Beth Johnson
FOUNDATION
looking at ageing in new ways

'How Do You Know That Intergenerational Practice Works?

A guide to getting started on evaluating Intergenerational Practice'.

Miriam Bernard
Stephen W Ellis

May 2004

LLOYDS TSB
FOUNDATIONS

COMMUNITY
FUND
Lottery money making a difference

‘How Do You Know That Intergenerational Practice Works?’

A guide to getting started on evaluating Intergenerational Practice.

Miriam Bernard (Centre for Social Gerontology, Keele University)
Stephen W Ellis (Institute of Education, Manchester Metropolitan University)

Foreword by Alan Hatton-Yeo (Director: Beth Johnson Foundation)

May 2004

Foreword

In recent years there has been an increasing interest in developing projects and processes that connect the generations to their mutual benefit. This interest has developed as a result of a number of factors that include:

- A recognition of the impact of increased life-expectancy and demographic shift (The Ageing Society).
- Changing economic and welfare patterns and the impact this has on society.
- Change and re-alignment in the structures of families.
- Community development coming back on the agenda and the need for socially inclusive approaches that can engage with the whole community.
- A concern about the perceived distance that has grown between many young and old people.
- The need to see the young and old as assets capable of making a valuable and essential contribution to their communities.

Such approaches have typically been characterised as intergenerational programmes or practice and it is this label that we will use for this publication. The importance of intergenerational practice has now been recognised across the world. The International Consortium for Intergenerational Programmes draws its membership from every continent and a shared recognition that we cannot take for granted that traditional relationships between the young and old will not be continually reshaped by social change.

To develop our understanding of intergenerational practice, the Community Fund and the Lloyds TSB Foundations for England and Wales funded the establishment of a UK Centre for Intergenerational Practice based at the Beth Johnson Foundation, that was launched in April 2001.

Since its inception the Centre has aimed to build networks, develop a systematic understanding of intergenerational practice and provide support to practitioners, policy makers and academics to enable them to engage more effectively.

In June 2003 the Centre held its first UK Conference at the University of Keele. Prior to this conference practitioners had been expressing an increasing desire for information that addressed evaluation from an intergenerational perspective. A seminar was held at the conference that explored this issue further and led to the production of this guide.

Our particular thanks go to the Lloyds TSB Foundations for England and Wales for funding this guide. We hope it will provide a useful tool and it is one of a series of publications we will be producing throughout the next two years.

Alan Hatton-Yeo
Director
The Beth Johnson Foundation

Background and aims

Some fifteen years ago now, a need was identified locally in North Staffordshire for a document that would enable those working in the voluntary sector to engage more easily in the process of evaluating their work (Bernard 1990). Since this time, the Beth Johnson Foundation has been continuing to develop and expand its activities and has been intimately involved in developing, researching and evaluating a range of intergenerational projects (Granville 2002; Ellis 2003a, 2003b). The focus of the Foundation's approach has been on promoting greater understanding and respect between the generations. Intergenerational practice aims to build upon the positive resources that different generations have to offer each other, and their communities. Its proponents believe it is an effective way to address some key Government priorities such as building active communities, promoting citizenship and social inclusion, regenerating neighbourhoods and addressing inequality between (inter), and across (multi), the generations (Beth Johnson Foundation 2003). Recently too, the original evaluation guide, together with the evaluation tools and techniques being used in the Foundation's ongoing research, formed the basis of an evaluation workshop at the 'Neighbourhoods for All Ages: Intergenerational Work in the UK' conference (Ellis 2003b). One important issue emerging from that workshop was a request from practitioners for the original guide to be updated and made more specific and relevant to those working in the intergenerational practice (IP) field.

Using the guide

Whilst this new guide can be read and used in its entirety, it is important to remember that you do not necessarily need to evaluate every aspect of every project! Indeed, IP practitioners can use the guide to focus on one or more aspects that best suit theirs and their project's needs at the time.

Moreover, this is not a 'how to' guide. There are many other such texts now available – some of which are included in the resource section at the end of this document. Rather, it is intended as a stimulus for groups or individuals who are beginning to think about monitoring and evaluating their own intergenerational practice. In this sense, it is very much about self-evaluation as opposed to evaluation imposed from the outside. However, it must be acknowledged that the impetus for setting up self-evaluation procedures does often come from external pressures.

The guide also stems from recognition that there is a wealth of experience and expertise amongst IP workers and volunteers that can be harnessed and developed in an evaluation context, as well as in terms of the day-to-day work people do (BJF 2003a). With support and guidance, monitoring and evaluation can and should become an integral element of a project's/organisation's functioning. In 2001, Granville (2002) identified over 200 intergenerational projects around the United Kingdom. Since then, the Centre for Intergenerational Practice (CIP) has been established at the Beth Johnson Foundation and, at the time of writing, now holds details of over 600 IP projects across the UK.

Who is the guide for?

The guide is relevant to those organisations and individuals who organise, fund and deliver an intergenerational approach in their work. Such organisations or individuals may wish, or need, to identify the outcomes that a particular intergenerational project has generated. Interested stakeholders might include:

- Intergenerational practice project managers
- IP project workers and developers
- Children and young people
- Older people from the middle and older generations
- Voluntary groups
- Schools
- Local authorities
- IP funders

What kinds of IP projects do we mean?

Defining intergenerational practice is extraordinarily difficult and there is, as yet, no widely accepted definition. In the context of this guide, intergenerational approaches and projects would include work with various organisations and on some/all of the following areas and themes:

- Active communities
- Age Concern Millennium awards
- Area-based initiatives
- Citizenship
- Community networks/civic participation
- Conflict resolution
- Environmental regeneration
- Intergenerational learning
- Intergenerational cultural understanding
- Local identity/sense of solidarity
- Mentoring initiatives
- Millennium Volunteers
- Neighbourhood renewal strategies
- Social exclusion and inclusion
- The Experience Corps
- Trust and reciprocal help and support

For example, at the first CIP national conference at Keele University (BJF 2003a) delegates presented workshops and papers on IP covering: fear of crime, citizenship, mentoring, reminiscence and education, project design, funding and evaluation, intergenerational arts, children and adult safety, developing community cohesion and building social capital.

What is evaluation?

It is important to distinguish from the outset what exactly we mean by evaluation and how this differs from research. Valerie Kuehne (2003:1) sees **research** as the 'disciplined search for knowledge' while **evaluation** 'is the process of judgements based on evidence about a programme'. Coincidentally, the existing literature about IP includes examples of both evaluation and research.

Complicating the picture still further, Suchman (1967:4) combines the two terms and provides a definition of 'evaluative research' as being:

> 'a method for determining the degree to which a planned programme achieves its desired objectives. It asks about the means by which this change is brought about and the signs according to which this change can be recognised'.

Because evaluation is potentially a large and complex topic, there is a danger that it can come to mean all things to all people. It is therefore important to be clear about the distinctions between evaluation and related terms such as monitoring.

In essence, monitoring is concerned with setting up procedures to record information about the day-to-day functioning of an organisation or project. Evaluation, though obviously related, is about assessing what has happened in terms of things like the quality and quantity of services offered.

It is also important to stress that there is no one correct way of undertaking evaluation and that there are many different forms. Woolf (1999), writing about collecting evidence for the evaluation of Arts Council Projects, identifies many of the forms and techniques that can be used, including:

- Questionnaires
- Semi-structured questionnaires
- One-to-one interviews
- Group interviews
- Focus group interviews
- Tape-recordings
- Video recordings
- Reflective diaries, comment boxes, 'graffiti' walls and log books
- Drawings, charts and diagrams
- Participatory techniques
- Statistical data collection
- Attending meetings, observation and photography
- Presentations, story-telling
- Internal monitoring
- Documentation review and secondary data

Each evaluation situation is also unique: it is a mixture of politics, people, history, context, resources, constraints, values, needs, interests and chance. But remember - evaluation does not have to be some strange and mysterious undertaking performed by a particular kind of human being called a 'social researcher' or 'evaluator'.

The evaluation process

Common concerns when getting started on evaluating IP include the following:

- *Evaluation worries me.*
- *Will it be useful?*
- *Can we afford it?*
- *Have we the time?*

Similarly, when people hear the word 'evaluation' a number of things often come immediately to mind. These are some of the associations people make:

- It's threatening
- It's about policing
- It's about getting value for money
- It will be about facts and figures, not feelings or meanings
- It's all to do with clipboards and computers
- There must be ulterior motives

Daunting though it may seem, evaluation is in fact like project work in that it involves a process which we go through: a process involving the setting up of criteria against which we can judge the success and effectiveness of a project or a group of volunteers. In other words, if we are interested in whether what we are doing is working; how it is working; and if it is achieving what it has set out to do, evaluation is the means by which we can find this out.

We also have to learn the language of what our funders mean by evaluation and, especially, the criteria that we need to engage with in order to successfully secure funding for our intergenerational work (see Hatton-Yeo, 2003). For example, the Children's Fund and the Community Fund are both very explicit in terms of their evaluation criteria and use a 'common language' of outputs, outcomes, impact, success indicators and targets (see glossary of terms). Any successful bid for funding must adhere to these criteria. Furthermore, there needs to be a clear understanding that any project bid should have evaluation built into the project design from the outset.

Consequently, the process of evaluation should be systematic. It also has certain identifiable components and phases:

- Establishing the background and context;
- Identifying the broad aims and specific evaluation objectives;
- Examining what we do to achieve these aims and objectives;
- Setting up systems for collecting and analysing the information needed to assess whether these aims and objectives are being met;
- Exploring the 'outcomes' e.g. who it serves; how older and younger people feel about it; whether it has changed their lives and whether it worked.

This process may be a cyclical and continuous one, involving feedback about what does and doesn't work in order to modify or change the project whilst it is still continuing. Alternatively, it may be carried out retrospectively, after a project or programme has finished, and can be used to inform future practice.

Importantly, evaluation is not a substitute for making choices or decisions. Good evaluation evidence can inform those choices and equip those who have to make them with a more detailed understanding of what has been done, and its effects.

Thinking about IP evaluation: some reminders

- **Evaluation usually reveals just how complex is the functioning or development of an IP group or project**

  If we begin with the idea that evaluation will make everything simpler, then we will be frustrated and disappointed. It will not provide easy answers. Conversely, it shouldn't be too clever or complicated either!

- **Evaluation is only useful if it is used and applied**

  Leaving the results sitting about unused and gathering dust on someone's shelf or in a filing cabinet, will not help the IP project or group to learn and move on.

- **In evaluation, there is no such thing as failure**

  It is important to remember that we can often learn as much from something that may be considered ineffective (or a disaster!), as from something that is a success.

- **Evaluation means commitment**

  In order for evaluation to help in the development of a group or project there has to be commitment at all levels: personal commitment from individuals as to why they are undertaking evaluation; commitment from managers and colleagues about the time it takes; commitment from IP funders that evaluation is a worthwhile undertaking; and commitment from everyone that the lessons which come from it will be applied.

- **Evaluation means having a go!**

  The theory and practice of evaluation is important but the only way to really learn is to do it. The more we incorporate monitoring and evaluation into everyday practice, the easier it will become. It will also become less threatening to people and be seen as just another tool for improving intergenerational practice and sharing our outcomes with other IP practitioners.

Why is evaluation important for IP organisations and IP project staff?

For positive reasons, rather than merely because a funding or statutory body requires it!

What distinguishes evaluation from other forms of research is the purpose for which it is done. Evaluation is aimed at action: at implementing change. If we know something about evaluation and can demonstrate that we are using it appropriately, it can help us stay one step ahead.

There are all sorts of reasons why evaluation is important for organisations and staff. Below are ten positive reasons:

- **To explain how our work develops and goals change**

  A great deal of IP is of a type that inevitably develops, changes and adapts as it progresses. This may mean that the end result - or what we end up doing - is sometimes rather different from our original intentions. This does not mean that it is any less valid or useful. However, if we evaluate what we do, it helps us to check whether or not we are meeting our broad aims and specific objectives, or why we have decided to continue or discontinue with a particular project or element of a project. It assists us in explaining and justifying our reasons, thereby satisfying both our funders and ourselves.

- **To help us identify gaps**

  There is sometimes duplication in the IP sector, and evaluation can help us to show that what we provide is both appropriate and necessary. It can help us to clarify different roles and responsibilities, and may facilitate comparisons with other IP projects or other voluntary organisations. It may also indicate whether our IP work or projects could usefully be expanded and replicated elsewhere (see Ellis 2003a).

- **For our clients, consumers or stakeholders**

  The IP sector should be interested in evaluation because, at bottom, we are interested in who is benefitting from the IP approach. We need to ask whether what we offer is meeting the needs and goals that the supposed beneficiaries themselves value, rather than what we think they value. We also need to demonstrate that our work has impact, provides value for money, and is relevant in terms of the broader issues facing an ageing society in the twenty-first century.

- **For our volunteers**

  Volunteers of all ages quite rightly say that they need to be convinced that, on the one hand, their IP organisers know what they are doing and, on the other hand, that there is something in it for them. Evaluation can help us clarify these issues, motivate and demonstrate to IP volunteers that they have brought about change and are 'making a difference'.

- **To demonstrate accountability**

  A great deal of public goodwill and sometimes financial investment is conferred on the voluntary sector, and accountability requires more than ill-informed guesswork or a handful of consumer testimonials. Through helping us to produce good quality regular reports and records, evaluation will enable us to see how effective and efficient we are. In fact, it is now a requirement of most funders that monitoring and evaluation reports are produced to demonstrate accountability and value for money.

- **As a sign of our professionalism**

  Evaluation can demonstrate that we value the range of resources we are given, whether these be financial, personnel, volunteers, paid staff, premises etc. Showing that we are deploying these resources effectively, and that we have achieved what we set out to do, is vital (see also Hatton-Yeo 2003).

- **As a sign of commitment**

  We engage in IP voluntarily, not because it is a statutory duty or because of the money, but because we believe this is the right sort of work to be involved in. We therefore ought to demonstrate that we are committed to achieving our broad aims and specific objectives.

- **To illustrate the good we claim to do**

  All too often we say we are not appreciated, that we are taken for granted, and that nobody realises what we do. But, have we bothered to tell anyone, or are we unable to do so because we have not collated or evaluated the information we need? Evaluation can help us get our 'message' across to various audiences be they clients, funders, staff, volunteers or management committees.

- **To help us secure funding**

  The requirements of funders are now much more stringent and, if we use evaluation for some or all of the above reasons, it will often help in the task of obtaining funds for other projects or developments. It demonstrates to funders that we are serious and committed and that we will use resources in the best ways possible. We need to acknowledge that IP projects are now much more target-driven than in the

1990s. However, one of the big issues for us is not just ticking boxes and gathering large quantities of statistics, but is about how we amass appropriate qualitative evidence about the benefits to clients and stakeholders. There is also a whole new language to learn about 'user involvement' (see glossary) and how users might be involved in shaping projects (NCVO 2003).

- **To influence and respond to policy and practice**

  Our IP groups and organisations exist in a much wider context. Changes in relation to policy, funding and legislation affect us all, and evaluation can help us to respond appropriately and effectively to these changes (see for example, BJF 2003).

Finally, keep in mind that evaluation is not a value-free undertaking: it is inherently political, and it may highlight conflicts and difficulties as well as success and consensus.

What are we evaluating?

This might seem like a simple question, but it is important to sort out early on just exactly what it is we are interested in focusing on in an evaluation. Evaluation can only ever give us a fragmented view: we are unlikely to have the time, resources or energy to look at everything. Furthermore, we work with people. Inevitably, that means there will be a degree of unpredictability in the ways a project is designed, implemented and concluded. Therefore, sorting out the main focus for the evaluation is crucial.

Some of the things we may be interested in evaluating are:

- The need for a particular kind of intergenerational approach or philosophy to the work or the project. How does an IP approach differ from, for example, other forms of volunteering?

- The project itself, in whole or in part. Crucial here is to identify clear aims and objectives for the evaluation. Try to be conservative in terms of your focus: avoid the 'all singing, all dancing' approach. Above all, the evaluation must be manageable. Therefore the outcomes and goals you set have to be measurable and realistic. Set clear goals, in clear language that is meaningful (Hatton-Yeo 2003: 7).

- The impact and performance of some, or all, of the staff involved in particular IP policies or procedures. Highlighting the lessons learnt and how these lessons might impinge on future IP activity.

- The cost-effectiveness of the work including the administration and structure of the organisation or project – again in whole or in part.

- What volunteers get out of their involvement and how participants feel about particular IP projects.

Remember - there are a variety of viewpoints to be taken into consideration when designing an evaluation. Everyone associated with IP, whether that is volunteering, designing a project or working as a project manager within the organisation, will have a different perception of it. Furthermore they might not necessarily have a shared understanding of what IP is about, or what IP is trying to achieve. We therefore need to think clearly, before we start, about the evidence we are going to gather to demonstrate the impact of the project and include this in our project plan (Hatton-Yeo 2003:7).

Remember too to build in checkpoints (monitoring) against the project activity plan. Make sure you measure progress against these checkpoints and reflect on whether the project is meeting these points and is 'on track'. For example, the Children's Fund requires quarterly returns against specific outcomes for the children. This can work in two ways for you: the returns provide the checkpoints and the outcome criteria can provide the focus for the evaluation.

Who wants evaluation? We all do!

To some extent, we have to acknowledge that who wants the evaluation may condition both what we do and how we do it. This is especially the case if evaluation is imposed on us from outside, rather than being something we ourselves value as an integral part of our work and development. However, evaluation is an essential tool for IP organisations: it helps us to show what does and doesn't work. It also helps us to 'showcase' and tell others about why an IP approach is important. Moreover, it helps us to improve our future use and understanding of intergenerational programmes.

Some or all of the following, might want an evaluation done:

- Funders – local authorities; central government; trusts and foundations.
- Bosses – line managers; management groups; trustees etc.
- The staff.
- The volunteers.
- The clients/customers.
- The public.
- Policy-makers.
- Outside researchers/academics.

Who does evaluation?

It is important to ask ourselves from the outset whether the particular evaluation we want doing is best done by someone within the organisation - an outsider - or a combination?

For example, if funding is to come from an external source then we need to decide this early on and build evaluation into any proposal. It doesn't have to be an either/or question though - internal and external evaluations can dovetail and address different questions and issues.

There are advantages and disadvantages to evaluation being done by an 'insider' or an 'outsider'. For example, an insider may know the issues and the organisation very well, and be a familiar figure to clients, volunteers and staff. However, it is sometimes difficult for an insider to distinguish the wood from the trees. It is often easier for an outsider to stand back and offer a more detached view on what is happening. An outsider is also unlikely to have an 'axe to grind'. However, internal evaluation can be used for things like staff development: developing the abilities of project staff to reflect on and develop evidence-based intergenerational practice. Similarly, internal evaluation can help to develop and promote deeper understanding of the organisation's capacity.

Making decisions about who does the evaluation means that we again have to be very clear about the purpose for which it is being done. Honesty about what we want to evaluate and why we want to evaluate it, is crucial. Is it really an evaluation we are after, or is it a public relations exercise we want done?

Some ethical considerations

All good evaluation needs to abide by certain ethical considerations and codes of conduct. It is important for us to ask ourselves the following questions, and to provide honest answers before embarking on the evaluation-proper (see BERA 1992).

- Who are we doing it for?
- Do they have pre-conceived ideas about what we are doing?
- What will we do if our results do not fit with their preconceptions?
- Who owns the findings?
- What will we do if we identify 'bad practice'?
- Where do our loyalties lie – with our colleagues/professional group; the employing organisation; service users; volunteers etc?
- Have we agreed a written statement of aims; scope; timescale; staff involvement; likely format of results; dissemination of findings – with all participants?

- Do we have informed consent from all ‘research subjects’ and have we ensured ways of preserving confidentiality and anonymity if necessary?

- In what ways do we propose to feed back the findings?

Concluding summary

In summary, IP evaluation should go through a number of clearly defined stages (Woolf, 1999). These include:

First – **the planning stage**: identifying who will have overall responsibility for the project, identifying clear aims and objectives for the research, agreeing on monitoring and evaluation procedures, and looking at how much it will cost. It is also important to agree early on about the reporting style and who owns the intellectual rights to the outcomes.

Second – **collecting evidence:** includes identifying the time framework, the methods to be adopted, the manageability of the data collection and agreed use of the data.

Third – **assembling and interpreting:** has the evidence been interpreted correctly? Are there any unexpected outcomes? Are we able to relate the outcomes back to the evaluation aims and objectives? How is the data to be presented? Identifying a clear structure for data interpretation is crucial.

Fourth – **reporting the outcomes:** report writing style and structure needs to relate clearly to the aims and objectives of the evaluation. Dissemination strategies need to be considered in terms of who else needs to be involved and who to share the outcomes with.

Finally – **reflecting and moving forward:** this also needs to be built into the monitoring and evaluation framework because the evaluation may change direction at any point. Opportunities for formative reflection can be identified in addition to the summative reflection that takes place at the conclusion of the IP project or programme. Identification of key findings and an agenda for change based on the evidence will be important.

So - let’s get started!

Getting Started (based on Woolf 1999)

Phase 1: Planning *Questions:* Why are we doing this IP project? What specific things do we want to achieve? How will we measure success? Clarify the starting points for your IP evaluation *Focus on:* Identifying a team to plan and manage the evaluation. Identify roles and responsibilities within the team. Costing and budgeting. Identifying aims, objectives and outcome measures of success.	**Phase 3: Analysis and Interpretation** *Questions:* At what point do we analyse and interpret the evidence? How do we interpret the evidence? How do we identify emerging themes and issues from the data? *Focus on:* The research aims and objectives - use these to structure the analysis. Developing simple descriptive statistics from the quantitative data e.g. use a spreadsheet to draw graphs. Developing themes from the qualitative data e.g. if you have used tape-recorded interviews get them transcribed. Focus on the positive outcomes as well as the negative. Remember to acknowledge unexpected outcomes. Be adventurous - it's okay to combine the quantitative and the qualitative - this is called 'mixed methods' and helps to triangulate opinions and data.
Phase 2: Collecting Evidence *Questions:* What evidence will we need? What methods might we use? What are our outcome measures of success? *Focus on:* Consider any ethical issues. How the collection of evidence will help us to achieve our success criteria. What type of evidence to collect. When to collect evidence. What methods to use: qualitative, quantitative, primary or secondary sources. Will we use cameras, video recorders, tape recorders, questionnaires, interviews, focus groups etc. Develop an evaluation plan - identify the methods, timing and sample size. Make sure the project evaluation is manageable and each person involved has clear roles and responsibilities.	**Phase 4: Reporting, Reflecting and Forward Planning** *Questions:* How do we write the report? Check with your partners or funders. Do we need a team meeting to decide who does what? How much time will it take? What structure shall we use for the report writing? Whom do we report to? *Focus on:* Initially you might like to present an interim report using SWOT analysis which includes: **s**trengths, **w**eaknesses, **o**pportunities and **t**hreats to your IP project. This will form the basis for report writing which should include the following: • Context of the study • Aims and objectives • Success criteria • Ethical guidelines • How the study was carried out • What we found out • Conclusions • Lessons learnt • Forward planning, reflection and dissemination • Bibliography

References

BJF (2003a) *'Neighbourhoods for All Ages in the UK'.* Intergenerational Conference Report. CIP/June. www.centreforip.org.uk

BJF (2003b) *Towards an Intergenerational Strategy for Wales.* Conference Report. University of Glamorgan, S Wales and The Beth Johnson Foundation, Stoke-on-Trent.

BERA (1992) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research.* Edinburgh: British Educational Research Association and the Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Bernard M (1990) *Evaluating Voluntary Action.* Keele University: Evaluation Research Unit.

CIP (2003b) *Intergenerational Directory: a directory of people interested in intergenerational approaches.* Stoke-on-Trent: The Beth Johnson Foundation.

Ellis S W (2003a) *Changing the Lives of Children and Older People: Intergenerational Mentoring in Secondary Schools.* Stoke-on-Trent: The Beth Johnson Foundation.

Ellis S W (2003b) '*Evaluating Intergenerational Practice' - Workshop*. 'Neighbourhoods for All Ages: Intergenerational Work in the UK'. First Annual Conference, 23-34 June, Keele University.

Granville G (2002) *A Review of Intergenerational Practice in the UK.* Stoke-on-Trent: Centre for Intergenerational Practice, Lloyds TSB Foundation and The Beth Johnson Foundation.

Hatton-Yeo A (2003) *Preparing Successful Project Bids.* Stoke-on-Trent: The Beth Johnson Foundation.

Kuehne V (2003) 'Intergenerational Program Research and Evaluation: What's Hot, What's Not, What's Next?' Neighbourhoods for All Ages: Intergenerational Work in the UK, First Annual Conference, 23-24 June, Keele University.

NCVO (2003) *Measuring Impact: case-studies of impact assessment in small and medium-sized voluntary organisations.* Plymouth: The UK Voluntary Sector Research Group.

Suchman E A (1967) *Evaluative Research.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Woolf F (1999) *Partners for Learning: a guide to evaluating arts education projects.* London: Regional Arts Board and the Arts Council for England.

Glossary: Intergenerational Dimensions, Ideas and Evaluation Terms

Aims/Goals	Broad statements of intention about the purpose or role of the organisation/project i.e. general directions.
Activities	What an organisation does with its inputs in order to achieve its mission.
Effectiveness	A measure of the degree to which aims and objectives are met; assesses quality.
Efficiency	A measure of the consumption of resources used in achieving aims and objectives - looks at the conversion of inputs to outputs - usually looks at quantity.
Formative Evaluation	A cyclical process and approach that contributes to the learning, development and review of the project. Evaluation activities are established early in the project and planned for across the duration of the project. May also be referred to as action-research.
Intergenerational Practice (IP)	Is inclusive and aims to build upon the positive resources that different generations have to offer each other and their communities. This approach is an effective way to address some key Government priorities such as building active communities, promoting citizenship and social inclusion, regenerating neighbourhoods and addressing inequality both between (inter) and across (multi) the generations (BJF 2003a).
Impact	The changes resulting from an activity. It includes intended, unintended, negative as well as positive, and long, medium and short-term effects. Intergenerational activity may impact in some of the following ways: increased public awareness of the role of older people; social inclusion for older and younger people; community development; improved health and well-being; participation in local decision-making; enhanced cultural life and education (NCVO 2003:24).
Impact Assessment	Recognises that voluntary organisations are increasingly engaged in intricate webs of organisational partnerships. Impact assessment in such a complex setting requires flexible, holistic and multi-perspective approaches. Thinking is based upon a 'systems approach' where, if interconnected variables change, then all other variables change together with the system as a whole. The immediate world is broken down into various parts. The analysis then focuses on the ways in which these parts interact with each other (Hatton-Yeo 2003; NCVO 2003:16).

Inputs	All the resources (both human and material) needed to carry out the project according to its stated aims and objectives.
Monitoring	The collection and recording of information relevant to the day-to-day operation of the organisation or project - provides regular feedback but cannot assess quality of work or user satisfaction.
Objectives	A set of statements setting out the means by which the aims are to be achieved - should be based upon the needs you believe exist - and should include specific outputs and timescales.
Outcomes	Looks at what has happened in terms of the value and impact it has had on the recipients' well being (e.g. how helpful is the training provided to volunteers). Difficult to measure and links with debates about quality of life. Some outcomes of intergenerational activity might include the following: improved quality of life, confidence, skills and self-esteem for older and younger people; community development, social inclusion and safety; empowerment; access to learning and cultural activities; personal and group support; physical and mental health improvements; participation in, and improvement of organisations, through intergenerational activity; developing public awareness (BJF 2003a; NCVO 2003: 24).
Outputs	Looks at what services are provided for people or generated by the project (e.g. training for volunteers) – should be fairly easy to measure and quantify.
Performance Indicators	Tools or criteria to help you assess whether the objectives have been achieved.
Performance Measurement	Tends to focus on the efficiency of the organisation or how well resources have been transformed into meaningful outputs (NCVO 2003:14).
Performance Measures	A way of quantifying how the organisation/project has performed or met its targets.
Quality Assurance	Measures to determine whether pre-set quality targets have been reached.
Qualitative data	Methods of collecting information that help us to explore people's feelings, understandings and perceptions of various experiences and events. In IP terms this might include exploring issues such as social isolation, physical and psychological well-being, empowerment, engaging new learners and learning etc. (see Ellis 2003a).

Quantitative data	Methods of collecting information that enable us to measure, count, summarise and aggregate data, often by means of statistical analysis. In IP terms this might include the use of tried and tested 'tools' or scales such as the Short-Form 12 and CASP-19 which help to measure people's well-being and their psychological and physical health (see Ellis, 2003a).
Social Capital	Features of social organisations, such as networks, norms and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit (Putman 1993). Relates to a growing body of literature on the impact of the voluntary sector on communities and local people.
Summative Evaluation	Evaluation that takes place towards the end of, or after a project has finished.
Targets	Measurable achievements - usually within a specified time period.

Further Reading, Resources, Centres & Websites

(Please note that a more extensive list relating to this guide and dating back prior to the 1990s, has been published on the CIP website: www.centreforip.org.uk)

Adams J (2001) *NGOs and Impact Assessment.* NGO Policy Briefing Paper No. 3 (March) INTERAC. http://www.intrac.org

Ageing and Society. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge Journals online: http://www.journals.Cambridge.org

Bernard M (2000) *Promoting Health in Old Age: Critical Issues in Self-Health Care.* Buckingham: Open University Press (see Chapter 6).

Community Evaluation Northern Ireland (1995) *CENI Evaluation Centre.* http://www.ceni.org

ESRC (2003) *Research Findings 1-16: from the Growing Older Programme. Swindon:* Economic and Social Research Council. http://www.ac.uk/uni/projects/go/index/htm

Field J (2003) *Evaluating Community Projects.* Lifelines in Adult Learning. London: NIACE and the DfEE. www.niace.org.uk

Freedman M (1993) *The Kindness of Strangers: Adult Mentors, Urban Youth and the New Voluntarism.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, MA.

Hatton-Yeo A & Ohsako T (2000) *Intergenerational Programmes: public policy and research implications - an international perspective,* Stoke-on-Trent: Beth Johnson Foundation and UNESCO.

Kendall J & Knapp M (1999) *Measuring the Performance of Voluntary Organisation Activities.* Belfast: Belfast Voluntary Activity Unit.

Kuehne V (2003a) 'The State of our Art: Intergenerational Program Research and Evaluation: Part One'*. Journal of Intergenerational Relationships: programs, policy and research*. 1 (1): 145-165.

Kuehne V (2003b) 'The State of our Art: Intergenerational Program Research and Evaluation: Part Two'*. Journal of Intergenerational Relationships: programs, policy and research.* 2 (1): 79-94.

Lloyds TSB Foundation for England and Wales (2001) *First Steps in Impact Assessment.* London: Lloyds TSB Foundation.

Rae L (1997) *Evaluation Approaches for Training and Development - a complete resource kit*. London: Kogan Page.

The Beth Johnson Foundation. e-mail generations@bjf.org.uk website: www.centreforip.org.uk

University of Plymouth (2003) *Evaluation Resource Pack*.
Available from janefield@educationanddevelopment.co.uk

Wainwright S (2002) *Measuring Impact – A Guide to Resources.* London: NCVO.

The Beth Johnson Foundation
Parkfield House
64 Princes Road
Hartshill
Stoke-on-Trent
ST4 7JL
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) 1782 844036

Email: admin@bjf.org.uk

Registered Charity 271526

ISBN: 0-907875-21-1