

Overview of Program Evaluation Framework

| Outcomes Hierarchy | Measures | | Information sources examples | Output |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| | Evaluation questions | Indicators/Judgement method | | |
| <p>Ultimate Outcomes — And finally? (Possibly >15 years)</p> <p>Sustainable Communities: An environment where communities participate in and drive their own futures. Established neighbourhoods are revitalised and people have pride in the community in which they live.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have essential needs been met within a priority neighbourhood? Are community resources and structures within a priority neighbourhood able to sustain and support that neighbourhood into the future without special support — can support for the priority neighbourhood be shifted from the PNRP to council's broader suite of planning programs? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All targets set for essential needs within a priority neighbourhood are met, triggering the implementation of an exit strategy for that priority neighbourhood. The priority neighbourhoods are being supported by structurally enduring community processes and mechanisms that can be supplemented by council's broader suite of planning programs to address ongoing needs. | Data, reports and statistics from agencies and council. Existing national social indicator frameworks (e.g. ABS's Measuring Wellbeing (2001)); existing crime statistics and intelligence frameworks; community surveys and focus groups; information supplied/sourced from strategic partners, government agencies, NGO's and others; council information, reports and case studies on local disadvantage and inequity, and investigations of the physical environment; and participant evaluation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority neighbourhoods are revitalised and people have a positive sense of belonging in the community in which they live. People are not disadvantaged by the place they live in. |
| <p>Intermediate Outcomes — Then what?</p> <p>Strengthening Communities: This is about how communities build their strengths on an ongoing basis to improve their wellbeing, education and employment opportunities and so on.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there evidence that activities (economic development, physical repair, community building etc), being implemented as part of the agreed delivery plan are addressing identified needs (e.g. is access to services improving and peoples' knowledge of how to access services improving)? Are these activities building on and developing resources and community structures within a priority neighbourhood that can be used to address the identified needs? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs are being addressed within priority neighbourhoods through the use of activities (economic development, physical repair, community building etc) that make optimal use of resources and community structures within neighbourhood to address identified needs and allow higher order outcomes to be achieved. | Data, reports and statistics from agencies and council. Existing national social indicator frameworks (e.g. ABS's Measuring Wellbeing (2001)); existing crime statistics and intelligence frameworks; community surveys and focus groups; information supplied/sourced from strategic partners, government agencies, NGO's and others; council information, reports and case studies on local disadvantage and inequity, and investigations of the physical environment; and participant evaluation). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Optimal use is being made of community resources and community structures within neighbourhoods to address needs. Resources and community structures within a neighbourhood are being enhanced and strengthened through the activities, allowing the neighbourhood to play a greater role in addressing its own needs. Activities are addressing the identified needs. |
| <p>Immediate Outcomes — What do we expect to happen as a result of this?</p> <p>Developing Positive Partnerships: Council, strategic partners, and community are committed to the delivery plan and each play an agreed role in its implementation.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have appropriate agreements, structures or processes been put in place to allow council, strategic partners and community to effectively participate in, influence, and provide input throughout the life of the renewal process? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A culture of partnership between strategic partners (agencies, NGOs etc), council and the affected local community (businesses, residents, voluntary organisations etc) has been developed and implemented for a particular priority neighbourhood that allows the effective implement of the delivery plan and allows higher order outcomes to be achieved. That within this partnership council plays a driving role at the outset of the development of the delivery plan and where appropriate devolves delivery responsibility of plan to strategic partner organisations and/or local community as they develop capacity. | Use community survey; focus group testing with strategic partners and community members; and participant evaluation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a commitment to work together through effective and constructive relationships. |
| <p>Outputs/Activities — What are we going to do? What is going to be done?</p> <p>A program of renewal is developed and implemented for priority established neighbourhoods that contributes to the sense of community identity and cohesiveness. (Operational Framework, Delivery Plans, Review of Delivery, Exit Strategies, Evaluation)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a delivery plan been created for each priority neighbourhood that addresses identified needs, builds on existing community strengths, has an agreed evaluation framework and exit strategy, and is appropriately resourced. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A delivery plan is developed and implemented for each priority neighbourhood that utilizes an approach that builds on strengths within the local community that were identified through consultation with that community (e.g. a respected local newsletters can be used to relay information about the plans progress, existing community groups can form key roles in the process, local residents who play key roles within specific neighbourhoods can become 'champions' for the plan). That each delivery plan clearly identifies those needs from the 10 selection criteria within a neighbourhood that it is essential to address/those that are desirable to address. The delivery plans are informed by a project specific evaluation framework that provides ongoing assessment of: capacity of communities, council and strategic partners to support delivery of each plan; changing needs and how priority needs are being addressed. Exit strategies are developed and implemented for each project so that neighbourhoods can be transitioned out of the program as soon as 'essential' needs are addressed. Appropriate resources and operational frameworks are determined in advance for each project. | Delivery Plan Progress Reports (i.e. monthly/half yearly) detailing key delivery milestones and attainment of priority needs; case studies – story telling; focus group testing with strategic partners and residents; community survey; participant evaluation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implemented Delivery Plan & Program reporting on it. |
| <p>Issues/Needs — What are the priority issues the program is responding to?</p> <p>The priority focus of this program is to target and strengthen particular established neighbourhoods within the Penrith LGA that face disadvantage/inequality due to a combination of prioritised factors.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What established neighbourhoods are priorities for the program? What are the needs that the program needs to address within those neighbourhoods? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use agreed indicators to select priority neighbourhoods The selection criteria developed to assist in decision making for further program areas in order of priority were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor access to key services and resources. SEIFA data. Crime and personal safety issues. Limited local training opportunities to support further employment opportunities. Poorer health indicators. Limited local employment and enterprise opportunities. Poor physical environment and public domain. Lower levels of car ownership and poor access to public transport. Indicators of social capital. Negative perceptions of the area — from both internal and external sources. | Existing national social indicator frameworks (e.g. ABS's Measuring Wellbeing (2001)); existing crime statistics and intelligence frameworks; community surveys and focus groups; Information supplied/sourced from strategic partners, government agencies, NGO's and others; Council information, reports and case studies on local disadvantage and inequity, and investigations of the physical environment within established areas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify priority list of established Neighbourhoods for the program and priority needs within each of those neighbourhoods. |

Supplementary file: Overview of Program Evaluation Framework in J. Prior, 'The role of local government in redressing neighbourhood disadvantage: A case study from Penrith City Council' in Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance, Issue 1: May 2008. <http://eprints.lib.uts.edu.au/ojs/index.php/cjlg>