



# **Participatory Evaluation: A Missing Component in the Social Change Equation for Public Services**

Dr Robyn Keast  
School of Management  
Queensland University of Technology

---

**Paper presented to the Social Change in the  
21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference**

**Centre for Social Change Research  
Queensland University of Technology  
29 October 2004**

# Participatory Evaluation: A Missing Component in the Social Change Equation for Public Services

Dr Robyn Keast, School of Management (QUT)

The author acknowledges the contributions of the Evaluation Unit of the Department of Community and the dedication of the agencies; practitioners and citizens involved in changing the Queensland social services system. However, it should be noted that the views represented in this paper are those of the author and may not represent those of the Department of Communities or any other participating reform agency.

## *Abstract*

A series of social, economic and political forces have highlighted inadequacies in many current welfare practices and arrangements leading to a growing consensus that the welfare system needs to be reformed. However, social change in human service organisations generally, and child welfare services in particular, has proven to be difficult to achieve and sustain. A greater engagement of these agencies and their workers in the planning and implementation of reforms has been presented as a key strategy to overcome this resistance and achieve mutually satisfying service outcomes.

This paper argues that participative evaluation models that deliberately and genuinely involve personnel and external agencies in understanding and assessing the reform process can contribute to the enhanced uptake of social change initiatives. Drawing on the experiences of a current, Queensland child welfare reform initiative, underpinned by a strong participatory evaluation component, the paper provides some preliminary evidence of a shift in service practice and orientation in both local community and departmental operational levels. The paper concludes with some insights into the implications of the change process for both community and government actors.

## **Reshaping the Sector: Forces for Change**

Over the past century, and especially since the 1970s, most western democracies have established extensive human services sectors to meet the basic welfare and wellbeing of their citizens (Esping-Andersen, 1997). Although providing improved social circumstances and life conditions for many citizens (Quiggin, 1999) in recent times a consensus has emerged that the traditional mode of service delivery is no longer adequate or appropriate and should be reshaped (Saunders, 1998; Keating, 2000, 2001). Specifically, it is argued that a reliance on categorical or program-based funding arrangements, specialised departmental delivery modes and the associated service fragmentation challenge government's ability to effectively and efficiently deliver the comprehensive service packages necessary for vulnerable citizens (Agranoff, 1991), and in particular children and families (Schorr, 1997; Evans, Hurrell, Lewis, and Volpe, 1998).

There has also been a realisation that many of the important issues confronting the public sector are highly complex and crosscutting or interrelated and which defy traditional linear based problem solving processes and cannot be tackled by any one agency working alone (Clarke and Stewart, 1997; Huxham, 2000). Instead they require more holistic, innovative approach and the establishment of closer interaction and relationships between departments and increasingly other sectors (OECD, 1996; Peters, 1998). The limitations of siloed based and unintegrated services are especially problematic in Indigenous communities where holistic and comprehensive services are a key cultural requirement (Pearson, 1999).

As well as these service oriented issues, the need to reshape public service provision has been influenced by a number of broader social and economic forces including fiscal restraints (Beresford, 2000), the demands for better quality and localised services by a more diverse, sophisticated and better informed citizenry (Keating, 2000; Head, 1999) as well as the emergence of new, cost-efficient ways of meeting clients needs and delivering targeted public services brought about advances in information and communication technology (Bellamy and Taylor, 1998; Bellamy, 1999; Vincent, 1999).

The combined effect of these ideological, economic, technological and social factors is a widespread demand, for social change in terms of the reform of service delivery practices and models within the human services arena. Change in this context goes beyond alteration of internal structures and processes to include a fundamental alteration of mechanisms of decision-making, policy development and service provision.

### Barriers to Reform

Despite the calls for reform as a number of authors point out, change in human service organisations has generally proven to be difficult to achieve and even harder to sustain (Hasenfeld, 1992; Drake, Berfield, D'Gama, and Gallagher, 1995; Macbeth, 1993; Burke, 2002). On this broad phenomenon of resisting reform, Janowitz's earlier (1969, cited Hasenfeld, 1992: 226) proclamation retains a level of currency: "There has been a great deal of innovation and very little change". That is, after some experimentation most change programs "reverted to business as usual".. This lower level uptake of reform initiatives by human service agencies has been attributed largely to the fact that many change efforts in this arena, and particularly those initiated by government, have had an over reliance on top-down, mandated change strategies (Hasenfeld, 1992; Agranoff, 1991). Such an orientation restricts involvement in decision-making to a select group of individuals and fails to engage or even inform the recipients of services of the change agenda.

A further factor impacting on the reform of human services centres on the professional ethos held by human service practitioners that, while strongly client focused, could be over-protective preventing change (Hasenfeld, 1992). Child welfare services in particular have been referred to as "monolithic bureaucracies" (Cohen and Austin, 1994). Referring to their poor take up of reform initiatives, Bargal and Schmid (1992: 5-6) have stated: "professionals tend to demand autonomy and expect authority in the making of decisions and the formulation and implementation of strategy". Further, clients themselves can be reluctant to engage in reform processes because of a preference for what is known and/or a lack of information about the change intentions.

Nevertheless there is evidence to suggest that human service organisations are capable of and do change. For example, Hasenfeld (1992) reported that a series of social services reforms in the 1970s provided evidence of change in practice in juvenile corrections, the YMCA and neighbourhood health care programs in the United States. A key aspect in many of these service renovations as well as more recent endeavours was a shift away from traditional, top-down processes of change to the increased inclusion of participants in the reform and evaluation process. Indeed, for almost twenty years evaluators have been writing about the benefits of including program participants and other stakeholders in the design and administration of program evaluations (Carlsson, 2000; Nichols, 2002; Campbell, Patton and Patrizi, 2003). As a consequence there has recently been an explosion of evaluation processes that are more participatory, more democratic, and inclusive with the intent that they are more useful, effective and utilised (Patton, 1997;Thoenig, 2000). Thus, through its inclusive practices and processes and by tapping other, often peripheral, sources of expertise and experience, participatory evaluation provides the missing component of the social change equation and offers a new way forward for social change

## **Participatory Evaluation: A New Way Forward for Social Change**

A participative approach to evaluation is one in which rather than adopting a distant independent stance, evaluators work in a collaborative partnership way to facilitate and support participants in owning and understanding evaluation with the dual objective of promoting program enhancement/improvement and encouraging self-evaluation and self-determination (Patton, 2002). Such a process facilitates stakeholder 'buy-in' because they have a sense of ownership of the evaluation process and are more likely to implement change. However, participatory evaluation does not preclude the involvement of external experts. Instead, the expert plays a facilitating role in partnership with the community or program staff, rather than being the "expert supreme" who decides in isolation how the evaluation will be conducted. In this way participatory evaluation can contribute to the building local capacity for decision-making (Narayan, 1993; Patton, 2002).

Narayan (1993) in discussing the application of participatory evaluation models stressed that methods used to gather data and insights necessarily have to be flexible, simple and eclectic in order to reflect the operating environment. Other participatory evaluation proponents have been more prescriptive identifying methods and processes such as action learning teams, focus groups, story telling, personal interview and visual techniques as key vehicles for data gathering (Patton, 1997; Burke, 2002).

Although evaluations that are both participatory and outcome-based are perceived as more successful than other types of evaluation, in general most evaluations do not follow this model and those that do tend only to employ aspects of the model.

### **Methodology**

Drawing on the preliminary results of a recent Queensland reform initiative, this paper tests the proposition that participatory evaluation can contribute positively to implementing social change. Further, it seeks to examine the factors restricting this model. A range of qualitative techniques of data gathering including case studies and stories, semi-structured interviews, focus groups for community and government respondents as well as documentation have been used to build a picture of the reform process, the participant's experiences and its initial impacts. These methodologies allow for rich and thick insights into the new service models as well as the uncovering the emergent relationships between provider groups. To tap into the experiences, reflections and insights of evaluation personnel with respect to the evaluation process, the paper also draws on information generated from reflective practice sessions. In this way the personal or 'lived experiences' of all reform participants, their understanding and interpretation of these experiences, and the context in which they occurred provided the primary focus for this research project (Marshall and Rossman, 1990).

### ***Social Change Reform in the Queensland Human Services Arena***

The Department of Communities has lead agency responsibility for the provision of services and programs to assist the more vulnerable citizens of the state – families, children and senior citizens (Queensland Government, 2002). Since its inception during the 1950s, the department's approach to family welfare services has been described by as piecemeal and marginalised particularly in terms of its funding allocation and policy development (Walsh, 1993; Marston, MacDonald and Zetlin, 2000). Indeed, when other Australian jurisdictions were subject to substantial reform the Queensland system remained unaffected (Walsh, 1993). Eventually, similar to other jurisdictions, Queensland was confronted by the suit of change factors identified above. However, while the suit of factors identified above have provided the broad context for a reform of the Queensland public service model, the change agenda has been strongly influenced

by a number of localised events, reviews and reports that have highlighted ongoing and current limitations hindering the optimal provision of public services in this state (Walsh, 1993; Marston *et al*, 2000; Forde Report, 1999; Department of Families, 1999).

Despite a range of reforms introduced during the 1990s, the child welfare system in Queensland has continued to require significant change to bring it to an equivalent status with many other jurisdictions nationally and internationally. In responding to these issues, on 20 June 2002 the Queensland government launched *Queensland Families: Future Directions* as its central policy statement to guide program development and service delivery to the state's most vulnerable citizens – those that are at risk of not meeting their full potential (Department of Families, 2003). *Future Directions* is a five-year change agenda designed to address critical and long-standing deficits and gaps in child and family service delivery in Queensland. The statement outlined the government's vision for investing a \$148 million four-year budget increase for the Department of Families (Communities) as the lead agency. A stronger focus on and investment in prevention and early intervention, enhanced service delivery practices and techniques and a renewed emphasis on building stronger working relationships with community agencies and service recipients were central principles for the reform process and its ongoing sustainability (Queensland Government, 2002). *Queensland Families: Future Directions* signalled a new direction, a new focus and a new emphasis (*Future Directions: One Year Milestone: 1*).

In this way, the *Future Directions* initiative can be described as a deliberative and strategic attempt to shift the department's service delivery model from a largely functional welfare oriented, 'people processing' approach to a model in which departmental services and personnel link with internal and external networks of service providers to supply a more comprehensive, prevention orientate, better integrated and more client-responsive suite of services. Such a model is consistent with the 'new public service model' articulated by Denhardt and Denhardt (2000), which is more inclusive, engaged and based on the establishment of shared patterns of service development and delivery including partnerships and networked forms.

The *Future Directions* strategy consists of twenty-seven (27) initiatives located within five (5) broad areas of service delivery: prevention and early intervention; increased financial and non-financial support to Foster carers; greater recognition and support to the community sector as a partner; higher profile of seniors' interests; and trialling better ways of working communication and information technologies to help workers be more efficient and effective (Queensland Government, 2002).

Reflecting the range of issues being addressed, the complexity and the diversity of the client populations, these initiatives have been implemented both internal and external to the department, at a number of levels of operation and at various sites across the state. In this way the *Future Directions* can be described, as a complex, multi-level initiative comprised of many features. The size and complexity of the reform agenda associated with *Future Directions* presents a high risk of unaligned action, duplication of effort, resource wastage and goal confusion. In view of this a change management process was put in place to guide the reform agenda and keep it on track. In addition to providing structured processes and mechanisms to enhance reform implementation, a major component of this change management prescription was an emphasis on continuous learning and evaluation. Indeed, it was considered that with *Future Directions* there was an opportunity for the mutual dialogue, relationship building and learning that has been absent from prior models (Queensland Government, 2002). The change model and its underpinning evaluation process was informed by organisational learning theories and practices that sought to assist participants to examine, reflect and review the application of theory to practice (Senge, 1990) through the use of participatory practices and processes. In this way, evaluation, rather than being an

additional consideration or requirement was used as a central plank of the reform process to monitor, inform and guide action.

Clearly, since the Future Directions reform has a strong top down implementation orientation and is subject to social and political imperatives to succeed, it cannot be described as a 'pure participatory' process. Nevertheless, the adoption of many of the participatory evaluation strategies locates it within a broad participatory framework that provides opportunity for exploration.

### **Evaluating Future Directions**

Responsibility for the development of an evaluation framework for the Future Directions initiative and its primary conduct has been assigned to the Evaluation Unit which is currently part of the Review and Evaluation Branch within the Department. Although this branch reports directly to the Director-General and is therefore largely independent of the operational and policy directorates, as critical partners in the change process these areas have been actively involved in the development of the evaluation process as well as the analysis of the emerging data. In forming an evaluation design and implementation strategy, the Evaluation Unit drew on many of the participatory evaluation principles outlined previously. As a commencing point it has applied a broad theory of change approach that required Future Directions initiatives to clearly articulate the intended changes in service provision to take place, the underpinning rationale for change, the pathways or steps that change would occur as well as identification of expected service outcomes and deliverables (Department of Families, 2003). In operationalising the 'theory of change' processes a Program Logic model was applied to identify key stakeholders (in addition to departmental representatives) and to bring their voice and perspective to the evaluation and reform process. This process also provided a framework to assist the articulation of program design elements, their outcomes and causal linkages (Project Management Solutions, 2000; Department of Families, 2003). In order to assist participant services to develop a program logic the Evaluation Unit conducted a number of workshops with service providers to develop the program logic for their service, clarify the links between actions and jointly establishing ways of observing and measuring outcomes. As Nichols (2002: 9-10) notes: "Clarifying program goals and program theory through an evaluation plan provides another opportunity to make the purposes and desired outcomes of the program explicit. Allowing group members to state their viewpoints and be equally involved in the process of designing the evaluation will help determine the future roles of planning members in a participatory evaluation". The program logic framework also served to forecast potential unintended consequences of interventions (Department of Families, 2003: 5).

Internal stakeholders have been accommodated through the creation of an Evaluation Working Group (EWG) comprised of representatives of each directorate within the department. This group provides operational and policy advice to the Evaluation Unit and reports on the progress of the evaluation to the Future Directions Steering Committee. To ensure that the evaluation methodologies and practices are culturally appropriate and provide useful information for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients and services, the Evaluation Unit has also established a group of Aboriginal and Islander people who will act as critical friends throughout the evaluation. Finally, the Evaluation Unit has established ongoing linkages with other departments, research bodies and institutions to facilitate external input and peer review into the evaluation framework and implementation process. Through these practices and processes the Department is making positive progress toward its objective of achieving an evaluation process that "...occurs with the program sponsors and providers and participants, rather than being done to them" (Department of Families, 2002a).

To facilitate increased participation of stakeholder groups in the operation and evaluation of services, a range of strategies have been employed. A key tactic has been the use of Action Learning Teams, comprised of project personnel, management staff and external stakeholders. The purpose of the Action Learning Teams is to encourage critical reflection of actions undertaken to generate understanding and knowledge that then informs the development of plans for future action (Department of Families, 2002b: 7).

Evaluation Unit personnel also participated in the action learning processes, particularly with respect to the evaluation process. In this situation the role of evaluation personnel as critical friends is to assist action learning teams and projects to best meet their data collection requirements through the exploration of alternative methodologies, instruments and performance indicators as well as facilitate and support reflective processes (Department of Families: 2002b: 8). Modelled broadly on the original concept of critical friend developed by the education sector, the primary role of the critical friend within the Future Directions initiative was officially described as:

Providing expert advice, support and encouragement to Action Learning Teams ... to enable them to fulfil service delivery and reporting obligations and achieve improved service delivery outcomes (Department of Families, 2002b: 7).

Also consistent with the emergent prescriptions for complex, comprehensive reform processes (Sanderson, 2000) and participatory methodologies a mixed method evaluation design using multiple data gathering strategies and respondents was employed. Quantitative methods such as service outputs and surveys were used to ascertain the number of type of client-related activities undertaken by agencies. Coupled with this, qualitative processes such as case studies and self and stakeholder reports as well as cultural relevant processes including 'story telling' provided more detailed operational and performance insights into what worked (or didn't) and under what circumstances. The Unit also worked with participating services to develop mutually satisfying and useful tools and instruments to facilitate standard data collection requirements such as client demographics, service activities and completion rates. Further, in order to keep evaluation partners informed of progress the evaluation framework relied on a number of different information dissemination and reporting processes including monthly data reports, feedback sessions, meetings and reflective practice sessions (Department of Families, 2003). Such processes, and in particular those that involved the Evaluation Unit providing feedback via practice reports, monthly data updates and informed commentary on case studies and evaluation reports, were intended to provide services with a range of data and insights with which to examine their delivery practices and make necessary adjustments as the projects unrolled.

## **Findings and Discussion**

Over the eighteen-month period of the reform project all the trials have been implemented. The Evaluation Unit has completed an initial evaluation of the trails. Preliminary results available from documentation and case reports provide some evidence of the beginnings of a shift in service delivery orientation. Indeed, the progress of Future Directions as a reform agenda was been acknowledged by other sources including the Crime and Misconduct Commission Inquiry (2004).

### *New Ways of Working*

Case study reports provided by both internal and external trial participants (2003) show some short-term evidence of a shift in service orientation from a previously siloed approach to more collaborative, inter-agency models that have inherent benefits of integration and innovation. Evidence of the understanding of the more collective

approach in these new ways of working can be seen in the following statement by a participating agency:

A collaborative model of service delivery is a new way of working for the ... organisations involved.... [which] historically have worked, for the most part, in isolation from other services.

The added benefit of innovation and creativity arising from these enhanced relationships and new, more collaborative ways of working was also acknowledged by a community respondent: "The model not only gives ... services an opportunity to develop better working relationships, it also enables them to look at novel ways of working".

Respondent agencies recognised that building and maintaining relationships with other providers and departmental services agencies was an essential aspect of this shift in service delivery mode. This was exemplified in the following statement:

Hope, networks, relationships, trust and support came together with the change processes and provided the turning point within the intervention.

It was also acknowledged that where these relationships were not secure or weak, the agencies struggled to deliver as they intended.

The importance of improved relationships between agencies and government as a conduit to 'working together' is also reflected in the broader literature (Edwards, 2000; Huxham, 2000; Keast, Mandell, Brown and Woolcock, 2004). While a better working relation between agencies and between agencies and the department was consistently identified as an outcome of the reform process, for most respondents the time and effort required to build, facilitate and sustain those relationships presented as an additional task. The issue of time was reflected in the frequently mentioned statement by both respondent groups that: "Relationship building takes time". There was also a strong understanding by all services both internal and external and particularly Indigenous agencies that moving to a collaborative model was strongly dependent on having "already built a relationship".

The need for additional time and effort in building and maintaining relationships, and particularly those that have been 'bruised' as a result of prior competitive or controlling practices is widely acknowledged in the academic literature (Edwards, 2000; Cigler, 2001). However, as Keast *et al* (2004: 369) found, although relationship building is recognised as central to collaborative endeavours the time and effort taken to establish and sustain these improved relations can be perceived as being at the expense of achieving outcomes and, as a consequence, the results can be undermined. Nevertheless as these authors (Keast *et al*, 2004; Keast, 2004) have discovered there are strategies that can be employed to 'ramp up' or 'turbo charge' relationships. Within the Future Directions initiative the use of action learning teams and critical friends has provided a way to 'fast track' relationships.

#### *Action Learning Teams*

Action learning teams were identified by a number of respondents (both internal and external) as a useful mechanism for relationship building within and between agencies. Indeed the provision of "... opportunities for professional development through the forming of working partnerships across disciplines and with the Department of Families in an action learning process" was considered by community agency respondents to be a key strength of the reform mechanism. Some participants expressed the view that this was the first time that they had been able to discuss professional issues outside their own agency.



Action learning was also described as being an effective process for reflective practice because it enabled people with different expertise and perspectives to discuss practice issues and extend the capacity of all those involved toward best practice. As a government respondent noted:

The action learning team was a critical factor in the success of this trial. The action learning process provided a regular opportunity to examine practice and learn from shared experiences. Access to the academic critical friend was particularly valuable.

The preliminary reports indicated that action learning worked best where there was a culture of reflective practice and where action learning was used as a tool to achieve continuous learning rather than as an operational management tool.

Consistent with the outcomes of other research efforts (Canadian Centre for Management Development, 1999), alternative communication mechanisms such as team meetings and inter-agency meetings were identified by both respondent groups as “useful ways to develop learnings about the project”. As well as contributing to practice reflections and alternative views of service delivery, the reflective processes offered by action learning teams, focus groups and reflective practitioner sessions have also resulted in the development of new or alternative evaluation methods and tools/instruments that better meet the practice, operational and cultural needs of services. This contribution was articulated by the Department as follows:

A focus group of Indigenous staff advised the evaluation on what they considered to be important features of the trials and what outcomes they would want to see to determine if the trial was effective. Workers were invited to present their work orally to Indigenous listeners rather than in writing with an emphasis on stories – rich case studies that showed the clients’ needs, the intervention they applied and the results.

The evaluators’ observations were generally that through participation in action learning teams and their role as critical friends they were able to build trust and stronger relationships with respondent agencies. It was noted that as well as providing a constant contact within the department, the critical friend role was able to provide insights and assistance and constant encouragement for actions and input. A side effect of these perceived enhanced relationships was a greater commitment to data gathering and evaluation. An evaluation unit member highlighted this view in the following comment:

Being almost embedded in the agency ... helps build relationships, get better data and hopefully enhanced outcomes for agencies.

On reflection evaluation personnel agreed that there were some agencies and services that had not been fully engaged in either the reform process or the evaluation. This impacted on the level of ‘buy-in’ that could be secured from agencies and personnel.

To the point where workers really want (to be involved) where they have an investment in creating an evidence base for this new model of practice.

It was also acknowledged that the expertise of the external critical friends could have been used more strategically to ensure that important material was captured and insights were enhanced. It was reflected: “... it’s like the knowledge base of the critical friend versus the knowledge base of the evaluator” (Evaluation Unit respondent).

Similar to the practitioners' experience evaluation staff found that taking on a more engaged role was more labour intensive. Brown (1996) and other participatory evaluators, although stressing the value of inclusive evaluation strategies, have acknowledged the additional commitment of time and energy required by evaluation staff in participatory model. The cost/benefits issue of time continued as a theme, for while it was noted that: "Interacting with (respondent) agencies helped to fine tune our own evaluation and data gathering strategies". Respondents also stated that: "Finding and taking time for internal evaluation capacity building" was difficult as evaluation timelines were frequently short and workloads high and often overtaken by shifting priorities.

For some evaluation personnel the issue of creditability, or the quality control evaluation design, selection of appropriate methodology or data gathering processes and the resulting quality of data generated was a concern. For example it was stated:

Lead agents were responsible for the quality of the data, but really they do not have the skills, the expertise. But still we wanted to be proactive.

In this way there was a feeling of 'loss of control' of the evaluation through having to share decision-making with respect to design methodology and data gathering mechanisms. However, this concern was tempered by a realisation that these other sources and processes provided for confirmation of validity and reliability. Thus, similar to Brown (1996:7) for the evaluators there was almost a "conflict between a legitimate need to be perceived as credible and their sense that taking on some roles traditionally considered outside of the evaluation enterprise may produce important and useful learning".

While many participant services and their clients saw benefit in the attempt to shift the service delivery model and embraced the opportunity to work collaboratively in the change process, there remained a number of agencies that continued to feel excluded from the reform. This was made evident at a feedback session where some respondents indicated that: 'the use of 'specialist' evaluation terminology and language served to exclude agencies from full participation. Along a similar line, Huxham and Vangen (1996) in their review of collaborative endeavours found that the: "Unthinking use of language can make collaborators angry and disempowered as well as disaffected and confused.

Together these factors of time, level of engagement required, concerns about quality control and the sharing of decision-making and power, provide some insights into the difficulties in fully implementing participatory evaluation. They also forecast new roles for all participants.

### *New Evaluation Roles*

From the beginning the Future Directions evaluation process forecast a change of mode of operating and evaluating for participating agencies, personnel and evaluation staff. For many agencies, and particularly those with capacity to participate at a higher level, this change was well accepted and responded to positively. However, it was generally identified that a shift to this style of working, where there is greater responsibility for both the program and the evaluation, required a rethinking of practice, skills and capacity. For the evaluation staff, in particular, there was a strong realisation that these new evaluation processes, which shifted them from the centre of the evaluation process or 'owning it' to a role in which they bring together the data and facilitate other stakeholders to interpret this within their operating frameworks. The shift in the role of evaluator in participatory approaches has been noted by a number of commentators. Shea, Lewko, Flynn, Boschen and Volpe (1995), anticipated a change in the role of evaluators from just facilitating evaluation to also facilitating program and

organisational development. Along a similar line, Brown (1996:1) described it as moving from “outputs monitor to that of collaborator”. Clearly, for all involved the participatory model of evaluation brought with it the need to tap into a broader skill set around facilitation and engagement.

### **Conclusions and implications**

Human services have entered an era of high uncertainty in which the pressures for change will be ever present. The long term survival, vitality and effectiveness of human service organisations depend on their capacity to change. Historically, however, human service organisations have not responded well to either the need or directive for change. The involvement of relevant players and stakeholders in the planning, implementation and evaluation of change processes has been found to have a positive effect on reform uptake and sustainability.

This paper has provided some preliminary evidence to confirm that a participatory evaluation approach to reform has merit and can produce benefits. In doing so, it has also highlighted a number of implications for providers, change agents and evaluation staff that need to be considered when adopting this model. In particular such an approach requires a greater investment in time and engagement for relationship building, a willingness to ‘share power’ and genuinely work together. Moving to a more participatory or inclusive model of service delivery and evaluation also requires a shift in the role and capabilities of practitioners and evaluators. For evaluation personnel the change in role from evaluation manager to facilitator is perhaps the most critical consideration.

## References

- Agranoff, R. (1991). Human Services Integration: Past and Present Challenges in Public Administration *Public Administration Review* 51 (6): 533-542.
- Bargal, D. and Schmid, H. (1992). Organizational Change and Development in Human Service Organizations: A Prefatory Essay *Administration in Social Work* 7 (4): 1-13.
- Bellamy, C. and Taylor, J. (1998). *Governing in the Information Age* Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bellamy, C. (1999). Joining-Up Government in the UK: Toward Public Services for an Information Age *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 53 (8):
- Beresford, Q. (2000). *Governments, Markets and Globalisation: Australian Public Policy in Context* St Leonards: Allen & Unwin.
- Brown, P. (1996). Shaping the Evaluator's Role in a Theory of Change Evaluation: Reflections <http://www.aspeninstitute.org/Program3.asp?bid=1281> accessed 17/10/03.
- Burke, W.W. (2002). *Organizational Change: Theory and Practice*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Campbell, M, Patton, M.Q., and P. Patrizi (2003). Changing Stakeholder Needs and Changing Evaluation Styles: The Central Valley Partnership of the James Irvine Foundation *Evaluation and Program Planning* 26: 459-469.
- Canadian Centre for Management Development (1999). *Moving from the Heroic to the Everyday: Lessons Learnt from Leading Horizontal Projects* Canadian Centre for Management Development.
- Carlsson, L. (2000). Non-Hierarchical Evaluation of Policy *Evaluation* 6 (2): 201-216.
- Cigler, B. (2001). Multitorganizational, Multisector and Multicommunity Organizations: Setting the research Agenda, in M.P. Mandell (ed.) *Getting Results Through Collaboration: Networks and Network Structures for Public Policy and Management* Westport, Ct.: Quorum books, 71-85.
- Clarke, M and Stewart, J (1997). *Handling the Wicked Issues: A Challenge for Government*, in LOGOV Discussion Paper, Institute of Local Government Studies, University of Buckingham.
- Cohen, B. J. and Austin, M.J. (1994). Organizational Learning and Change in A public Child Welfare Organization *Administration in Social Work* 18(1): 1-19.
- Commission of Inquiry into Abuse of Children in Queensland Institutions (1999) (Forde Report) *Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Abuse of Children in Queensland Institutions*, Queensland Government: Brisbane.
- Crime and Misconduct Commission (2004). *Protecting Children: An Inquiry into Abuse in Foster Care*, Queensland Government: Brisbane.
- Denhardt, R. and Denhardt, J. (2000). The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering *Public Administration Review* 60 (6): 549-559.
- Department of Families (1999). *Putting Families First: Listening to Queenslanders*, Queensland Government: Brisbane.

- Department of Families (2002a). Future Directions – Info Sheet: About Evaluation
- Department of Families. (2002b). Action Learning Teams Operating Principles <http://www.communities.qld.gov.au/department/futuredirections/resources/action.html>
- Department of Families (2003). Queensland Families: Future Directions Strategy *Evaluation Framework*, Brisbane.
- Edwards, M. (2000). Participatory Governance into the Future: Roles for Government and Community Sectors *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 60 (3): 78-88.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1997). *Family, Market and Community: Equity and Efficiency in Social Policy*, Office of Economic and Cooperative Development: Paris.
- Evans, P, Hurrell, P. , Lewis, M and Volpe, R. (Eds). *Coordinating Services for Children and Youth at Risk: A World View*, Centre for Educational Research and Organization for Economic and Cooperative Development: Paris.
- Keast, R. (2004). Integrated Public Services: The Role of Networked Arrangements unpublished PhD thesis, School of Management, Queensland University of Technology
- Keast, R., Mandell, M.P., Brown, K, and G. Woolcock (2004). Network Structures: Working Differently and Changing Expectations *Public Administration Review* 64 (3): 363-371.
- Keating, M. (2000). The Pressures for Change in G. Davis and M. Keating (Eds.) *The Future of Governance: Policy Choices* St Leonards: Allen & Unwin 8-40.
- Keating, M. (2001). Reshaping Service Delivery in G. Davis and P. Weller (Eds.) *Are You Being Served? State, Citizens and Government* St Leonards: Allen & Unwin 98-125.
- Hasenfeld, Y. (1972). People Processing Organizations: An Exchange Approach *American Sociological Review* 37:256-63
- Hasenfeld, Y. (1992). *Human Services as Complex Organizations* Newbury Park, CA.: Publications.
- Head, B. (1999). The Changing Role of the Public Service: Improving Service Delivery *Canberra Bulletin of Public Administration* 94: 1-3.
- Huxham, C. and Vangen, S. (1996). Working Together: Key Themes in the Management of Relationships Between Public and Non-Profit Organisations. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 9 (7): 5-17.
- Huxham, C. (2000). The Challenge of Collaborative Advantage. *Public Management* 2 (2): 337-357
- Marshall, S. and Rossman, G.B. (1989). *Designing Qualitative Research* Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Marston, G., McDonald, C. and Zetlin, D. (2000). *Community Services in Queensland: An Environmental Scan*, Community Services Strategy Research Paper, prepared for the Community Services Strategy Secretariat, Social Policy Unit Department of Premier and Cabinet, Qld.

- Narayan, D. (1993). *Participation Sourcebook*, The World Bank <http://www.worldbank.org/html/edi/sourcebook/>
- Nicols, N. (2002). Participatory Program Planning: Including Program Participants and Evaluators *Evaluation and Planning* 25: 1-14.
- OECD (1996). *Strategic Governance and Policy Making: Managing Cross-cutting Issues*, PUMA: Paris.
- Patton, M.Q. (1997). The Changing Role of the Public Service: Improving Service Delivery *Canberra Bulletin of Public Administration* 94: 1-3.
- Patton (2002) "Two Decades of Developments in Qualitative Inquiry: A Personal, Experiential Perspective" *Qualitative Social Work* 1(3): 261-283
- Pearson, N. (1999). Positive and Negative Welfare and Australia's Indigenous Communities *Family Matters* 54 (Spring/Summer): 30-35.
- Peters, B.G. (1998). Managing Horizontal Government: The Politics of Coordination *Public Administration* 76 92): 295-311.
- Project Management Solutions Pty Ltd (2000). *Maximising Project Success by Designing LogFrames* Workshop Manual Version3.0.
- Queensland Government (2002). *Queensland Families: Future Directions*, Brisbane.
- Quiggan, J. (1999). The Future of Government: Mixed Economy or Minimal State *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 58 (4): 39-53.
- Sanderson, I. (2000). Evaluation in Complex Policy Systems *Evaluation* 6 (4): 433-454.
- Saunders, P. (1998). *Global Pressures: National Responses: The Australian Welfare State in Context*, SPRC Discussion Paper No.90, October 1998.
- Schorr, L. (1997). *Common Purpose: Strengthening families and neighbourhoods to Rebuild America* Anchor Books: Australia.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization* Currency: Doubleday, Australia.
- Shea, M.P., Lewko, J.J., Flynn, R.J., Boschen, K.A. and Volpe, R. (1995). Design and Measurement Considerations in Evaluating Integrated Human Service Delivery Systems *Evaluation Practice* 16 (3): 247-253.
- Thoenig, J-C. (2000). Evaluation as Useable knowledge for Public Management Reforms *Evaluation* 6 (2): 217-229.
- Vincent, I. (1999). Collaboration and Integrated Services in the New South Wales Public Services *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 58 (3): 50-54.  
Queensland Government
- Walsh, P. (1993). Welfare Policy in B. Stevens and J. Wanna (Eds.) *Goss Government: Promise and Performance of Labor in Queensland* Macmillan: South Melbourne 215-225.