to develop an evaluation plan. Citizens learning teams were led by a local coordinator and consisted of five to twenty-five local people representing a wide array of stakeholders (residents, local EZ/EC board members, and other community organizations).

2. Followed a ten month process known as the Learning Wheel facilitated by regional researchers:
   a. Defining indicators of success for one or more goals
   b. Measuring and monitoring to document results
   c. Analyzing the results
   d. Deciding how to take action for continuous improvement

3. Provided training and capacity building activities for local coordinators, learning teams, and regional researchers.

4. Conducted workshops that provided local coordinators and regional researchers with materials on participatory monitoring and evaluation, popular research methods, and community-based indicators.
5. Local volunteers selected goals and indicators, decided on tools and sources of data, gathered new information, developed lessons and findings and communicated them to local, state, and national decision-making bodies.

6. Used various data gathering tools included interviews, focus groups, reviews of public documents, content analysis, media analyses, questionnaires, mapping, personal observations, windshield surveys, oral histories, educational test scores, and informal communications.

7. Established an EZ/EC roundtable for learning teams to visit Washington and share their findings with officials in the USDA, the President’s Community Empowerment Board, and others involved in the program.

Results

The research was a significant accomplishment for many of the teams in reference to providing documentation on and assessment of the EZ/EC program. The learning team model encourages citizens to participate in decision making and gives a voice to those who normally would not be involved in the community’s development. The Learning Wheel was a complex, interactive process that teams had to make adjustments in order to fit their context. This process informed citizens that they can hold their leaders and institutions accountable through citizen participation. As a result of this experience, members developed confidence and skills and became involved in other public roles in the community.

Citizen participation contributed to the program’s goal of strengthening partnership and local empowerment. Deciding who participates. The differences between beneficiary participants and stakeholder participation were recognized, and the challenge of combining the
two was highlighted. It was acknowledged that involving local citizens in the process meant excluding or not actively including a stakeholder could make it difficult to gain their support for the process as well as create an atmosphere of distrust. Who the participants are will affect the priority of objectives. Deciding what to measure can be change by changing who is involved in the evaluation process as well as alter priorities.

PE is a social and political process. Almost every phase required team building, negotiation, conflict resolution, stakeholder involvement, facilitation and group leadership skills. Some participants on the learning teams felt that they needed more time and support for the process to reveal itself. To build sustainability, a PE process requires long-term commitment and sensitivity from funders and technical assistance providers. An indicator of sustainability from this project was the application of the model by a team member who adapted it to the state’s welfare reform strategy and students who formed a learning team to evaluate the performance of their high school.

Active learning for active citizenship: participatory approaches to promote citizen participation in England 2008

Marjorie Mayo and Alison Rooke

The Issue

Active learning for active citizenship (ALAC) was established in 2004 as a community education program that used community development principles to promote participation, active citizenship, and empowerment. This was a government program that operated within the realm of voluntary and community sectors. Networks of organizations and agencies worked
in partnership with community education providers in universities and the Workers Education Association. Seven hubs were formed across different English regions to address learning requirements such as those of women, ethnic minority communities, migrant agricultural workers, refugees and asylum seekers, faith communities, and people with disabilities and careers. The forms and levels of learning programs were diverse but shared a set of common principles. Building upon people’s existing knowledge and skills, learning was determined by people’s own priorities and needs. ALAC intended to facilitate reflective self-evaluations, to share the knowledge within and among the hubs.

**Strategy**

1. Build relationships of trust with hubs.
2. Series of visits to the hubs.
3. Conducted workshops, seminars, and conferences to bring community participants and learning-providers together allowing them to reflect upon their experiences and to share reflections to influence policies and practices.
4. Devised a strategy and evaluation framework.
5. Subsequent follow-ups included written records, use of photographs using participative tools, and video recordings.

**Results**

Individuals and groups increased their participation and were more effective in grassroots community activities and within governance structures, new forums, and partnerships. Active citizenship learning occurred through facilitated workshops and participation in activities. Participants learned strategic approaches that allowed them to
address context specific barriers. There was an increase in community dialogue and awareness about local services and how to access them.

Governmental officials were supportive but required traditional indicators to demonstrate the value of the program in order to convince politicians to award funds to ALAC. There was evidence of reduced tensions among different communities in some areas and evidence of increased social cohesion (solidarity). Participants agreed that a participatory approach was the most appropriate strategy for monitoring and evaluation.

A Case Study of Participatory Evaluation in Haiti 1997
Francoise P. Coupal, Marie Simoneau

Issue

Since Haiti declared its independence in 1804, it has been ruled by military leaders and merchant oligarchy. Majority of Haitians have been excluded from participating in the development of their country. Their lives were greatly influenced by favoritism, corruption, arbitrariness, violence, and repression. Subsequent to the first democratic election in 1990, nongovernment organizations (NGOs) and grassroots organizations started to rebuild Haitian civil society and implement development programs. During this period of political instability and repression, Haitians were faced with relentless economic, social, and political problems which the state had minimal power to address. The Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC) established the Canada-Haiti Humanitarian Alliance Fund in 1993 as a mechanism to support the efforts of local NGOs within civil society.
In addition to accountability, the CCIC wanted to conduct an evaluation that would build capacity among Haitian and Canadian NGOs by teaching local stakeholders participatory approaches and methodology. This learning process would enable CCIC to explore the project while assessing the efficiency and the impacts of the fund. While planning the participatory evaluation, the CCIC was faced with many challenges including limited time and resources, coordination of more than thirty-six projects, availability of NGOs, timelines of projects, cultural and language barriers, and lack of familiarity with participatory methods.

**Strategy**

Four phases were identified consisting of planning, training, visiting project sites and collectively reflecting on and disseminating the findings. During phase one, the planning mission, exercises were conducted to demystify the process in order to guarantee early buy-in and interested commitment to the evaluation. Participant training took place in phase II. Exercises were designed to stimulate learning about concepts and tools or PE; how attitudes and behaviors can have an adverse effect on others; to make participants aware of social dynamics and class differences. Exercises combined with community visits equipped participants with the required knowledge and experience to become PE facilitators. In phase III, the PE facilitators were divided into teams of three to five persons. They visited fifteen projects within a two-week period to explore evaluation issues. Collective reflection and dissemination was the final phase. As a major source of exchange, each team summarized key findings and integrated maps into a written report. Also, each team made a presentation of learning experiences to the larger group of PE facilitators. Following the smaller presentations, a final presentation was organized for PE facilitators to present their findings to all of the
program partners. Presenters used drawings, maps, project evaluations, role playing, and testimonial of their experiences.

1. Held a planning meeting with directors or program staff of thirty-six NGOs and several community representatives to discuss time lines and level of commitment to be expected.

2. Divided participants into small groups and asked them to discuss and draw pictures of their experiences of evaluation. This exercise was conducted to identify an evaluation preference.

3. Selected projects by pulling names from a hat.

4. Using Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) (also known as Participatory Learning and Action (PLA), twenty-eight participants were trained to be “PE facilitators”.

5. Summarized key findings and integrated maps and drawing to generate a written report.

6. Presentation of findings to community stakeholders, PE facilitators and program partners.

Results

It was revealed that participatory approaches are a viable alternative to traditional approaches. Successful projects integrated participation throughout the project cycle while projects without participation had limited impact. After the increased awareness of the constraints that poor community members faced, capacity was built as community members were engaged in the process and able to use the tools effectively. Over ten thousand persons benefited from the Fund’s program.
The major concerns included time and cost. Behaviors and attitudes changed as a result of the process. Towards the end of the process, PE facilitators realized that community members had the potential and capacity to use PE tools effectively. This experience changed the way the PE facilitators viewed development and demonstrated that an evaluation does not require an external technical expert. Skilled practitioners can train others in the use and application of participatory methods to evaluations. A network was created among different NGOs to continue participatory methods, to share information, exchange future experiences, to support and encourage one another, and to share knowledge with other organizations. They learned the importance of gaining trust and establishing rapport prior to asking questions and introducing tools. Several of the facilitators have integrated the PE concept and tools into their daily work with organizations and communities.

A Case Study of a Community-Based Participatory Evaluation Research (CBPER) Project: Reflections on Promising Practices and Shortcomings 2009

Jini uma, Laurie Bennett, Nick Cutforth, Christ Tombari, and Paul Stein

The Issue

Community-based research (CBR) is a collaborative research process which engages faculty members, students, and community members in projects that address needs identified by the community. This case study seeks to contribute to the dialogue that a participatory evaluation model is a viable vehicle to conduct community-based research to assess the effectiveness of program services. Participatory evaluation model can be used as a vehicle to guide community organizations through the evaluation process. The case study sought to
address the following questions: first, what worked and what did not with this community-based participatory evaluation research project (CBPER) project, second, what lessons can be learned from a promising but imperfect experience, and third, does WorkStyles impact short-term employment outcomes for refugees. Collaborating with other stakeholders to conduct this study, provides more comprehensive insight to inform better practices and dialogue to advance the theoretical and methodological understanding of CBR including the use of participatory evaluation. A multiple outcome, mixed method project was designed to answer the questions of the funder and lead community partner.

The Spring Institute for Intercultural Learning WorkStyles program is a two-week pre-employment class for newly arrived refugees designed to help individuals obtain, retain, and become successful in employment. The Colorado Refugee Services Program (CRSP), which is the main funder of WorkStyles, commissioned and funded the evaluation study. The main goal of CRSP is to rapidly move refugees to self-sufficiency effectively. The purpose of the study is to evaluate the impact of the WorkStyles program upon the short-term employment of its graduates. Collectively, the Colorado Community Based Research Network (CCBRN), the director of the CRSP, staff members of WorkStyles, refugees, and community partners conducted the evaluation.

**Strategy**

1. Research initiated with CRSP and the Spring Institute/WorkStyles to figure out if their mission is successful and what measures of success they could use. CRSP developed relationships with the university, volunteer agencies, WorkStyles, and community partners.
2. All recognized partners were involved in the planning process. Series of initial meetings to determine research questions, measures, and methods in consideration of CRSP, Spring Institute/WorkStyles and the university CCBRN needs.

3. Established realistic goals and clear expectations. Designed a quasi-experimental study to meet the needs of CRSP for quantitative data to understand WorkStyles’ success/failure. To capture non-quantifiable successes, a qualitative dimension was introduced to the project design.

4. Observed WorkStyles training sessions with refugees; conducted interviews with representatives from volunteer agencies who referred refugees to the program; established two comparison focus groups of refugees and a final focus group of the WorkStyles trainers.

5. For the quantitative matched-control group study, WorkStyles staff compiled descriptive data for the three WorkStyles classes studied. Volunteer agencies staff provided similar data for non-WorkStyles participants. The data was analyzed by the lead quantitative doctoral student.

6. For the qualitative part of the study, the following in-depth data was collected: 20 hours of observation of two WorkStyles program sessions; interviews of volunteer agencies representatives; focus groups of WorkStyles and non-WorkStyles refugees; and a focus group of WorkStyles trainers. The data was thematically analyzed by the lead qualitative doctoral student.

7. Interpreted and verified findings. Quantitative and qualitative results were shared with WorkStyles staff. Both the lead quantitative and qualitative doctoral students drafted
separate reports of their findings that was combined into a single report and shared with WorkStyles staff and two lead researchers for verification. Findings were verified for accuracy, feasibility of recommendations verified, incorporated any final information that was gleaned about the program.

8. Final report was disseminated to the funder with both the quantitative and qualitative studies. A meeting was held with all stakeholders to discuss findings and how they might be utilized.

Results

The project outcomes/impacts were viewed as successful. All partners benefited from the project. The project yielded results that worked and did not work. Despite challenges, a participatory evaluation was thought to be a viable CBR vehicles to help community service providers assess the effectiveness of their program. The combined qualitative and quantitative reports created a comprehensive report detailing an accurate picture of the program. Quantitative results revealed that there were no statistical differences between the WorkStyles group and the control group in short-term employment outcomes. A longer study time frame was needed and funding for the program may be inappropriate. Qualitative results revealed there was a strong need for the program.

With participatory evaluation approaches, early active participation by all partners in all phases is important and most likely to yield a more robust and meaningful process. The choice of community partners influenced the success of the program. Each partner was truly invested in this project and remained motivated until the project was completed.
What did not work included a restricted timeframe, limited financial resources, insufficient focus on program theory during the planning phase, and the team failed to anticipate barriers for focus groups to participate.

Through the use of participatory evaluation, participants in each case study were empowered to obtain the qualitative information they were seeking as well as build capacity in their communities. As discussed in the literature review, PE has various challenges which the participants experienced such as time constraints and cost. Lessons that I learned from the case studies are to consider a program’s theoretical model before embarking on the evaluation to ensure the collected data is relevant and worthwhile; the use of a mixed method design can maximize information gleaned from a project; encourage every stakeholder to state their goals/expectations in the beginning; an evaluation workshop should be conducted to introduce participants to the basic concepts of participatory evaluation; and a meeting should be held to discuss the utilization of findings and how the information will be disseminated.

4.5 Chapter Conclusion

Providing public housing for low- to moderate-income households has been a challenge. The HOPE VI program differs from earlier public housing programs. HOPE VI is intended to transform public housing sites into healthy communities and reduce concentrated poverty while moving residents to self-sufficiency. In 2000, Notice of Funding Availability mandated that HOPE VI grantees hire an external evaluator and demonstrate attainment of HOPE VI goals and objectives. HUD did not offer guidance to HOPE VI grantees concerning questions to ask or how to form or focus an evaluation. Participatory evaluation is an approach that can be applied to neighborhood development initiatives such as HOPE VI.
Because of the growing acknowledgment that monitoring and evaluation should be participatory in development and community based-initiatives, a new school of thought has gradually evolved which recognizes the importance of including beneficiaries and major stakeholders. Participatory evaluation has emerged as a dynamic educational process through which beneficiaries and major stakeholders produce action-oriented knowledge about their reality, clarify and articulate their norms and values, and reach consensus about further action. PE in the U.S. is becoming common with the growing awareness of participation and benefits such as empowerment and capacity building. Local capacities can be strengthened through the acquired skills of decision making, planning, and problem solving. As a collaborative evaluation, participatory evaluation is reflective, action-oriented, and seeks to build capacity.

All of the cases reviewed involved project level staff and beneficiaries in implementing PE while some engaged stakeholders at all institutional levels including funders and policy makers. Experience in various countries illustrate that information that cannot be achieved with conventional methods can be obtained through the use of participatory methodology describe in each case study. The case studies demonstrate how different stakeholders have applied PE to varying purposes and contexts. In each case study, there was an expressed interest to learn from the process and learn how the programs/projects impacted beneficiaries. In each case study, the emphasis is on who is evaluating and how diverse concerns and interests were negotiated and represented. The case studies indicate the range of diversity in PE methodology. There is no single definition or methodology for participatory evaluation. Using PE as a learning process, the case studies demonstrated how PE can be used as a tool for capacity building, empowerment, conflict negotiation, accountability and governance.
In this chapter, the framework for planning and conducting a participatory evaluation is presented. The PE methodology consists of four steps and several intermediary steps. City West HOPE VI site, in Cincinnati’s West End neighborhood, will be used to demonstrate the application of a participatory evaluation. In this hypothetical application, I will try to demonstrate whose reality counts and who counts reality during a participatory evaluation.
process. I will briefly describe the socio-economic demographics of the West End and conclude with a discussion of the participatory evaluation phases and intermediary steps from start to finish.

5.1 The West End Neighborhood

A predominantly African American neighborhood, the West End is located off I-75, north-west of the Cincinnati downtown business district, east of Queensgate, west of Over-the-Rhine, and southeast of Fairview (Department of Community Development and Planning 2002). The West End is bounded by Central Avenue on the east, the Mill Creek to the west, Bank Street to the north, and the Ohio River at the south (Giglierano 1988). Within one mile walking distance of Cincinnati’s central business district and city government, the West End residential community is mainly a public housing market with both scattered site and project based units (Community Design & Development Center 1998). Furthermore, it is the home to the recently built HOPE VI development, City West, which is the city’s largest housing development project since World War II (CMHA 2001).
Once a vibrant, thriving community, the West End suffered from neglect and disinvestment and was eventually designated as a blighted area. The West End began as an upper working class neighborhood and evolved into a neighborhood plagued by poverty, high crime, drugs, as well as suffered from physical, social and economic decay. The decline of the neighborhood began with the exodus of the upper and middle class followed by industries (e.g., retailers, businesses). There has been a steady decrease in population. As of 2007, African Americans were 87 percent (DCDP 2004) of the 6,331 residents (Social Compact 2007). In 2007,
45.4 percent of the neighborhood population lived below the poverty level with a median income of $17,037 compared to the city’s 21.9 percent poverty rate and $39,893 median income (Social Compact 2007). The declining population is illustrated in the population by sex and age breakdown tables in appendix A. Through the years, several urban renewal programs have tried to eradicate the social ills of the West End including Queensgate I and II, the Mill Creek Expressway (I-75), and residential developments (e.g., Park Town, Richmond Village, and Stanley Rowe Towers).

### 5.1.1 West End History and Urban Renewal Efforts

After the establishment of Cincinnati in the 1790s, the West End was one of the first sites for neighborhood development. The area was penetrated by residential and industrial development (e.g., slaughter houses, factories). As the West End developed, the community became densely populated as it attracted residents from diverse ethnic and economic backgrounds (Giglierano 1988). As Blacks established the lower West End as a black community, the Jewish population settled in the areas to the north and west. The increase in population and establishment of additional developments (e.g., residential, commercial, warehouses, hotels, railroad tracks, and terminals) in the West End reduced the aesthetics of the community (Davis 1991). Most middle-income families left the area while a few working-class families remained (Giglierano 1988; Davis 1991). By the late nineteenth century, the West End was plagued by factories and deteriorated, overcrowded housing built too closely together. By 1925, the West End had become Cincinnati’s largest and poorest slum (Giglierano 1988) and home to 85 percent of the City’s 38,000 African American population (Giglierano 1988; Davis 1991; Cincinnati Historic Society).
Through the years, there have been several attempts to improve living conditions, clear out tenements and old factories in the West End. Early efforts to improve living conditions and to address social problems were employed by philanthropist who contributed time and charitable donations to benevolent institutions such as housing settlements and the milk fund (Giglierano 1988). During the early 1920s, city officials made the correlation between population density, poor health and sanitation, and high crime rates. City officials looked towards urban renewal projects to improve the West End. The 1925 Official Master Plan of Cincinnati, “the first officially adopted by any city in the United States the size of Cincinnati or larger”, sought to address these concerns through physical development focusing on beautification and application of zoning ordinances and building regulations to increase the public health, safety, prosperity, and general welfare (City Planning Commission 1925). Early projects included the construction of Union Terminal, completed in 1933, and the creation of the West End Playground at Gest and Dalton streets (Giglierano 1988).

Cincinnati was an early target of the Roosevelt’s Administration Public Works Administration (PWA). In 1933, the Basin District Redevelopment Plan was instituted to demolish 145 blocks and replace them with sixteen superblocks low-cost housing units (Giglierano 1988; Davis 1991). The city used federal funds to build Laurel Homes which was Cincinnati’s first and largest public housing project (Giglierano 1988). Completed in 1938, the housing project was the second largest housing project in the United States built by the PWA. Laurel Homes consisted of 27 buildings, three and four stories tall with a total of 1,039 units. Initially, African Americans were excluded from the housing development. A bitter protest led
to the building of an additional 264 units exclusively for African Americans. In 1942, Lincoln Court, exclusively for African Americans, was completed with 1,015 units (Giglierano 1988).

As a framework for future developments, the Cincinnati Metropolitan Master Plan 1948, the nation’s first metropolitan master plan, sought to address planning problems on a regional scale in Hamilton County in Ohio and Kenton County and Campbell County in Kentucky. Acknowledging outward expansion (suburbanization), the plan called for industrial and low density residential developments and an expressway (City Planning Commission 1948). The framework of the plan introduced separated land use (e.g., residential, commercial, public services) and emphasized isolated locations for each land use. As a result of the plan, the West End was designated as “deteriorated area” in need of redevelopment which was defined by the plan as “complete demolition of buildings and restoration of the cleared land to the market” (City Planning Commission 1948).

Proposed in the 1948 Cincinnati Metropolitan Master Plan, the Mill Creek Highway (Interstate-75) corridor, which would act as a buffer between residential and commercial areas, was close to realization. As the first Cincinnati urban renewal project, Mill Creek Highway split the West End into two sections, displaced a substantial portion of the population, and eliminated/razed around 31,000 housing units (Davis 1991).

Following the construction of Interstate-75, Laurel – 3 (later known as Park Town) and Richmond (later known as Richmond Village) housing projects were developed with partial funding from the federal government and private developers (Giglierano 1988). Each housing project consisted of 323 units.
The urban renewal projects in the late 1950s, Queensgate I and II, demolished houses and businesses in lower West End as part of slum clearance efforts (CDDC 1998). Queensgate I, 296 acres, 13 superblocks was envisioned for commercial and industrial land use. The large industrial park located south of I-75 would be dedicated to light industries, warehouses, and services. Queensgate II, located north of I-75 was planned as a mixed-use area including residential use. The area (Queensgate I and II) was home to 10,000 families, 500 businesses, missions, and churches (Davis 1991). Urban renewal projects from the 1950s to 1970s, further exacerbated the decline of the neighborhood contributing to the elimination of housing stock, razing of half of the housing acreages (Davis 1991), and a decrease in population which led to the relocation of low-income residents to other neighborhoods, most of them African Americans (Jenkins 1982).

Like other older cities, the downward demographic trends experienced by Cincinnati during the 1980s resulting in “overall population decline, increase in minority and low-income population, loss of jobs to outlying suburban areas, and an increase in female head of households with children (HUD 1995).” The Cincinnati Consolidated Plan strategy was to reduce poverty, improve housing units, increase commercial development and expansion, create jobs, and attract and retain businesses. The one year action plan outlined activities and programs funded under the 1995 Community Development Block Grant, the Emergency Shelter Grant and the HOME Investment Partnership Programs in addition to program funding (HUD 1995). Seven programs were targeted in the West End including Betts Longworth Revitalization, Cincinnati Ballet Public Improvements, Dominican Community Services
The West End Comprehensive Plan and the West End Urban Design Plan recommended strategies to stimulate growth through improving the neighborhood image, job creation, business development and retention efforts, housing options, improving public services and safety, improving quality of life for residents, and neighborhood redevelopment while preserving the urban character.

In 1999, the West End was designated as a blighted area and qualified as an Urban Renewal area under chapter 725 of the City’s Municipal Code (CDDC 1998). It was determined that the aid of the City through Urban Renewal legislation would be required to revitalize the community. The West End Urban Design plan was adopted by the Cincinnati City Council in November 2001. The plan supported the transformation of the Lincoln Courts and Laurel Homes projects into a HOPE VI mixed-income site (DCDP 2002). The plan looked at existing conditions, such as land use and zoning, to propose revitalization strategies for the blighted area.

The West End Comprehensive Plan was established to present redevelopment issues and concerns and to act as a guide for implementation of redevelopment as a result of the community’s vision. The comprehensive plan was a community partnership between the West End Community Council, key stakeholder (e.g., residents, businesses, property owners), City Staff, and Menelaos Triantafilou, University of Cincinnati professor and private consultant, to establish goals, objectives and strategies (City of Cincinnati 2003).
5.2 City West

Figure 5.3 City West Site Map

Source: CAGIS 2000
Like other major metropolitan cities, Cincinnati’s public housing projects and surrounding areas have suffered from physical, social and economic decay. Since the 1930s, the City of Cincinnati has made several attempts to revitalize the West End neighborhood using a variety of strategies. A new construction housing strategy has been adopted to demographically and physically transform the West End into a less dense residential community, de-concentrate poverty and promote economic growth. Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority was awarded a HOPE VI grant of $31 million in 1998 and a $35 million HOPE VI grant in 1999 to transform the Lincoln Court and Laurel Homes projects and surrounding area into a vibrant mixed-income community (Source CMHA 2001, DCDP 2002, TCB, Inc. 2008). The HOPE VI development was a financial partnership between the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority, the Community Builders (TCB), the City of Cincinnati, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (see table 5.1 for funding information). In addition to the grants received from HUD, the City of Cincinnati contributed $15 million in infrastructure and leveraged $150 million in other sources of financing (DCDP 2004).

Table 5.1 City West Funding

| Source: Department of Community Development and Planning 2004 |
City West incorporated New Urbanist principles into its design to create a pedestrian oriented development with human scale streets allowing the community to reconnect to the surrounding neighborhood as well as the central business district. City West has received numerous awards for its use of New Urbanism (The Community Builders, Inc. 2008). City West consists of 1,085 townhomes where 250 are homeownership units and the remainder are market rate units and public housing units (DCDP 2004).

Commercial Retail Space

A goal of HOPE VI developments is to attract new households as well as tenants for commercial retail space. Commercial space is on the first floor of loft style units along the Linn Street retail corridor. City West has not been successful in this component of the project. Commercial units, 20,000 square feet, suffer from a high vacancy rate.

Community Image/Safety

The West End suffers from a poor image. The West End and surrounding neighborhoods are widely perceived as high crime areas. The crime data below indicates that crime has
decreased in the West End within a 10 year span. Statistics are not available to indicate if the City West development has influenced the decrease in criminal activity.

Table 5.2 Crime Data (1999 – 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Part 1 Crimes</th>
<th>Aggravated Assault</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Homicides</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Thefts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Byers, Paul Cincinnati Police Dept February 2, 2010

5.3 Participatory Evaluation Framework

As discussed in section 5.1, the West End residential community is mainly a public housing market with both scattered site and project based units. The West End began as an upper working class neighborhood and evolved into a neighborhood plagued by poverty, high crime, drugs, as well as suffered from out migration, neglect, disinvestment, and physical, social and economic decay. Urban revitalization efforts are initiated through government programs such as HOPE VI. Through the years, several urban renewal programs have tried to eradicate
the social ills of the West End. City West housing development was conceived with the idea of being a catalyst for revitalization. In 2007, 45.4 percent of the neighborhood population lived below the poverty level with a median income of $17,037 compared to the city’s 21.9 percent poverty rate and $39,893 median income (Department of Community Development and Planning 2002). According to the 2000 census, less than 2,165 residents have less than a high school diploma.

HOPE VI intended to use innovative and comprehensive approaches to transform distressed public housing into vibrant mixed-income communities. Crucial elements of the HOPE VI program are full resident involvement and community input (HUD.gov). HUD published the “General Guidance on Community and Resident Involvement” to recommend ways that housing authorities can cultivate resident and community involvement. In 2000, HUD published “HOPE VI: Community Building Makes a Difference” which emphasized building social and human capital rather than physical changes. “The spirit of HOPE VI is one of consultation and collaboration among the housing authority, affected residents, social service providers and the broader community. (HUD 2000b).” HOPE VI is a participatory program why not conduct a participatory evaluation?

Participatory evaluation is explicated as two streams based upon their central goals, functions, and historical and ideological roots. Practical participatory evaluation supports program or organization decision making and problem solving “by involving stakeholders in certain aspects of the evaluation process (Cousins 1998).” The transformative participatory framework is within the context of power and transformation. Most of the literature on transformative participatory evaluation relates to participatory research and later to
participatory action research. Stakeholders are encouraged to participate in the creation of sustainable network of communicative actions and supportive partnerships.

Although residents and community members are required to participate during the planning phase, there is no implicit requirement for the evaluation phase. It’s critical that housing programs involve citizens more closely throughout the development process in project planning, decision-making, implementation, and evaluation. In view of the growing importance that’s attributed to participation, the T-PE framework will foster HOPE VI’s key principles of collaboration, inclusion, communication and participation.

The following framework is a compilation of frameworks adapted from my literature review. The methodology emphasizes four phases, adapted from the UNDP participatory handbook, each composed of a number of intermediary steps (see table 5.3). The framework draws heavily on the experience of Judi Aubel and Beverly Burke. Drawing on their own experiences and that of various practitioners, both Burke and Aubel’s methodologies were influenced by Rapid Rural Appraisal, Participatory Research for Action, and by Rapid Assessment Procedures.

Participatory evaluation differs from other participatory approaches in that it engages a wider range of stakeholders and in the timeframe that the evaluation is conducted. Rapid rural appraisal and rapid assessment procedures uses varying community engagement techniques to identify community views quickly and intensively over a two or three week period (UNDP 1997). Participatory action research is a collaboration between researchers and beneficiaries. Its theory is that those currently poor and oppressed will transform their environment (UNDP 1997). City West needs an approach that is inclusive and not time sensitive.
My framework was influenced by HOPE VI’s objective to find innovative and comprehensive ways to increase collaboration while transforming distressed public housing and the debate about if City West is a successful HOPE VI site. A residential satisfaction survey needs to be conducted. The voices of those most affected should be heard. When choosing the steps, I took demographic information such as the low education attainment rate and the percentage of people living below the poverty rate into consideration. Groups that are generally excluded from the evaluation process are those that lack education and live in poverty. See appendix A for detailed demographic information.

Many PE frameworks present a series of 10 steps to follow. I decided to expand the series to 17 steps to give a simple, logical detailed account of what is required to implement a participatory evaluation process. Anyone from any educational level will be able to understand and implement this framework. The framework will provide the opportunity to answer what does success looks like to everyone in the group. Collectively, using the 17 steps, stakeholders will identify metrics of success that are simple, measurable, attributable, realistic, time-bound, and objective. In other words, the framework is a logical learning process providing guidance to CMHA, affected residents and the broader West End community allowing them the opportunity to jointly examine relevant issues, generate knowledge, and take corrective action.

This model is specific to the HOPE VI housing policy because of HOPE VI’s intent to cultivate resident and community involvement. Previous housing policies did not advocate resident participation. Conventional housing evaluations had a quantitative focus. Federal, state and local officials were concerned with outcomes such as the cost to the federal
government, the percentage of eligible population served, and how the program has been
administered in terms of adequacy of underwriting, processing applications just to name a few.

Additionally, I feel that transformative participatory evaluation is applicable to HOPE VI
and City West because the process is concerned with social action towards change, as well as
transforming power relations in order to empower the marginalized. In 2000, HUD began to
emphasize building social and human capital rather than physical changes. Residents that
participate in the process will acquire skills to add to their resumes and will have the
opportunity to network with potential employers or people that are well connected to
mainstream America. If implemented well, stakeholders will be empowered; will build
capacity; will establish partnerships and local ownership of projects and programs; and acquire
techniques and skills conducive to self-sustained action. Qualitative and quantitative data from
those most affected by HOPE VI legislation and the City West community can be collected and
analyzed to help understand and improve the program’s performance.

I would like to use this model specifically with City West to conduct a residential
satisfaction survey. Many would like know if the HOPE VI mixed-income model worked for City
West. Additionally, I would like to provide an opportunity to engage stakeholders that feel that
they were excluded from the design, planning, and development process of City West as well as
the community support service program. I feel that the model will illustrate how to constantly
engage stakeholders for future evaluations. The CSS program, described in section 3.3.2, along
with community partners will continue to provide services to residents. A routine evaluation
will need to be conducted to assess the program’s performance. Instead of using an outside
evaluator, I feel that the management staff along with residents and other stakeholders should be able to conduct future evaluations with the skills acquired from the initial evaluation.

This framework is not exclusive to City West or to a housing development. The skills acquired can be utilized with other policies and programs. The case studies reviewed in chapter four illustrated how stakeholders were able to use PE tools and techniques at work and to evaluate other programs. One case study expressed how participants were empowered to engage in other community development efforts.

As discussed in chapter four, various individual and groups will be involved in the participatory evaluation process. A clear vision of what an evaluation team is working towards should be established. The purpose of this section is to illustrate how to implement a participatory evaluation for a HOPE VI site.

| Table 5.3 Steps in the Development and Implementation of a Participatory Evaluation |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Phase I:** Pre-Planning and Preparation | **Step 1:** Define evaluation goal & objectives                  |
|                                                | **Step 2:** Identify who should and wants to be involved         |
|                                                | **Step 3:** Clarify participants’ expectations of the process and in what way each person or group wants to contribute |
|                                                | **Step 4:** Develop visual framework of the project              |
| **Phase II:** Evaluation Planning Workshop; Generate Evaluation Questions | **Step 5:** Organize stakeholders into a working group           |
|                                                | **Step 6:** Define the priorities for monitoring and evaluating  |
|                                                | **Step 7:** Generate evaluation questions                       |
|                                                | **Step 8:** Identify indicators that will provide the information needed |
|                                                | **Step 9:** Identify data collection sources and techniques      |
|                                                | **Step 10:** Agree on the methods, responsibilities and timing of information collection |
| **Phase III:** Fieldwork: Preparation, Data    | **Step 11:** Collect the information                             |
|                                                | **Step 12:** Analyze information collected                      |
| Table 5.3 Steps in the Development and Implementation of a Participatory Evaluation |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Gathering and Analysis      | **Step 13:** Adapt the data collection methodology as needed |
| Phase IV:                   | **Step 14:** Summarize evaluation findings & lessons learned |
| Reflection & Action;        | **Step 15:** Develop an action plan: Agree on how the findings are to be used and by whom |
| Documentation & Dissemination of Information | **Step 16:** Write evaluation report |
|                             | **Step 17:** Distribute and discuss evaluation results with program stakeholders/collaborators |

Adapted from Aubel 1999, 2004; UNDP 1997; Burke 1998; Estrella et al. 2000; Guijt 2000

### 5.3.1 Who is involved in the evaluation process?

It is critical to identify and engage those who are involved in the program operations (e.g., sponsors, funding officials, administrators, program managers, and field staff); those served or affected by the program/project/policy (e.g., residents, neighborhood organizations, property owners, business owners, academic institutions, city officials, local HUD field workers, and public housing authorities); and the primary users of the evaluation (e.g., persons that are in a position to make decisions). Below is a summary of the roles that stakeholders will be involved in.

**Evaluation Coordinating Group:** This is a small group (2-5 persons) which is responsible for the general coordination from start to completion. During Phase I, this group is in charge of all of the initial logistical and methodological planning. During the workshops in Phase II, this group should assist with all logistical arrangements and materials. For the period of data collections and analysis they will assume the role of team coordinator. In the last phase, they should provide support as needed.
**Evaluation Team:** This refers to the entire group of stakeholders who develop the evaluation methodology. If the group is relatively small, all may be included in the field work teams unlike larger groups where only a portion will serve on the field work teams.

**Fieldwork Team:** A sub-group of the Evaluation Team members. Teams of stakeholders that collect and analyze data.

**Fieldwork Team Leaders:** Responsible for facilitating and organizing fieldwork team members. Leaders should have experience with qualitative data collection and analysis.

**Evaluation Coordinator:** Responsible for facilitating all steps in the evaluation process. The person should have an understanding of qualitative evaluation methods, group dynamics and training, and knowledge of the program/project/policy.

**Logistics Coordinator:** One or more program staff members with knowledge of systematic planning to assure the required resources are available for each activity during the preparatory and field work phases (Aubel 1999, 2004).

### 5.4 The Steps to Follow

The framework in table 5.3 emphasizes four phases with a set of generic steps to be implemented in the hypothetical application. The steps are interdependent and may occur in a nonlinear sequence; allowing for flexibility in the process due to stakeholder’s learning and negotiations.

#### 5.4.1 Phase I: Pre-Planning and Preparation

In the first phase of the evaluation process, the evaluation coordinator meets with the CMHA HOPE VI program manager and others key stakeholders that will be involved in the
entire coordination of activities from start to completion. The Evaluation Coordinating Group is in charge of guiding the first four steps.

**Step 1: Define evaluation goal and objectives.** The Evaluation Coordinating Group will define the goal and objectives. The focus of the evaluation needs to be chosen such as the effectiveness of the CSS plan, the relocation process, the physical development or all of the above.

Goal: To assess if City West is meeting the national HOPE VI guidelines/what City West has accomplished and for whom.

Objectives: (1) residential satisfaction; (2) physical shape of public housing; (3) impact of the CSSP; (4) reduce concentrations of poverty; and (5) formation of public/private relationships

**Step 2: Identify who should and wants to be involved.** The composition of the evaluation team should include members that can contribute to or learn from the process. The team should reflect members with knowledge of HOPE VI, local context, community dynamics, and political context; experience with qualitative and quantitative data collection experience; team building and facilitation skills; and logistic skills for field management. See the appendix B for a list of potential stakeholders.

**Step 3: Clarify participants’ expectation of the process.** Determine the information needs and in which way each person can and wants to contribute to the process. CMHA has knowledge of HOPE VI and can facilitate a workshop to share the national goal and objectives. Residents may be able to get more residents to participate in interviews and surveys.

**Step 4: Develop visual framework of the project.** There needs to be a common understanding of the program elements to be evaluated. The decision making process will determine what
should and should not be included in the evaluation. The visual framework should include the scope of the evaluation as well as the goal and objectives. This framework will be shared with stakeholders that did not participate in this step to communicate the scope.

Goal: Evaluate residential satisfaction to find out whether HOPE VI revitalization efforts have enhanced the quality of life in City West and the West End

Objective: Measure the effectiveness of HOPE VI five objectives

5.4.2 Phase II: Evaluation Planning Workshop; Generate Evaluation Questions

The “Evaluation Planning Workshop” is conducted in the second phase. All of the stakeholders identified in phase I should participate in the workshop. The Evaluation Team will learn the basic concepts of participatory evaluation and develop the evaluation methodology. The workshop sessions should be structured but participatory and conducted in 4 to 5 days (Aubel 1999, 2004). The Evaluation Team should finalize the goal and objectives. During the workshop, steps 5 to 9 are addressed. The workshop should be designed to talk about the different task associated with steps 6 to 9.

Step 5: Organize stakeholders into a working group. The evaluation coordinator is responsible for orienting stakeholders to the PE process and facilitating team building exercises. In this step, the role of each person is discussed. The priorities for monitoring and evaluating are defined.

Step 6: Define the priorities for monitoring and evaluating. During this step, the goals, objective and activities to focus on will be identified. Understanding the issues and concerns of stakeholders helps to focus the evaluation (Burke 1998). Knowing what information the team wants to find out from the evaluation will help to generate evaluation questions.
Step 7: Generate evaluation questions. During this step the task will be divided into two steps.

During the first half, participants are divided into small groups (3 – 6 persons) to develop questions. In the second part, each group will present their questions for feedback from the entire evaluation team. Groups are assigned to work on a portion of the framework. The groups will be divided into five groups to generate questions in reference to the five objectives of HOPE VI.

Examples of evaluation questions:

Has the CSS program been beneficial to you?

Is the West End a safer neighborhood?

Step 8: Identify indicators. This is one of the most difficult steps throughout the PE process.

The indicators can be either quantitative or qualitative depending on the objectives of the process (Aubel 2004). A common set of indicators can be developed or each group can developed their own set of indicators (Estrella et al. 2000).

The following are examples of indicators:

1. Less public housing residence receiving public assistance.

2. A decrease in the poverty level for the West End.

3. An increase of middle- to high-income families in the West End.

4. Obtaining education and skills that lead to full-time employment with decent pay.

5. Decrease in criminal activity.

Step 9: Identify data collection sources and techniques. Data collection methods can consist of both quantitative and qualitative methods. The evaluation team must decide for each question (1) is quantitative and/or qualitative information required; (2) from whom or what
source should the information be collected; (3) what data technique(s) should be used (Aubel 1999). Numerous data collection techniques can be used such as the rapid appraisal methods discussed in chapter four table 4.7.

The following four data collection instruments can be used to conduct an evaluation for City West: (1) focus group interviews with CMHA and TCB staff; (2) focus group discussion with residents; (3) individual interviews with residents; and (4) performance logic/system model.

**Step 10: Agree on the methods, responsibilities and timing of information collection.** In this step, team members will work in the same groups that were developed in step 7. Categories of interviewees will be determined. Interview question and/or observation elements will be established. The evaluation coordinator should explain the purpose of the interview/observation guide and provide guidelines on how to develop it.

An interview/observation guide will be drafted for the following categories of interviewees: residents (returning, relocated, and new), neighborhood/community organizations, and local businesses/churches. The interview guide is a set of open ended questions used primarily to collect qualitative information (Aubel 1999). The interview guide is flexible thus it is different than a questionnaire. It guides the interviewer but allows him/her to adapt or modify questions as the interview proceeds (Aubel 1999). The observation guide is used to structure the observer’s examination of certain aspects of an activity that is of interest.

Final decisions in this step include finalizing the data collection sites, the sample of persons to be interviewed, and the schedule. A data collection worksheet can be utilized to determine the data collection sample at each site (see table 5.4). At site A, 30 people will
participate, 15 individuals and two groups consisting of 15 people. Once the worksheet is completed, the dates and times of each interview or observation can be scheduled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection sites</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Neighborhood/Community organizations</th>
<th>West End Businesses/Churches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site A</td>
<td>15 (individual)</td>
<td>5 (1 group)</td>
<td>10 (1 group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site B</td>
<td>25 (individual)</td>
<td>10 (1 group)</td>
<td>7 (1 group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site C</td>
<td>10 (individual)</td>
<td>15 (2 groups)</td>
<td>8 (1 group)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Aubel 1999

5.4.3 Phase III: Fieldwork: Preparation, Data Gathering and Analysis

The third phase is the preparation phase for fieldwork teams to conduct data collection and analysis and summarize fieldwork findings.

**Step 11: Collect the information.** This step should begin with an orientation of fieldwork logistics including roles and expectations of team leaders and team members; in-depth interviewing skills; note taking; and a discussion of how to analyze qualitative data. The data collection team will be equipped with materials such as the evaluation questions, copies of interview and observation guides, clipboard, writing pads, pens, folders and paper clips and/or stapler.

The next step is the fieldwork evaluation. A daily data collection schedule should be created to map out activities such as how much time should be allotted for travel and data analysis and which time of day interviews should be conducted. The suggested composition of a team is one interviewer and one to two note-takers.
Step 12: Analyze information collected. As the most challenging step in the process, the information collected must be analyzed the same day so that it can be summarized, understood, and used (Aubel 1999, 2004). At the end of the fieldwork phase, each field team should synthesize their data analysis findings for each evaluation question; then conduct a workshop to formulate lessons learned from each evaluation question.

Unlike quantitative data that is analyzed after the data collection is completed, it is suggested that qualitative data should be analyzed concurrently as data is collected (Aubel 1999). Formulas are used to analyze quantitative data and the content analysis technique is used to analyze qualitative data. The daily data analysis process for content analysis include: (1) re-read the interview questions; (2) read the interview notes; (3) discuss the responses; (4) categorize the responses and summarize findings; and (5) identify unclear or missing information.

Step 13: Adapt the data collection methodology as needed. A mini feedback session should follow each group interview to allow the data collection team to discuss the dynamics of the interview, constraints, and lessons learned. Knowledge gained through the study of one set of interview data may reveal modifications that “should be made in the content of subsequent interviews (Aubel 1999).”

5.4.4 Phase IV Reflection and Action; Documentation and Dissemination of Information

In this last phase of the evaluation, the results are shared with stakeholders that did not participate in the data collection and analysis process. The appropriate action to be taken
based upon findings and lessons learned will be negotiated. The major findings and lessons learned will be summarized into an evaluation report.

**Step 14: Summarize evaluation findings & lessons learned.** Using the key elements of the program framework, a summary should be prepared.

The following examples of summary results are hypothetical:

1. **Physical improvements**

   Decaying public housing was replaced with new urbanism style townhomes and apartments. Residents are highly satisfied with the housing structure and amenities.

2. **Participation**

   Many residents expressed interest in being involved in the HOPE VI process. Many expressed that they were not allowed to participate in significant ways that would give them a sense of ownership of the project. Thus the level of distrust for CMHA, TCB, and public officials grew and many formed a negative perception of HOPE VI (VanLoon 2005).

3. **Self-sufficiency**

   Using the comprehensive case management program, CMHA (later TCB) ran the CSS program to help transition residents to self-sufficiency as the area transitioned into a mixed-income community. Partnering with several social service agencies, the emphasis of the program was to help find and maintain employment, asset building, and a successful transition to a mixed-income community. The CSS program did not meet residents’ expectations. The education and job training programs were insufficient and led to temporary and minimum wage dead end jobs. Thus the CSS program had little or no impact (VanLoon 2005).
Step 15: Develop an action plan: Agree on how the findings are to be used and by whom. This step should be conducted immediately following the evaluation. A small group should conduct this task composed of the HOPE VI program manager, two or more field staff members and the evaluation coordinator. An action plan should be drafted based upon the findings and lessons learned. The group should agree on how the findings are to be used and by whom.

Step 16: Write evaluation report. The person(s) to complete this report and the completion date should be established in step one (Aubel 1999). The report should be written so that it is easily understood by all stakeholders. The content and style of the report will be determined by its function (e.g., education tool, synthesis of findings and recommendations). At the beginning of the report, an executive summary should be included with the major findings and lessons learned (Aubel 1999, 2004).

Step 17: Distribute and discuss evaluation results with program stakeholders/collaborators. The findings should be shared with all program collaborators and stakeholders (Burke 1998; UNDP 1997). Typically, limited copies of the report are printed and distributed. Alternative approaches to share and discuss the report with all key stakeholders and collaborators should be agreed on. The following are a few approaches that can be implemented: full evaluation report distributed to a few stakeholders (e.g., CMHA, TCB, West End Community Council, City officials); a summary of the report (10 pages) shared with all stakeholders; a fact sheet (2 pages) distributed to a variety of people who are interested; meet with program collaborators to discuss lessons and possible application; and fieldworkers return to their respective sites and discuss the findings and recommendations with program collaborators (Aubel 1999, 2004).
5.5 Chapter Conclusion

Urban revitalization efforts are initiated through government programs such as HOPE VI, Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Communities, and Community Building Development Grants.

Once a thriving community, Cincinnati’s West End has been the target of several redevelopment efforts through the years. The West End today is a community in transition. It is still in the midst of trying to implement the goals, objectives and strategies from the Urban Design Plan and the Comprehensive Plan. City West housing development was conceived with the idea of being a catalyst for revitalization.

The participatory evaluation framework, consisting of four phases and 17 intermediary steps, can be used to evaluate residential satisfaction and the achievement of the national and local HOPE VI goals and objectives. Implementing a participatory evaluation method will enable CMHA to obtain qualitative data as well and quantitative data. Various stakeholders will be able to participate in the process contributing knowledge about the local context, community dynamics, and institutional structures to develop an action plan.
CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATION

The purpose of this thesis was to present participatory evaluation as a viable option to evaluate HOPE VI sites through engaging individuals most affected by the implementation of the HOPE VI program. My assessment of participatory evaluation was based upon a comprehensive literature review of applications of participatory evaluation approaches, comparison to conventional models, the major benefits and challenges in pursuing an approach that involved multiple stakeholders, participatory evaluation guiding principles, and identifying the core implementation steps. I also conducted a literature review of the history of public housing including HOPE VI and its current context.

As a result of inefficiencies from previous housing programs, some public housing projects were socially and physically devastated by conditions such as years of neglect and disinvestment, concentrations of poverty, and criminal activity. The National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing was established to propose a national action plan to eradicate conditions that contribute to severely distressed public housing.

In the 53 years history of U.S. public housing policy, the federal government drastically changed its policy for housing the poor when HOPE VI was passed into law in 1993. HOPE VI pledge was to transform the nation’s most distressed public housing projects into mixed-income communities. With an emphasis on family self-sufficiency, public housing authorities have pursued HOPE VI revitalization through a variety of approaches: demolition and/or renovation at the current site and the development of mixed-income communities.

HUD’s mission statement outlined the goal of developing a new relationship between HUD and public housing authorities to work together in collaboration with residents and
stakeholders. Crucial elements of the HOPE VI program are resident involvement and community input. There are four key principles of the HOPE VI program that relate to residents: collaboration, inclusion, communication, and participation in program planning.

HUD did not mandate evaluation of HOPE VI programs until 2000. Since then, HOPE VI sites have conducted evaluations without formal guidance. Although participation is required during the planning process, there is no explicit requirement for evaluation. Participation needs to occur in the evaluation process as well as in the planning and design stages of an HOPE VI development. Participation is viewed as a positive activity within democratic societies. Although still contested, the idea of stakeholder participation has gained acceptance in the evaluation community.

In response to the growing dissatisfaction with conventional approaches to monitoring and evaluation, participatory evaluation has gradually evolved as an alternative approach. There are several participatory approaches that fall under the umbrella of participatory monitoring and evaluation. The method chosen depends on what information is needed to be collected to make major decisions and if the evaluation is going to be used as a means or end or both.

Participation has become an important concept in community development. There has been a growing interest in participatory monitoring and evaluation in recent years. Two pivotal questions that should be considered when implementing a participatory development program is whose reality count? And who counts reality? Robert Chambers posed the question whose reality counts? and argued that the implementation of development programs needs to begin with the priorities of poor and marginalized people (Chambers 1997). Another pivotal question
is who counts reality? in other words, whose voices are used to define success and who 
benefits and learns from the process of monitoring and evaluating change (Estrella et al 2000)?
Involving a wide range of stakeholders, participatory monitoring and evaluation is a learning 
process that can be used for capacity building, empowerment, conflict negotiation, 
collaboration, accountability and governance. PE raises sensitive question about responsibility, 
accountability and performance. The partnership of participatory evaluation can be realized 
when participants are involved in the process of choosing when and how to monitor, evaluate, 
communicate and utilize the information.

HOPE VI is a participatory program why not have a participatory evaluation? PE can be 
used at different stages of a HOPE VI project including: development and implementation phase 
to collect baseline data; mid-point to review progress; and at the end to assess achievements.
PE is less common in the U.S. than internationally. My study was designed to acknowledge the 
growing interest in participatory evaluation and recommend an evaluation framework. To 
prove PE as a viable option, I hypothetically applied the recommended framework to a HOPE VI 
site, City West in Cincinnati, Ohio. This site was chosen due to the debate about if the 
implementation of City West has been successful and because a residential satisfaction survey 
has not been conducted.

6.1 Key Findings

Participatory evaluation deviates from conventional monitoring and evaluation 
approaches in that its focus is the program stakeholders’ input and not the agency. Thus many 
are involved in the process. The assumption is that stakeholder involvement will make sure 
that the evaluation addresses issues and concerns that are context specific thus increasing
stakeholders’ sense of ownership over the evaluation results. Following are some of the key findings of why someone should consider using participatory evaluation over conventional monitoring and evaluation approaches. Participatory evaluation contributes to the participants’ learning; it allows everyone to understand other stakeholders’ view points; enables participants to acquire evaluations skills; enhances teamwork; builds capacity; and increases the probability that the evaluation results will be used and not shelved by program decision-makers and implementers.

Many different terms for participatory approaches to monitoring and evaluation and a wealth of experiences in various disciplines exist. While there are many variations to PM&E, the literature review revealed four guiding principles, four basic phases and several core steps that are used to implement a participatory framework. Participatory evaluation guiding principles (participation, flexibility, learning, negotiation) are aligned with HOPE VI goals and objectives. HOPE VI is a holistic housing program that encourages participation. Public housing authorities have the flexibility to design sites and develop support and social services based upon the needs of residents. Through these programs, residents are able to learn skills to help them move to self-sufficiency.

PE is relationship driven. A certain level of trust must exist. To implement a PE in the context of a housing program, the program must have a participatory element and relationships must be built between public housing authority staff, developers, local government, social service organizations, public housing residents, and residents and business owners in the surrounding area. All individuals, organizations and groups must be provided the opportunity to engage in the four basic phases of the framework: (1) pre-planning and preparation; (2)
evaluation planning workshop; generate evaluation questions; (3) fieldwork (preparation, data-gathering, and analysis); and (4) reflection and action; documentation and dissemination of information.

The following list of concerns should be taken into consideration before implementing a participatory evaluation: why is a participatory evaluation being conducted; how long will a PE take; how much will it cost; and the hiring of a knowledgeable participatory evaluation facilitator. One of the exchanges of adopting a participatory evaluation approach is accepting new, less rigid standards of what is relevant and valid data. Literature review suggest that there will be trade-offs between scientific rigor, and participatory approaches that are context specific and locally relevant. Instead of focusing on the issue of either scientific rigor or participation, new standards of validity for participatory evaluation need to be developed when increased participation is an objective.

My literature review revealed that some public housing residents did not feel that they were properly included in the development and implementation phases; their concerns were not met; and their voices were not heard. Participation should reflect human interactions, learning, and sharing of decision-making, power, and resources. Below is the framework that I recommend to help the evaluation phase become participatory in the HOPE VI program which deals with a variety of cultures, attitudes, and behaviors at different sites.

6.2 Recommendation

Having a conceptual framework will help to establish goals, objectives and priorities. Furthermore, a conceptual framework will help everyone to understand the vision and desired output. The model (see figure 6.1) was adapted from Mallory D. McDuff who developed the
framework based upon the core principles: participation, learning (capacity building), flexibility, and negotiation. The model integrates input from both stakeholders and an external facilitator leading to outputs including information or an action plan, dissemination of reports, identification for program improvement, and success factors and challenges. In chapter five, this model was illustrated in detail involving four phases and seventeen steps. The seventeen steps appear to be linear in sequence. It’s not the case that a linear flow should be adhered to rigidly since the steps are interdependent. A nonlinear sequence could be encountered resulting in frequent back and forth movement as well as skipping over multiple steps. This allows for flexibility and continuous reflection as well as adaptation of the framework.

As an alternative approach for evaluating HOPE VI sites, I suggest a transformative participatory approach because T-PE is concerned with social action towards change. T-PE allows stakeholders to negotiate different values, attitudes, and perceptions. The focus is on reconciliation of differences as well as an interactive learning environment that builds consensus among all stakeholders.
Figure 6.1 HOPE VI Participatory Evaluation Conceptual Model

**PHAs/Residents/HOPE VI Staff/Other Stakeholders**

**Indigenous Knowledge**
- Local knowledge
- Political context
- Community dynamics
- Institutional structures
- HOPE VI objectives & goals

**External Facilitator**

**Scientific Knowledge**
- Technical expert
- Training
- Evaluation design
- Data collection/analysis
- Identification of indicators
- Uses for evaluation

**INPUTS**

**Participatory Evaluation**
- Identify local institutional structures and knowledge
- Identify who should and wants to be involved
- Generate evaluation questions collectively
- Identify indicators and methods collectively
- Gather and analyze data collectively
- Prepare an action plan collectively
- Distribute and discuss evaluation results

**OUTPUTS**

- Information for action plan
- Determine the uses for outcomes and reports
- Identify areas for program improvement
- Success factors and challenges

Adapted from McDuff 2001
6.3 Further Work

This study has attempted to recommend an evaluation framework that would align with HUD’s mission to increase participation in public housing policy. Evaluation was not an initial requisite thus stakeholder participation is not an implicit requirement for evaluation. There is a need for documentation of HOPE VI sites’ evaluative procedures. Participatory evaluation can be implemented at any stage of a program.

Future research should conduct a participatory evaluation at several HOPE VI sites that are in different phases of planning and implementation. Researchers should document the strengths and challenge. HUD should establish an evaluation database to share evaluation notes using the participatory evaluation method. Researchers should study the results of qualitative data from participatory evaluations and quantitative data from conventional methods to inform the objectivity and subjectivity debate. Lastly, instead of focusing on the issues of either scientific rigor or participation, new standards of validity for participatory evaluation need to be developed when increased participation is an objective.
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Appendix A – West End Demographics

POPULATION

Population by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West End</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,886</td>
<td>11,370</td>
<td>8,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5,569</td>
<td>4,889</td>
<td>3,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7,317</td>
<td>6,481</td>
<td>4,399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Community Development and Planning 2002

Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West End</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>5,402</td>
<td>4,995</td>
<td>3,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Families</td>
<td>5,402</td>
<td>4,995</td>
<td>3,958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Community Development and Planning 2002

Age Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West End</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 and Under</td>
<td>5,229</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>2,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 24</td>
<td>4,770</td>
<td>4,448</td>
<td>3,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 64</td>
<td>7,317</td>
<td>6,481</td>
<td>4,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,886</td>
<td>11,370</td>
<td>8,115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Community Development and Planning 2002
### Population by Race (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>7,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Two or More Races</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hamilton County 2000

### Households by Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>5,402</td>
<td>4,995</td>
<td>3,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married w/Children</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married w/o Children</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female HH w/Children</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female HH w/o Children</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Households</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Community Development and Planning 2002

### Median Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>$5,306</td>
<td>$7,206</td>
<td>$15,402</td>
<td>$17,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cincinnati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Community Development and Planning 2002; Social Compact 2007
### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West End</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below $10,000</td>
<td>$10,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>$25,000 - $34,999</td>
<td>$35,000 - $49,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,215</td>
<td>3,605</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Community Development and Planning 2002

### Poverty Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West End</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons below Poverty</td>
<td>Families below Poverty</td>
<td>Percentage of All Persons</td>
<td>Percentage of All Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,093</td>
<td>7,592</td>
<td>4,163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Community Development and Planning 2002

### Housing Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West End</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Community Development and Planning 2002
Educational Attainment for Residents over Age 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West End</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>4,583</td>
<td>3,331</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree or Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Community Development and Planning 2002
### WORKFORCE

Employment for Residents Age 16 and Older

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Employed</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,233</td>
<td>2,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Community Development and Planning 2002

### Top Industries by Total # of Businesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Total # of Businesses</th>
<th>Total # of Employees</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Offices – City</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Misc</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$2,854,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service and Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$2,760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Cont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Stations and Broadcasting Com</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>$24,970,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>$28,690,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Social Compact 2007
### Top Industries by Total # of Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Total # of Businesses</th>
<th>Total # of Employees</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Services-Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$312,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Offices-City, VI</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Research &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>$618,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Stations and Broadcasting Com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Gov and Transportation Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing Equip-Wholesale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>$18,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Stations and Broadcasting Com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Social Compact 2007

### Top Industries by Total Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Total # of Businesses</th>
<th>Total # of Employees</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Services-Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$312,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits and Vegetables</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>$65,018,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Stations and Broadcasting Com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglar Alarm Systems-Wholesale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$46,060,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Products-Wholesale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual Production Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$39,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Fixtures-Wholesale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Programs &amp; Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$28,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Social Compact 2007
SWOT Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Strength/Assets</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>• Housing stock&lt;br&gt; • Public Housing&lt;br&gt; • Non-profit developers&lt;br&gt; • Private developers&lt;br&gt; • HOPE VI City West&lt;br&gt; • Housing redevelopment</td>
<td>• Aging structures&lt;br&gt; • Low rates of homeownership&lt;br&gt; • Unaffordable units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>• Location&lt;br&gt;  o I-75&lt;br&gt;  o Proximity to central business district</td>
<td>• Economic disinvestment&lt;br&gt; • Decaying buildings in neighborhood business district&lt;br&gt; • Under used parcels&lt;br&gt; • Concentration of low-income households&lt;br&gt;  o 55% households below poverty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>• Green spaces and parks</td>
<td>• Pollution&lt;br&gt; • Poor maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>• Religious institutions&lt;br&gt; • Art Consortium&lt;br&gt; • The Element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from CDDC 1998
## Appendix B – Group Interview Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps in Conducting Group Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before the interview starts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose a quite, secluded spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify the characteristics of group participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit the number of participants to approximately 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat participants in a circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit at the same level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction to the interview</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greet the participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain the purpose of the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assure them of the confidentiality of their responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the participation of all group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitate the group discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct the interview in the local language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use interview guide to structure the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview should last 1 to 1½ hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take as many notes as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending the interview</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review interview guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank the participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Aubel 1999
Appendix C – Potential Stakeholders

The Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Alliance Women’s health
Arts Consortium Better Housing League
Betts-Longworth Neighborhood Association
Detoxification Center
Central Community Health Board of Hamilton County, Inc.
Cincinnati Museum Center
Cincinnati Opera
Cincinnati Recreation Commission
Cincinnati State Technical & Community College
Cincinnati-Hamilton County Community Action Agency
City Manager
City of Cincinnati
City Planning Department
City, Department of Architecture
City, Police District One
Community Land Co-op
Department of Community Development
Department of Neighborhood Services
Dominican Community Services
Duke Energy
Every Child Succeeds
Firstar Bank
Frisch’s
Greater Cincinnati Mortgage Counseling Services
Greater Cincinnati African American Chamber of Commerce
Hamilton County
HUD Local Staff
H.O.M.E (Housing Opportunities Made Equal)
HOPE VI Local Staff
The Homeownership Center
Jamison & Jamison, Jr., Inc.
Jerrie Baptist Church
Laurel Homes Resident Council
Lincoln Court Resident Council
Miami Purchase and Preservation Fund
Music Hall
Ohio Department of Development
Ohio Historic Preservation office
Outreach Program of Cincinnati
Queen City Vocational Center
Revelation Baptist Church
Residents (Renters and Homeowners):
  o Returning (Laurel Homes & Lincoln Courts)
  o Non-returning (Laurel Homes & Lincoln Courts)
  o New
St. Joseph Church
St. Mark Christian Fellowship Church of God
Sylvan Learning Center
The Community Builders, Inc.
Union Baptist Church
United Parcel Service
University of Cincinnati
Urban League of Greater Cincinnati
West End Community Council
West End Business Community
YMCA-West End Branch