



**2<sup>nd</sup> INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE  
ON AGE-FRIENDLY CITIES**

LIVING AND AGING TOGETHER  
IN OUR COMMUNITY

# Participatory Evaluation Tools and Strategies for Age-Friendly Cities Initiatives

Marita Kloseck, PhD

University of Western Ontario

London, Ontario CANADA

[mkloseck@uwo.ca](mailto:mkloseck@uwo.ca)

September 2013



# Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation

---

## Objectives

- Context
- Critical Evaluation Components
- Evaluation Strategies & Tools
- Conclusion



# Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation

## CONTEXT



# Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation

---

- Solid evaluation frameworks increasingly expected by funders, but rarely done
- AFC evaluation is a challenge
- Cities - collection of communities - each community unique
- AFC initiatives use an 'active aging' framework - must use participatory & empowerment evaluation strategies



# Context within AFC Framework



## Capacities and resources among older people:

- frail, older individuals
- needs of most vulnerable
- inclusion and contribution of most vulnerable
  
- bottom-up collaborative participatory approach
- shared decision-making & action planning
- negotiated change
- participatory empowerment evaluation framework



# Context – Our Model

- NORC
- 'city within a city'
- n=3000
- mean age 79 yrs ( $\pm 9.53$  SD)
- community-business-education partnership
- 'true' engagement by all
- WHO 'active aging' framework
- demonstration community 1996-2011

## Unique model

- most vulnerable, frail
- participatory evaluation



Degrees of Community Involvement (Poulton 1999)

Providing Info.	Education	Consultation	Satisfaction Survey	Active Participation	Empowerment
1-way flow of information	1-way	2-way opinions sought feedback may/may not be used	2-way	Some shared decision-making; suggestions only; active participation	Active participation. determine what outcomes important & evaluate them, transfer of power & control





# Context -Traditional Evaluation Frameworks

**MOST FEASIBLE**

Set project specific goals & measure achievement, with judgment of outcomes against prior established goals

- specific to, and established by, a particular community
- measure degree of goal achievement

## 1. RCT

Difficult – hard to compare communities with different needs

## 2. Closed System

Specific to, and established by, particular projects; community/city specific

## 3. Professional Model

Professional judgment model such as accreditation process

## 4. Political Model

Stakeholder and funder interests



## Context – Underlying Principles

---

- Outcomes must meet needs of your community
- Community members drive the evaluation process - build capacity & empower
- Approaches that appeal to communities - visually oriented, simple, quick & easily carried out
- Role of evaluator - coach, facilitator
- Most important - *collective* capacity of the community to work with municipality





# Critical Evaluation Components

What Should We Evaluate and When?



# Critical Evaluation Components

Pre- AFC Analysis  
Community  
Readiness Profile

1.

- Community/city profile, readiness, commitment, buy-in

Determine specific evaluation timeframe

AFC Development  
& Action Evaluation  
Process & Outcome  
Evaluation

2.

- What will be evaluated? Who will be involved? Identify key stakeholders. Include vulnerable, frail. Timeframes? Methods? Create an AFC Community Advisory Council to guide evaluation

Sustainability  
Evaluation  
Long Term  
Sustainability of  
AFC Development

3.

- Community/inter-sectoral commitment, strength of partnerships, Council (municipal) resolutions, policy formation



# Participatory Evaluation Strategies & Tools



# Participatory Evaluation Tools

Pre- AFC Analysis  
Community  
Readiness Profile



- Environmental scan socio-demographic profile, cultural, economic, frail/vulnerable
- Asset mapping community design, services, resources
- Census data (StatsCan)  
age, gender, ethnicity, household composition, education , household income –health info. not publically available – health service utilization patterns
- Key informant interviews – small number, most knowledgeable
- SWOT analysis
- Nominal Group Technique
- Delphi Technique
- Town hall meetings
- Focus groups





# Participatory Evaluation Strategies

AFC Development  
& Action Evaluation



## **INDIVIDUAL LEVEL MICRO**

change at individual level (community, service provider, etc.) – knowledge, attitude, skills, involvement, etc.

## **COLLECTIVE COMMUNITY LEVEL MESO**

*collective* capacity of a community to identify issues & mobilize resources to bring about desired change

## **COMMUNITY-MUNICIPAL LEVEL MACRO**

ability of a community to work with the city/ municipality (or other formal systems); ability to mobilize internal & external resources to bring about desired change





# Participatory Evaluation Tools

AFC Development  
& Action Evaluation



## INDIVIDUAL LEVEL **MICRO**

- event/activity logs, attendance lists
- type, level & degree of involvement
- case studies
- round table discussions
- review of records, plans, databases
- neighbourhood mapping – location & types of changes
- satisfaction ratings
- photos – capture change over time





# Participatory Evaluation Tools

AFC Development  
& Action Evaluation



## **COLLECTIVE COMMUNITY LEVEL** MESO

- scale – community perception of control
- connectivity (social networks) within the community
- degree of community leadership & diversity of stakeholders
- shared decision-making, negotiated priorities
- perceived co-operation & ability to work together - case studies
- type of collaboratively implemented partnerships, services, programs, etc.
- Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS)



# Participatory Evaluation Tools

AFC Development  
& Action Evaluation



## **COMMUNITY-MUNICIPAL LEVEL** **MACRO**

- municipal council resolutions & plans
- practice & policy changes
- inclusive decision-making
- shift of power, control, ownership to community
- existence of community-municipal coalitions
- reciprocal communication flow
- outcomes documented in municipal performance reports
- media coverage
- Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS)





# Long Term Sustainability

## Sustainability Evaluation



- extent to which community engages as leaders with the city to address community-identified issues (demonstrate transition from ‘top-down’ to ‘bottom-up’)
- partnership capacity
- co-ownership
- shared responsibility
- Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS)





# Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS)

---

- versatile, under-utilized method of setting & writing goals, & measuring degree of achievement, over- & under-achievement of community-identified priorities
  - » by creating individualized 5-point scales (-2, -1, 0, +1, +2) of potential outcomes for each activity undertaken
  - » adaptable to a wide range of situations – can be used at all levels (micro, meso, macro)
  - » feasible, practical, user-friendly participatory approach that engages older adults & stakeholders in the evaluation process



# Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS)

Very nature of AFC – personal - GAS particularly well suited

## Goal Attainment Scaling

GOAL ATTAINMENT LEVELS	Goal		
	Goal:	Goal:	Goal:
Much less than expected -2			
Somewhat less than expected -1			
Expected level (Program Goal) 0			
Somewhat better than expected +1			
Much better than expected +2			
Comments			

Goal Status:

Initial:

4 Months:  \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 Months:  \_\_\_\_\_  
 12 Months:  \_\_\_\_\_

Initial:

16 Months:  \_\_\_\_\_  
 20 Months:  \_\_\_\_\_  
 24 Months:  \_\_\_\_\_

Initial:

28 Months:  \_\_\_\_\_  
 32 Months:  \_\_\_\_\_  
 36 Months:  \_\_\_\_\_



# Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS) Example

## "Connecting London Seniors" Project – Central (Neighbourhood 2)

GOAL ATTAINMENT LEVELS	CENTRAL: HEALTH & MENTAL HEALTH ACCESS TO HEALTH & MENTAL HEALTH INFORMATION		
	Centralized Information Centre for Seniors in Central Neighbourhood (Physical Infrastructure)	Central Seniors' Neighbourhood Advisory Council (SNAC) (Operationalizing the Information Centre)	Community Volunteers to Operate the Central Seniors' Information Centre (Operationalizing the Information Centre)
Much less than expected -2	No seniors' health information centre or centralized access to health information in the Central community. ★	No Seniors' Neighbourhood Advisory Council (SNAC) in the Central Community. ★	No trained community volunteers (seniors) to operate the Central Seniors' Information Centre. No formal sustainable system for recruiting volunteers. ★
Somewhat less than expected -1	Accessible seniors' health information centre in the Central community with some, but not all, requested information types (health and health services info., support services info., social services info.)	A Seniors' Neighbourhood Advisory Council (SNAC) with <10 active council members in the Central Community. Council meetings are organized and led by the project co-ordinator. No recruitment strategy for sustainable membership. ①	Some, but not enough, trained community volunteers (seniors) to operate the Central Seniors' Information Centre. No formal sustainable system for recruiting volunteers. Recruitment of volunteers conducted by the project co-ordinator.
Expected level (Program Goal) 0	Accessible seniors' health information centre as part of the Central community with some, but not all, requested information types (health and health service, support services, social services info.). With some specific information related to affordable services geared to low income seniors. ① ②	A Seniors' Neighbourhood Advisory Council (SNAC), with a Chair and 9 active council members, in the Central Community. Council meetings are organized and led by the SNAC Chair. No recruitment strategy for sustainable SNAC membership.	Adequate number of trained community volunteers (seniors) to operate the Central Seniors' Information Centre. Formal sustainable system for ongoing recruitment of volunteers. Recruitment of volunteers conducted by project co-ordinator in collaboration with Central SNAC. ①
Somewhat better than expected +1	Accessible seniors' health information centre as part of the Central community with all requested information types (health and health service, support services, social services info.). With a wide variety of specific information related to affordable services geared to low income seniors.	A Seniors' Neighbourhood Advisory Council (SNAC), with a Chair, 9 active council members and City of London representation, in the Central Community. Council meetings are organized and led by the SNAC Chair. A recruitment strategy for sustainable SNAC membership is in place and operational. ②*	Adequate number of trained community volunteers (seniors) to operate the Central Seniors' Information Centre. Formal sustainable system for ongoing recruitment of volunteers. Recruitment of volunteers conducted by Central SNAC in collaboration with project co-ordinator.
Much better than expected +2	Accessible seniors' health information centre as part of the Central community with all requested information types (health and health service, support services, social services info.). With a listing of all health/mental health affordable programs and services geared to low income seniors.	A Seniors' Neighbourhood Advisory Council (SNAC), with a Chair, 9 active council members and City of London representation, in the Central Community. Council meetings are organized and led by the SNAC Chair. A recruitment strategy for sustainable SNAC membership is in place and operational. Regular, ongoing collaborative communication and action between the Central SNAC and City of London.	Adequate number of trained community volunteers (seniors) to operate the Central Seniors' Information Centre. Formal sustainable system for ongoing recruitment of volunteers. Recruitment of volunteers conducted by Central SNAC. ②*
Comments	Want access to information in a common place – drop in centre at the market	* SNAC evolved into 'The Gathering Place'	* SNAC evolved into 'The Gathering Place'

Goal Status: Initial (September 2009): ★ 30.00  
 Year 1 (September 2010): ① 50.00  
 Project Completion (2011): ② 50.00

Initial (September 2009): ★ 30.00  
 Year 1 (September 2010): ① 40.00  
 Project Completion (2011): ② 60.00

Initial (November 2008): ★ 30.00  
 Year 1 (November 2009): ① 50.00  
 Project Completion (2011): ② 70.00



# Conclusion



# Conclusion

---

## **Benefits of Participatory Empowerment Evaluation:**

- builds knowledge, skills, relationships (learn together)
- empowers communities & builds capacity - key for sustainability
- more objective measure of achievement
- less expensive

## **BUT . . . . .**

- time intensive – ‘up front’
- requires commitment
- staff/community member turnover may present a challenge



**2<sup>nd</sup> INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE  
ON AGE-FRIENDLY CITIES**

LIVING AND AGING TOGETHER  
IN OUR COMMUNITY

THANK YOU!

Marita Kloseck, PhD  
University of Western Ontario  
[mkloseck@uwo.ca](mailto:mkloseck@uwo.ca)