

## Pathfinder: Resource List

*Pathfinder* is a practical guide to the advocacy evaluation process. This resource list is a supplement to *Pathfinder*. It provides a listing of the best, up-to-date sources relevant to each topic discussed in *Pathfinder*. Many of these resources apply to multiple *Pathfinder* topics—not just the topic it is listed under. We draw on these resources in our own work, and we hope you find them helpful, too.

### Background Information:

### Recommended for:

Innovation Network, Inc. (2008). *Speaking for themselves: Advocates' perspectives on evaluation*. Washington, DC: Innovation Network, Inc.  
<http://www.innonet.org/resources/node/307>

Advocates  
 Funders  
 Evaluators

Based on Innovation Network's research, *Speaking for Themselves* examines advocates' views on evaluation, the advocacy strategies and capacities they find effective, and current evaluation practices. The report includes recommendations for advocates, funders, and evaluators.

Coffman, J. (2009). *Framing paper: Current advocacy evaluation practice*. Los Angeles, CA: The California Endowment.  
<http://www.calendow.org/uploadedFiles/Evaluation/TCE%20Framing%20Paper%20GENERAL2.doc?n=328>

Advocates  
 Funders  
 Evaluators

Written for the Advocacy Evaluation Advances convening in January 2009, this paper summarizes the current state of advocacy evaluation practice. The paper identifies four evaluation design questions and then offers common responses to those questions: *Who will do the evaluation?; What will the evaluation measure?; When will the evaluation take place?; and What methodology will the evaluation use?*

### Evaluation Purpose:

### Recommended for:

Guthrie, K., Louie, J., & Foster, C.C. (2005). *The challenge of assessing policy and advocacy activities: Strategies for a prospective evaluation approach*. San Francisco, CA: Blueprint Research & Design.  
[http://www.blueprintrd.com/text/challenge\\_assess.pdf](http://www.blueprintrd.com/text/challenge_assess.pdf)

Advocates  
 Funders  
 Evaluators

Produced for The California Endowment, this publication begins with an overview of the advocacy evaluation field and outlines a "prospective evaluation approach" which (in contrast to a retrospective approach) allows evaluation to become a management and planning tool. It offers steps for developing such an advocacy evaluation.



Evaluation Purpose (continued):	Recommended for:
Aspen Institute's Global Interdependence Initiative. <i>Continuous Progress evaluation guide for advocates</i> . Retrieved from <a href="http://fp.continuousprogress.org/advocates">http://fp.continuousprogress.org/advocates</a>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocates <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funders
Aspen Institute's Global Interdependence Initiative. <i>Continuous Progress evaluation guides for grantmakers</i> . Retrieved from <a href="http://fp.continuousprogress.org/grantmakers">http://fp.continuousprogress.org/grantmakers</a>	
<p>Continuous Progress is an online collection of planning and evaluation tools and services for advocates and funders. Their featured project, the "Advocacy Progress Planner," is an online tool based on the Advocacy &amp; Policy Change Composite Logic Model.</p>	
<p>Coffman, J. &amp; Harris, E. (2005) Ask the expert: What is strategic learning and how do you develop an organizational culture that encourages it? <i>The Evaluation Exchange</i>, 11(2), 8.  <a href="http://www.hfrp.org/evaluation/the-evaluation-exchange/issue-archive/evaluation-methodology/what-is-strategic-learning-and-how-do-you-develop-an-organizational-culture-that-encourages-it">http://www.hfrp.org/evaluation/the-evaluation-exchange/issue-archive/evaluation-methodology/what-is-strategic-learning-and-how-do-you-develop-an-organizational-culture-that-encourages-it</a></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocates <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funders <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluators
<p>In this newsletter article, John A. Healy, Director of Strategic Learning and Evaluation at The Atlantic Philanthropies, shares ways to position learning as an organizational priority.</p>	

Roles and Responsibilities:	Recommended for:
<p>UNICEF. <i>Internal vs. external evaluation</i>. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.ceecis.org/remf/Service3/unicef_rus/module3/docs/3-2-3_internal-vs-external-evaluation.doc">http://www.ceecis.org/remf/Service3/unicef_rus/module3/docs/3-2-3_internal-vs-external-evaluation.doc</a></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocates <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funders
<p>Few resources exist that thoroughly and accurately describe when to choose an internal and/or an external evaluator to conduct an evaluation. This one-page resource provides a helpful, concise comparison between internal and external evaluators</p>	
<p>Stufflebeam, D. (1999). <i>Evaluation contracts checklist</i>. Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University.  <a href="http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/contracts.pdf">http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/contracts.pdf</a></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocates <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funders
<p>Dr. Daniel Stufflebeam, founder of Western Michigan University's The Evaluation Center, shares his checklist for coming to agreement on an evaluation contract. This resource is particularly helpful for funders and advocates preparing for the first time to work with an external evaluator.</p>	



Theory of Change:	Recommended for:
<p>Aspen Institute's Global Interdependence Initiative. <i>Advocacy progress planner: An advocacy &amp; policy change composite logic model</i>. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.planning.continuousprogress.org/">http://www.planning.continuousprogress.org/</a></p> <p>This online tool walks the user through the construction of a composite logic model. Definitions and tips are offered throughout the process, and the end product is a customized composite logic model.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocates <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funders <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluators</p>
<p>Coffman, Julia. (2009). <i>A user's guide to advocacy evaluation planning</i>. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project. <a href="http://www.hfrp.org/evaluation/publications-resources/a-user-s-guide-to-advocacy-evaluation-planning">http://www.hfrp.org/evaluation/publications-resources/a-user-s-guide-to-advocacy-evaluation-planning</a></p> <p>This guide offers guidance on how to evaluate advocacy efforts by introducing several key evaluation planning steps using the composite logic model.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocates <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funders <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluators</p>
<p>Organizational Research Services, Inc. (2008). <i>Orientation to theory of change</i>. Seattle, WA: Organizational Research Services, Inc. <a href="http://www.organizationalresearch.com/publications/orientation_to_theory_of_change.pdf">http://www.organizationalresearch.com/publications/orientation_to_theory_of_change.pdf</a></p> <p>Organizational Research Services produced this worksheet to introduce a theory of change and the "Layer Cake" model.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocates <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funders <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluators</p>
<p>Harris, E. (2005) Ask the expert: An introduction to theory of change. <i>The Evaluation Exchange</i>, 11(2), 12. <a href="http://www.hfrp.org/evaluation/the-evaluation-exchange/issue-archive/evaluation-methodology/an-introduction-to-theory-of-change">http://www.hfrp.org/evaluation/the-evaluation-exchange/issue-archive/evaluation-methodology/an-introduction-to-theory-of-change</a></p> <p>In this newsletter article, Andrea Anderson, a research associate at the Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change, shares an introduction to theory of change and steps for creating a theory of change.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocates <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funders <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluators</p>
What to measure:	Recommended for:
<p>Guthrie, K., Louie, J., &amp; Foster, C.C. (2006). <i>The challenge of assessing policy and advocacy activities: Part II—Moving from theory to practice</i>. San Francisco, CA: Blueprint Research &amp; Design. <a href="http://www.blueprintrd.com/text/06_10_challengeofassessing.pdf">http://www.blueprintrd.com/text/06_10_challengeofassessing.pdf</a></p> <p>This report, produced for The California Endowment, synthesizes the results of a series of discussions that were a response to Blueprint's October 2005 report, "The challenge of assessing policy and advocacy activities: Strategies for a prospective evaluation approach." The publication focuses on data collection planning, defining benchmarks and indicators, collecting data, and using findings.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocates <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funders <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluators</p>



What to measure (continued):	Recommended for:
<p>Raynor, J., York, P., &amp; Sim, S. (2009). <i>What makes an effective advocacy organization? A framework for determining advocacy capacity</i>. San Francisco, CA: TCC Group. <a href="http://www.tccgrp.com/pdfs/EffectiveAdvocacy_final.pdf">http://www.tccgrp.com/pdfs/EffectiveAdvocacy_final.pdf</a></p> <p>Based on its evaluation of a cohort of advocacy groups funded by The California Endowment, TCC Group discussed four critical capacities for advocacy organizations: leadership capacity, adaptive capacity, management capacity, and technical capacity.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocates <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funders <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluators</p>
<p>Organizational Research Services, Inc. (2007). <i>A guide to measuring advocacy and policy</i>. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation. <a href="http://www.organizationalresearch.com/publications/a_guide_to_measuring_advocacy_and_policy.pdf">http://www.organizationalresearch.com/publications/a_guide_to_measuring_advocacy_and_policy.pdf</a></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocates <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funders <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluators</p>
<p>Organizational Research Services, Inc. (2007). <i>A handbook of data collection tools</i>. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation. <a href="http://www.organizationalresearch.com/publications/a_handbook_of_data_collection_tools.pdf">http://www.organizationalresearch.com/publications/a_handbook_of_data_collection_tools.pdf</a></p> <p>First, the guide provides advice for conducting an advocacy evaluation. Material is presented in two main sections: <i>Context of Measuring Advocacy and Policy Change Efforts</i> and <i>Designing Appropriate Evaluation</i>. Next, the handbook provides examples of data collection instruments and tools for advocacy evaluation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocates <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funders <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluators</p>
<p>Coffman, J. (2007). What's different about evaluating advocacy and policy change? <i>The Evaluation Exchange</i>, 13(1), 2. <a href="http://www.hfrp.org/evaluation/the-evaluation-exchange/issue-archive/advocacy-and-policy-change/what-s-different-about-evaluating-advocacy-and-policy-change">http://www.hfrp.org/evaluation/the-evaluation-exchange/issue-archive/advocacy-and-policy-change/what-s-different-about-evaluating-advocacy-and-policy-change</a></p> <p>In this article, Julia Coffman highlights the differences inherent in evaluating advocacy and policy change, and offers recommendations for evaluators who work in the field.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluators</p>
<p>Coffman, J. &amp; Reed, E. (2009). <i>Unique methods in advocacy evaluation</i>. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.innonet.org/resources/node/390">http://www.innonet.org/resources/node/390</a></p> <p>This brief, produced for the California Endowment, describes four new methods developed to respond to advocacy's unique measurement challenges: Bellwether Methodology; Policymaker Ratings; Intense Period Debriefs; and System Mapping.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funders <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluators</p>
<p>Beer, T. &amp; Reed, E. (2009). A model for multilevel advocacy evaluation. <i>The Foundation Review</i>, 1(3), 149-161. <a href="http://www.innonet.org/resources/node/469">http://www.innonet.org/resources/node/469</a></p> <p>An evaluator and funder discuss an ongoing evaluation designed to build grantees' capacity to evaluate their work and incorporate real-time feedback into their strategies; monitor the progress of each grantee toward its unique policy goals; and assess growth in capacity of the health advocacy community of Colorado as a whole.</p>	



**Analysis, Reflection, and Data Use:**

**Recommended for:**

Coffman, J. (2003). *Lessons in evaluating communications campaigns: Five case studies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.  
<http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/browse-our-publications/lessons-in-evaluating-communications-campaigns-five-case-studies>

- Advocates
- Funders
- Evaluators

Julia Coffman of the Harvard Family Research Project discusses the evaluation of five communications campaigns, including the methods used for data collection and analysis.

Mayne, J. (2008). *Contribution analysis: An approach to exploring cause and effect*. ILAC Brief 16. Retrieved from [http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/files/publications/briefs/ILAC\\_Brief16\\_Contribution\\_Analysis.pdf](http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/files/publications/briefs/ILAC_Brief16_Contribution_Analysis.pdf)

- Advocates
- Funders
- Evaluators

In this brief from Biodiversity International's Institutional Learning and Change Initiative (ILAC), John Mayne discusses the steps involved in contribution analysis. Contribution analysis is an approach that tests a theory of change against logic and evidence to understand the likelihood that an intervention contributed to an observed change. The analysis either confirms—verifies—the postulated theory of change or suggests revisions in the theory where the reality appears otherwise.

**Communications and Reporting:**

**Recommended for:**

Philip R. Lee Institute for Health Policy Studies of the University of California, San Francisco. (2008). *Clinic Consortia Policy and Advocacy Program: Evaluation executive summary*. Los Angeles, CA: The California Endowment.  
[http://www.calendow.org/uploadedFiles/Publications/Evaluation/General/ClinicConsortia\\_ExSum\\_9.pdf](http://www.calendow.org/uploadedFiles/Publications/Evaluation/General/ClinicConsortia_ExSum_9.pdf)

- Funders
- Evaluators

This resource provides a useful example of reporting advocacy evaluation findings to a diverse range of stakeholders and audiences. It describes results from 2004 to 2006, focusing on program outcomes of the grantee population.

Clear Horizon. (2008). *Participatory performance story reporting*. Retrieved from <http://www.clearhorizon.com.au/monitoring-evaluation/flagship-techniques/participatory-performance-story-reportin/>

- Advocates
- Funders
- Evaluators

Jess Dart of Clear Horizon (Victoria, Australia) developed participatory performance story reporting (PPSR) as a modification of Mayne's performance story approach. The PPSR technique is characterized by two elements: a five-stage participatory process whereby the information is generated and a five-part structure in which the report product is presented. PPSR aims to explore and report on the extent to which an intervention has contributed to outcomes, trying to answer the "impact" question.

**Communications and Reporting (continued):**

**Recommended for:**

- University of Wisconsin-Extension. (2002). *Quick tips: Basics of good evaluation reporting*.  
 Madison, WI: Board of Regents University of Wisconsin System  
<http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/resources/pdf/Tipsheet14.pdf>
- Advocates
  - Funders
  - Evaluators

This short and concise guide provides useful tips for evaluation reporting.

**Grant Making Decisions:**

**Recommended for:**

- Morariu, J. & Brennan, K. (2009). Effective advocacy evaluation: The role of funders. *The Foundation Review*, 1(3), 100-108.  
<http://www.innonet.org/resources/node/470>
- Funders

This paper addresses the role of funders in supporting accountability and effectiveness in advocacy work. Incorporating survey findings, interview findings, and their consulting experience, the authors discuss various advocacy evaluation challenges and approaches. Recommendations to funders to increase nonprofit involvement in advocacy and use of advocacy evaluation are also provided.

- Egbert, M., & Hoehstetter, S. (2006). Mission possible: Evaluating advocacy grants. *Foundation News & Commentary*, 47(1). Retrieved from  
[www.foundationnews.org/CME/article.cfm?ID=3545](http://www.foundationnews.org/CME/article.cfm?ID=3545)
- Funders
  - Evaluators

The article offers several advocacy evaluation tips to funders, including discussion of common expectations between funders and grantees, the adaptive nature of advocacy work, and contribution over attribution.

**Additional Resources:**

**Recommended for:**

- Innovation Network, Inc. *Advocacy Evaluation Update* (series). [www.innonet.org](http://www.innonet.org).
- Advocates
  - Funders
  - Evaluators
- The Advocacy Evaluation Update newsletter series highlights current events in advocacy evaluation and offers tools, tips, and resources.
- Coffman, J. (2008). Advocacy evaluation training scan. *Advocacy Evaluation Update*, 1(4). Retrieved from  
[http://www.innonet.org/resources/files/advocacy\\_evaluation\\_update\\_sept\\_2008.pdf](http://www.innonet.org/resources/files/advocacy_evaluation_update_sept_2008.pdf)
- Advocates
  - Funders
  - Evaluators

The training scan identified 14 organizations that reported providing customized advocacy evaluation training. The trainings cover a range of evaluation topics (theory of change/logic model; outcome selection; indicators/measures; and design/methods), and are designed for all audiences (advocates, funders, and evaluators). If you're looking to learn more about advocacy evaluation, this would be a great place to start.

- Behrens, T. (Ed.). (2009). *The Foundation Review*, 1(3).
- Funders
  - Evaluators

In its third issue, *Foundation Review* focused on advocacy and policy change. The issue provides eleven articles from an assortment of writers.



**Additional Resources (continued):**

**Recommended for:**

American Evaluation Association's Advocacy and Policy Change Topical Interest Group.

Evaluators

Membership and participation in AEA's Advocacy and Policy Change TIG is a great way to keep in touch with other evaluators, stay abreast of emerging approaches and tools, and to share your advocacy evaluation work. If you're interested in the TIG, contact Annette Gardner (annette [dot] gardner [at] ucsf [dot] edu).

All of these resources—and many more—are available through Innovation Network's online database of evaluation tools and resources, Point K. Free registration is Required: [www.innonet.org/resources](http://www.innonet.org/resources)