



Project EQUAL/041 ; CZ.04.4.09 / 2.3.00.1 / 0076

Community planning as the tool for the enhancement of social cohesion and the support for social integration and prevention against social exclusion of socially disadvantaged people on the labour market

Development partnership Europa house

Number of the thematic priority: 9.2 Development of the business activities

Number of the thematic measure: 2.3, The enhancement of social economy (third sector), especially community services with a view to the improvement of the work places quality in the areas of the objective No. 1

Evaluation of periodic processes involving public participation and its application in community planning

Part 1 – General Principles

Evaluation is a management tool with a long-standing tradition in the USA, which was later spread within OECD and to the countries of the original EU - 15. Since 1990's, it has been obligatorily used in the implementing structures of EU development programmes, designed also for new and acceding countries. Unlike internal audit, which looks for deficiencies in partial activities inside of the system, in individuals and individual activities, evaluation is a source of feedback for the improvement of the management system as a whole. Evaluations in general have different objectives and purposes and can be systemised in different ways. According to the content (subject) of evaluation, there are evaluation of objectives, evaluation of a process or evaluation of impact. From the point of view of the time when the evaluation is performed, there are planning evaluation (ex-ante), interim (formative) and subsequent (summative, ex-post) evaluations. Most often evaluation is used as an ongoing project management tool, focusing on the efficiency and economy of the use of funds, and it gained importance especially in relation with the implementation of development assistance programmes. As a potential definition of evaluation in this sense, the following formulation, contained in principal manuals of OECD, can be used¹: *“An evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors”.*

In the case of processes implemented by territorial self-governing units with the participation of the public, such as community planning of social services, evaluation is quite a complex task. It has to evaluate common management requirements concerning the efficiency of the use of (public) funds and the effectiveness of the management, as well as the quality of public participation, i.e. the participation of a number of participants which is not known in advance, and especially evaluate the mutual relations between these “hard” and “soft” criteria. It is quite obvious that the process would often be more effective without the participation of the public, in terms of economy, speed, and ease of attainment of results, and maybe also in terms of their immediate applicability. Nevertheless, it is also clear that the participation of the public cannot be omitted in certain types of planning processes, either due to a legal obligation or for political reasons. In addition to that, active public participation in the planning process can significantly affect the subsequent acceptance and sustainability of the resulting outputs. This raises a pressing methodological question of how to perform evaluation of such participative processes efficiently.

Project partners:

Česká rada humanitárních organizací, Úřad práce v Ústí nad Labem, Statutární město Ústí nad Labem, Statutární město Ostrava, Univerzita Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Ústí nad Labem, Komunitní nadace Euroregionu Labe, Krajská hospodářská komora Ústeckého kraje, Sdružení pro vzdělávání komunit o.s., Mikroregion České Švýcarsko



Promoter of the project: Centrum komunitní práce Ústí nad Labem e-mail: krbcovamasinova@ckpul.cz, www.ckpul.cz,

www.komunitniplanovani.com

The project has been supported by the ESF EU and the state budget of Czech Republic



Project EQUAL/041 ; CZ.04.4.09 / 2.3.00.1 / 0076

Community planning as the tool for the enhancement of social cohesion and the support for social integration and prevention against social exclusion of socially disadvantaged people on the labour market

Development partnership Europa house

Number of the thematic priority: 9.2 Development of the business activities

Number of the thematic measure: 2.3, The enhancement of social economy (third sector), especially community services with a view to the improvement of the work places quality in the areas of the objective No. 1

In the following part, we have formulated the principal requirements pertaining to the evaluation methodology of periodic (cyclic) planning processes with public participation, and suggestions of how to satisfy them. As an example of a cyclic participative process we will, if necessary, use the aforementioned community planning of social services, however, the proposed procedures can be applied to any planning processes with public participation.

1. TO PERCEIVE A PARTICIPATIVE PLANNING PROCESS AS A PROJECT AND ALSO MANAGE IT AS SUCH. Although it is a periodic process, which is in general time unlimited, planning always consists of closed cycles and its activities lead to the achievement of specifically defined outputs, goals and objectives. It is therefore necessary to apply project management methods, unlike in the case of institutional operations. Just like for any project, also for the community planning process a PCM (Project Cycle Management) logical framework can be developed. It is well known to all applicants for assistance from the Phare programme and Structural Funds.²
2. NOT TO EXAGGERATE INNOVATION, TO EVALUATE IN A WAY SO AS TO CLEARLY SHOW IMMEDIATE BENEFITS. If possible, procedures that are generally well known and more or less well-established should be used for evaluation, so that the users, who have enough worries with the methodology of the process itself, do not have to deal with a new scheme of its evaluation. Evaluation should attain its principal purpose, i.e. it must result in feasible recommendations of how to rectify the identified shortcomings still during the process, prevent imminent failures and generally improve what can be improved. Czech local governments, if acquainted with evaluation at all, are most often acquainted with the interim evaluation methodology, applied by the European Commission for the evaluation of projects supported by EU development assistance programmes.³ The evaluation process of the EU, evaluating the course of a project on the basis of criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, also has a link to the PCM logframe and is suitable as a basic model.
3. TO FIND A WAY OF EVALUATING THE RELATION BETWEEN HARD PARAMETERS PERTAINING TO MANAGEMENT AND SOFT PARAMETERS PERTAINING TO THE QUALITY OF A PARTICIPATIVE PROCESS. Under normal circumstances, the evaluation of standard project cycle management focuses primarily on the evaluation of the efficiency of the use of funds, the viability of the planned outputs and their impact on the achievement of the defined objectives. It, however, does not deal as much with the formal aspects of the process of using the funds – it only examines formal compliance with the prescribed procedures and in the case of non-compliance sanctions may be imposed. Whereas standard project management has a fixed structure of participants, in our case the group of process participants is open. Not only do their activities result in project outputs, which are then implemented in the form of implementation measures that again have

Project partners:

Česká rada humanitárních organizací, Úřad práce v Ústí nad Labem, Statutární město Ústí nad Labem, Statutární město Ostrava, Univerzita Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Ústí nad Labem, Komunitní nadace Euroregionu Labe, Krajská hospodářská komora Ústeckého kraje, Sdružení pro vzdělávání komunit o.s., Mikroregion České Švýcarsko



Promoter of the project: Centrum komunitní práce Ústí nad Labem e-mail: krcovamasinova@ckpul.cz, www.ckpul.cz,

www.komunitniplanovani.com

The project has been supported by the ESF EU and the state budget of Czech Republic



Project EQUAL/041 ; CZ.04.4.09 / 2.3.00.1 / 0076

Community planning as the tool for the enhancement of social cohesion and the support for social integration and prevention against social exclusion of socially disadvantaged people on the labour market

Development partnership Europa house

Number of the thematic priority: 9.2 Development of the business activities

Number of the thematic measure: 2.3, The enhancement of social economy (third sector), especially community services with a view to the improvement of the work places quality in the areas of the objective No. 1

an impact on these open groups of participants, but also their participation itself, if purposeful, leads to the attainment of other, more general objectives. Complete identification of such objectives (if possible), the definition of the extent and way of public involvement in the process and qualitative parameters of the organisational aspects of such participation are some of the most important tasks of participative project management and must be subject to evaluation. The PCM logframe should, besides objectives and indicators of the planning content, clearly define also the immediate goals and long-term objectives of the participative process itself and their indicators of achievement, applicable to a certain extent regardless of the factual content of the planning project. The logframe thus must include clearly separated content and process components.

4. TO EVALUATE THE RELATION BETWEEN THE CONTENT AND PROCESS COMPONENTS OF PARTICIPATIVE PLANNING. In our case, open participation of target groups in the process is generally prescribed, however, on principle it cannot be formalized by law (and sanctions for non-compliance with this principle are only illusory). Therefore, if standard project evaluation were applied, the evaluation would be limited only to identifying whether or not the target groups were involved and to what extent, without any further implications and outputs other than formal statements. In different types of activities of the planning process project management, the efficiency of the participation of open target groups can vary and in some cases it can even be counterproductive. This is why during our evaluation we must pay special attention to the analysis of the relation between meeting this specific process criterion and the outcome of the process, i.e. the impact on the target groups. Correct assessment of the relation between the content and process of planning is crucial for the success of its evaluation.
5. TO USE THE DIVISION OF THE PROCESS INTO PHASES FOR THE RIGHT TIMING OF EVALUATION OUTPUTS. Interim evaluation of a continuously managed project is usually performed on a certain planned date, sometimes even randomly, and is actually an evaluation of what has been done and an estimate of what will happen in the future as a result of the past developments. If a project is divided into clearly defined phases, its interim (formative) evaluation can be designed more precisely as a combination of partial ex-post evaluations (partial summative evaluation) and ex-ante evaluations (partial planning evaluation). In other words, interim evaluation of a process that is divided into phases can always be successfully performed at the point of the conclusion of the particular phase. As for individual evaluation criteria - relevance, effectiveness and efficiency would be evaluated ex-post, and impact and sustainability ex-ante. Outputs, i.e. primarily recommendations formulated on the basis of one phase, can then be used as preconditions for the implementation of the following phase in the PCM logframe.

Project partners:

Česká rada humanitárních organizací, Úřad práce v Ústí nad Labem, Statutární město Ústí nad Labem, Statutární město Ostrava, Univerzita Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Ústí nad Labem, Komunitní nadace Euroregionu Labe, Krajská hospodářská komora Ústeckého kraje, Sdružení pro vzdělávání komunit o.s., Mikroregion České Švýcarsko



Promoter of the project: Centrum komunitní práce Ústí nad Labem e-mail: krbcovamasinova@ckpul.cz, www.ckpul.cz,

www.komunitniplanovani.com

The project has been supported by the ESF EU and the state budget of Czech Republic



Project EQUAL/041 ; CZ.04.4.09 / 2.3.00.1 / 0076

Community planning as the tool for the enhancement of social cohesion and the support for social integration and prevention against social exclusion of socially disadvantaged people on the labour market

Development partnership Europa house

Number of the thematic priority: 9.2 Development of the business activities

Number of the thematic measure: 2.3, The enhancement of social economy (third sector), especially community services with a view to the improvement of the work places quality in the areas of the objective No. 1

6. TO TAKE CARE OF THE ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS OF EVALUATION AND ITS SUPPORTING PROCESSES – MONITORING, REVIEW – IN TIME. Evaluation must be taken into consideration from the very beginning and its organisation should be one of the first steps when deciding about the launch of a planning cycle. Independence is one of the crucial attributes of evaluation; i.e. ideally, there should be an external evaluator who is not paid by any participant of the project subject to evaluation. A viable model would, for example, be a model where evaluation would be performed by a different department of the authority (e.g. the Mayor's office) than the one responsible for the implementation of the project (e.g. the Social Department). As we have already mentioned in the previous section, evaluation starts only at the end of the project phase and its performance will be time-stressed. It is therefore necessary that the project owner monitor the course of the project and regularly assess the effectiveness of project activities in terms of the use of funds and respect of the time schedule. Monitoring reports are some of the most important documents for evaluation but they can also serve the project owner for partial changes of the process if rectifiable deficiencies are identified. If the project lasts for quite a long time and has several successive outputs, it is advisable to perform a wider evaluation of the course of the project so far after several monitoring inputs, which would also identify the efficiency of the achievement of expected outputs – this is called review in professional literature. Monitoring should be performed by the project owner himself (the community plan developer) while an independent evaluator should be present and observe. Reviews should be performed in cooperation with the evaluator who also has an advisory role. An independent evaluation will then evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency from a general point of view of the project phase subject to evaluation and its recommendations will focus on the improvement of the procedures and processes so as to achieve the ideal impact and sustainability of the outputs of the ending phase for the next phase.

The general structure of the system of logframes for a participative planning cycle is to be found in Fig. 1

Evaluation of periodic processes involving public participation and its application in community planning.

Part 2 – Practical Steps

In the previous section, we formulated the principles that can, with the use of generally known project management methods, be applied to the evaluation of periodic self-governing processes with public participation, with regard to the requirement to perform evaluation of community planning of social care. In the following section, we shall focus on practical recommendations and examples of how to apply these general principles.

7. TO CORRECTLY SET OBJECTIVES AND QUALITY PARAMETERS OF THE PROCESS (PARTICIPATIVE) COMPONENT OF EACH PLANNING PHASE. A precondition for success of any

Project partners:

Česká rada humanitárních organizací, Úřad práce v Ústí nad Labem, Statutární město Ústí nad Labem, Statutární město Ostrava, Univerzita Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Ústí nad Labem, Komunitní nadace Euroregionu Labe, Krajská hospodářská komora Ústeckého kraje, Sdružení pro vzdělávání komunit o.s., Mikroregion České Švýcarsko



Promoter of the project: Centrum komunitní práce Ústí nad Labem e-mail: krcovamasinova@ckpul.cz, www.ckpul.cz,

www.komunitniplanovani.com

The project has been supported by the ESF EU and the state budget of Czech Republic



Project EQUAL/041 ; CZ.04.4.09 / 2.3.00.1 / 0076

Community planning as the tool for the enhancement of social cohesion and the support for social integration and prevention against social exclusion of socially disadvantaged people on the labour market

Development partnership Europa house

Number of the thematic priority: 9.2 Development of the business activities

Number of the thematic measure: 2.3, The enhancement of social economy (third sector), especially community services with a view to the improvement of the work places quality in the areas of the objective No. 1

project management is the correct formulation of objectives, which by itself is not always easy even for the content component of a project. In our case, when we are preparing for the evaluation of process quality, to start with it will be necessary to separately define process objectives and outputs, describe their relation to the content framework and identify indicators of these relations. From the content point of view, organisational and economic goals and outputs are important for evaluation and from the process point of view, motivation objectives play a crucial role, in a psychological and political sense. Only the general objective of each planning phase could be identical for its content and process components, i.e. to ensure successful implementation of the following phases.

8. TO CORRECTLY SET INDICATORS OF ACHIEVEMENT. The evaluation of a project is based (not only) on indicators defined at the beginning of the project for each goal. These indicators must be specific, attainable in the given period and verifiable ("SMART indicators" - Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely). It is a combination of quantitative and qualitative, direct and indirect indicators. The definition of the smallest possible number of appropriate indicators that will reliably prove the achievement of the goals and objectives is an important project management task. Their correct formulation is the more difficult the "softer" the parameter that it pertains to. A lot of attention is currently being paid to the formulation of quality criteria for community planning. This may be important in the case of the incorporation of quality standards of planned social services into monitored content indicators. As for the quality of the participative process, we believe that it is not necessary to discover something that has been discovered already. Some general standards have already been formulated and are commonly used – e.g. among horizontal criteria applied to the assessment of development assistance applications. These are the Principles of Good Governance formulated with slight changes by all international donor programmes, starting with the World Bank and ending with the Financial Mechanism of EEA/Norway, and they are commonly taught at law schools.⁴ The principles of good governance have been formulated with slight modifications and they usually include the following elements:

- a. . transparency and openness;
- b. . representation and participation;
- c. . equality and democracy;
- d. . qualifications and competence;
- e. . ability to react to human needs; and
- f. . rule of law and responsibility.

If, to these qualitative indicators, we add subjective values such as

- g. . active approach and commitment and ownership,

we see a substantial set of qualitative indicators of all participative process activities, leading to the required outputs and the attainment of the set goals and objectives. In professional literature, we will probably find definitions of quantitatively graded parameters of achieved quality for individual

Project partners:

Česká rada humanitárních organizací, Úřad práce v Ústí nad Labem, Statutární město Ústí nad Labem, Statutární město Ostrava, Univerzita Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Ústí nad Labem, Komunitní nadace Euroregionu Labe, Krajská hospodářská komora Ústeckého kraje, Sdružení pro vzdělávání komunit o.s., Mikroregion České Švýcarsko



Promoter of the project: Centrum komunitní práce Ústí nad Labem e-mail: krcovamasinova@ckpul.cz, www.ckpul.cz,

www.komunitniplanovani.com

The project has been supported by the ESF EU and the state budget of Czech Republic



Project EQUAL/041 ; CZ.04.4.09 / 2.3.00.1 / 0076

Community planning as the tool for the enhancement of social cohesion and the support for social integration and prevention against social exclusion of socially disadvantaged people on the labour market

Development partnership Europa house

Number of the thematic priority: 9.2 Development of the business activities

Number of the thematic measure: 2.3, The enhancement of social economy (third sector), especially community services with a view to the improvement of the work places quality in the areas of the objective No. 1

indicators and if not, we can try to formulate them ourselves. As an inspiring example we can state a scale developed for participation as early as in 1969⁵ (see table in Fig. 2). As for the effectiveness of evaluation, it is advisable to realize that not all activities must necessarily have all the attributes of the principles of good governance and that some activities might require only a reasonable application of the principles, i.e. we should not always expect the highest level of the proposed indicators. For example the collection of data and development of information systems do not have to be assessed from the point of view of democracy, and complete openness of this type of activity would lead to unbearable delays. Or, when drafting a project budget, qualifications and responsibility are much more important than other criteria etc.

9. TO CORRECTLY FORMULATE OTHER EVALUATION QUESTIONS. The evaluation of indicators of achievement by itself is, to a considerable extent, part of monitoring and review activities. In order to perform a meaningful evaluation, it is necessary to answer also other questions, concerning the functioning of the system as a whole and, in our specific case, also special questions focusing on the relation between the content and process components of the planning cycle. This is particularly important in situations when it is revealed that one of the indicators has not achieved the level determined at the beginning. At times, the mutual interdependence of the process and component deficiencies is obvious. However, at other times, it can only be an indication showing that e.g. the failure to achieve a certain process indicator will result in the failure to achieve the content indicator only in one of the following phases. We can, of course, also not rule out situations when the failure to achieve one of the indicators will not influence the achievement of the general objective at all – this means that we have probably set the indicator in question incorrectly or unnecessarily strictly and we should use it as a lesson for the next planning cycle.
10. AS AN EXAMPLE TO CONCLUDE WITH, let us present a proposal of an evaluation logframe for the phase “Preparation of Organisational Structures for the Community Planning of Social Services” (Fig.3). It is a simplified example as the establishment of organisational structures by itself cannot really be considered as a closed phase of community planning and evaluation of only this phase would not be efficient. Ideally, the evaluation of the entire phase of the preparation of community planning should be performed, incl. e.g. the elicitation of political demand and the achievement of consensus concerning the principles of the prepared activities, drafting the project assignment and the proposal of funding etc. However, the complete logframe for the entire phase would significantly exceed the publication possibilities of this paper. We believe that this simplification will not make this example less illustrative.

Notes:

Project partners:

Česká rada humanitárních organizací, Úřad práce v Ústí nad Labem, Statutární město Ústí nad Labem, Statutární město Ostrava, Univerzita Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Ústí nad Labem, Komunitní nadace Euroregionu Labe, Krajská hospodářská komora Ústeckého kraje, Sdružení pro vzdělávání komunit o.s., Mikroregion České Švýcarsko



Promoter of the project: Centrum komunitní práce Ústí nad Labem e-mail: krbcovamasinova@ckpul.cz, www.ckpul.cz,

www.komunitniplanovani.com

The project has been supported by the ESF EU and the state budget of Czech Republic



Project EQUAL/041 ; CZ.04.4.09 / 2.3.00.1 / 0076

Community planning as the tool for the enhancement of social cohesion and the support for social integration and prevention against social exclusion of socially disadvantaged people on the labour market

Development partnership Europa house

Number of the thematic priority: 9.2 Development of the business activities

Number of the thematic measure: 2.3, The enhancement of social economy (third sector), especially community services with a view to the improvement of the work places quality in the areas of the objective No. 1

¹ OECD. Principles of effective aid: Development Assistance Manual, Paris 1992; 132:

² see e.g. the Development Centre of the Institute of International Relations: Project Cycle Manual for Czech Republic's International Development Cooperation, 2006 (<http://rozvojovestredisko.cz>)

³ - EC: Strengthening Evaluation of Commission Activities, SEC (2000) 1051, 26.07.00.

- EuropeAid: Guide to the Evaluation Procedures and Structures currently operational in the Commission Programmes". EuropeAid Cooperation Office, March 2001.

⁴ see e.g.

- Commission of the European Community: European Governance, a White Paper. Brussels 25.7.2001, COM (2001) 428 fin.

- OECD: Participatory Development and Good Governance. OECD Paris 1995.

- UNDP: Governance for Sustainable Human Development, a UNDP policy paper; 1997

- EEA Grants: Good Governance and Anti-corruption policy and guide. The EEA Financial Mechanism & The Norwegian Financial Mechanism 2004-2009; 01 Dec. 2005; Add: 05 May 2006. Czech version at http://www.mfcr.cz/cps/rde/xbcr/mfcr/Dobra_sprava_a_korupce_pdf.pdf

- Hendrych, D. a kol: Správní právo, obecná část, 5. rozšířené vydání (Administrative Law, general part, 5th supplemented edition), C. H. Beck, Prague 2003.

⁵ Arnstein, Sherry R. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," JAIP, Vol. 35, No. 4, July 1969

Reference:

Both parts of the paper are abstracts from a longer methodological material, drafted within the Europa House development partnership, managed by the Community Work Centre in Ústí nad Labem within the CI EQUAL project, funded from the European Social Fund. The methodology of the evaluation of planning processes with public participation was published and discussed at the EQUAL international conference in Ústí nad Labem on April 26th and 27th 2007.

Project partners:

Česká rada humanitárních organizací, Úřad práce v Ústí nad Labem, Statutární město Ústí nad Labem, Statutární město Ostrava, Univerzita Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Ústí nad Labem, Komunitní nadace Euroregionu Labe, Krajská hospodářská komora Ústeckého kraje, Sdružení pro vzdělávání komunit o.s., Mikroregion České Švýcarsko



Promoter of the project: Centrum komunitní práce Ústí nad Labem e-mail: krbcovamasinova@ckpul.cz, www.ckpul.cz,

www.komunitniplanovani.com

The project has been supported by the ESF EU and the state budget of Czech Republic

Fig. 1: PCM Logframe for both the content and process components of a participative project, with links to interim evaluation

Previous evaluation		Content logframe					Process logframe					Previous evaluation	
Plan, start		<i>(Relevance)</i>					<i>(Relevance)</i>					Plan, start	
		Phase 2. Content logframe:					Phase 3. Process logframe:						
Type of evaluation	Management level	Objectives	Verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Evaluation questions (among others)	Evaluation recommendations	Evaluation questions (among others)	Sources of verification	Verifiable indicators	Objectives	Management level	Type of evaluation	
Interim evaluation	General objective				Sustainability	Relations --□	□--Relations	Sustainability ?			General objective	Interim evaluation	
	Immediate goal (purpose)				Impact	Relations --□	□--Relations	Impact			Immediate goal (purpose)		
Review	Outputs				Efficiency	Relations --□	□--Relations	Efficiency			Outputs	Review	
Monitoring	Activities				Effectiveness	Relations --□	□--Relations	Effectiveness			Activities	Monitoring	
Previous evaluation		<i>(Relevance)</i>					<i>(Relevance)</i>					Previous evaluation	
Plan, start		Phase 1. Content logframe:					Phase 3. Process logframe:					Plan, start	
		Preconditions and risks + implementation of recommendations from evaluation of Phase 1					Preconditions and risks + implementation of recommendations from evaluation of Phase 1						

Fig. 1A: PCM Logframe for the content component of a participative project, with links to interim evaluation

						(Phase 3. – content....)
Previous evaluation	Plan, start				(Relevance)	Preconditions and risks + implementation of recommendations from evaluation of phase 2
		Phase 2.	Content logframe:			
Type of evaluation	Management level	Goals and objectives	Verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Evaluation questions (E.g.)	Evaluation recommendations <i>In the next phase, how to rectify existing deficiencies jeopardising its implementation? How to prevent the recurrence of identified deficiencies?</i>
Interim evaluation	General objective	<i>What do we expect from it for the future?</i>	<i>E.g. evaluation conclusions</i>	<i>E.g. evaluation report</i>	Sustainability <i>Will the implementation of the plan lead to an improvement of the situation in the planned area?</i>	Relations --> <i>Will potential process deficiencies influence the achievement of the general content objective?</i>
	Immediate goal (purpose)	<i>Why do we want to achieve this?</i>	<i>1..... 2..... 3.....</i>	<i>A..... B..... C.....</i>	Impact <i>Will the achievement of goals enable the implementation of the following project phases?</i>	Relations --> <i>How does the potential failure to fulfil the purpose relate to potential deficiencies in the participative process?</i>
Review	Outputs	<i>What do we want to achieve through the activities?</i>	<i>1..... 2..... 3.....</i>	<i>A..... B..... C.....</i>	Efficiency <i>Do the outputs lead to the fulfilment of the expected purpose?</i>	Relations --> <i>How do potential deficiencies in the quality of the outputs relate to potential deficiencies in the participative process?</i>
Monitoring	Activities	<i>How do we want to achieve this?</i>	<i>(INPUTS)</i>	<i>Financial and human resources</i>	Effectiveness <i>Were the activities performed functionally and economically?</i>	Relations --> <i>How did process conditions affect the performance of activities?</i>
Previous evaluation	Plan, start				(Relevance) <i>Have the preconditions been met?</i>	Preconditions and risks + implementation of recommendations from evaluation of phase 1
		Phase 1.	Content logframe:			

Fig. 1B: PCM Logframe for the process component of a participative project, with links to interim evaluation

(Phase 3. – process...)						
Preconditions and risks + implementation of recommendations from evaluation of phase 2	(Relevance)				Plan, start	Previous evaluation
Process logframe: Phase 2.					Phase 2.	
Evaluation recommendations <i>In the next phase, how to rectify existing deficiencies jeopardising its implementation? How to prevent the recurrence of identified deficiencies?</i>	Evaluation questions (E.g.)	Sources of verification	Verifiable indicators	Goals and objectives	Management level	Type of evaluation
<--Relations <i>Will potential management failures affect the achievement of the general process objective?</i>	Sustainability <i>Did the principles of good governance become applicable principles for the following activities?</i>	<i>E.g. evaluation report</i>	<i>E.g. evaluation conclusions</i>	<i>What will improve in the processes in the future?</i>	General objective	Interim evaluation
<--Relations <i>How does a potential failure to fulfil the process purpose relate to potential deficiencies in project management?</i>	Impact <i>Are the participants motivated to participate in the following project phase?</i>	A..... B..... C.....	1..... 2..... 3.....	<i>Why are we proceeding this way?</i>	Immediate goal (purpose)	
<--Relations <i>How do potential deficiencies in the quality of process outputs relate to potential deficiencies in project management?</i>	Efficiency <i>Was the application of principles of good governance accepted by the participants?</i>	A..... B..... C.....	1..... 2..... 3.....	<i>What do we want to achieve by this?</i>	Outputs	Review
<--Relations <i>How did project management affect the performance of participative activities?</i>	Effectiveness <i>Were the process quality indicators adequate?</i>	<i>Criteria of principles of good governance</i>	<i>Principles of good governance</i>	<i>What activities, what procedures?</i>	Activities	Monitoring
Preconditions and risks + implementation of recommendations from evaluation of phase 1	(Relevance) <i>Have the preconditions been met?</i>				Plan, start	Previous evaluation
Process logframe:					Phase 1.	

Fig. 2: The Ladder of Participation (Arnstein, 1969)

8.	Citizen control	Citizen power	Have-nots handle the entire job of planning, policy making and managing a programme e.g. neighbourhood corporation with no intermediaries between it and the source of power
7.	Delegated power		Citizens holding a clear majority of seats on committees with delegated powers to make decisions. Public now has the power to assure accountability of the programme to them.
6.	Partnership		Power is in fact redistributed through negotiation between citizens and power holders. Planning and decision making responsibilities are shared e.g. through joint committees.
5.	Placation	Tokenism	For example, co-option of hand-picked „worthies“ onto committees. It allows citizens to advise or plan ad infinitum but retains for power holders the right to judge the legitimacy or feasibility of the advice.
4.	Consultation		Again a legitimate step – attitude surveys, neighbourhood meetings, and public enquiries.
3.	Informing		A most important first step to legitimate participation. but too frequently the emphasis is on a way flow of information. No chanel for feedback.
2.	Therapy	Non-participation	Both are non participative. The aim is to cure or educate the participants. The proposed plan is best and the job of participation is to achieve public support by public relations.
1.	Manipulation		

Fig. 3: Draft PMC Logframe Matrix of Community Planning Phase project management, as prepared, under the proposed methodology, for its content and process evaluation: (Example for the virtual stage “Establishment of the Organisational Structures”) (version 04/2007)

(Preconditions of the initial phase: CONTENT)				Preconditions of the initial phase Discussed recommendations based on the evaluation of the preparation phase, realistic proposals of their implementation or well-founded explanations of their rejection	
CP LFM – preparation phase: CONTENT					
LEVEL	Objectives	Indicators	Verification sources	Other evaluation questions – conditions, risks	Relations between content - process
Overall objectives	To ensure a successful drafting and implementation of the community plan	- Positive evaluation statement - Executable evaluation recommendations for the content of the drafting phase	Evaluation report, outcome of its discussion in the umbrella organisational structure	Were all the necessary documents available during the evaluation? Did the attitude of the participants towards evaluation reflect CP values and principles? Did the attitude of the participants affect the quality of the evaluation? Were the indicators well set up? If not, did the management try to amend them?	Are there any records of insufficient participation, legality, competence etc., which could affect following drafting and implementation of the community plan?

LEVEL	Objectives	Indicators	Verification sources	Other evaluation questions – conditions, risks	Relations between content - process
Specific goals	Organisational and economic preparedness of the participants to have a community plan and participate in its drafting phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The decision to have a plan has been made, the decision includes specific tasks, deadlines and allocated funds - Assigned tasks are being performed - Evaluation of the preparation phase has been commenced, monitoring has been done 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decision of the Council and/or the Board of Representatives on the start of the drafting phase, including tasks, deadlines, allocated funds and its justification - Announced tenders for external services - Modified job descriptions, signed contracts for work beyond regular employment contracts etc. - Budget of the organisation ordering the plan - Control activities of the local government bodies concerning the performance of the assigned tasks - Minutes of the meetings of executive and advisory bodies of the ordering entity - Minutes of the meetings of the umbrella 	<p>Was the proposal approved in the form in which it was submitted?</p> <p>Were the changes in the original proposal beneficial for the subsequent phase?</p> <p>Any unplanned effects?</p> <p>Were the indicators well set up? If not, did the management try to amend them?</p>	Were the changes of the original proposal during approval process recorded, if any, caused by mistakes in its drafting or by any mistakes in the predeceasing process of participation as well?

			organisational structure - Monitoring reports		
--	--	--	--	--	--

LEVEL	Objectives	Indicators	Verification sources	Other evaluation questions – conditions, risks	Relations between content - process
Outputs	Functional organisational structures established in accordance with CP process needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The organisational structures have been institutionalised within the commissioner’s bodies - The organisational structures have rules of procedure - Managerial management and administrative support have been proposed for the organisational structures - The incorporation of an external evaluator into the organisational structures has been ensured for the evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resolution of the Council and/or Board of Representatives on the establishment of organisational structures and its justification - Rules of procedure and minutes of the meetings where organisational structures were established - Decision of the relevant body on the arrangement of external evaluation 	<p>Are the organisational structures balanced in order to cover all the technical issues?</p> <p>Are the rules of procedure functional, do they allow a flawless course of meetings and the production of obligatory outputs?</p> <p>Has the independence of evaluation been ensured?</p> <p>Were the indicators well set up? If not, did the management try to amend them?</p>	<p>Were there any gaps in drafting of the resolution proposal caused by non-compliance with CP principles?</p> <p>Have they appeared any procedural problems in functioning of the organisational structures caused by the rules failure? If any, were they caused by insufficient involvement of the participants during rules preparation?</p>

LEVEL	Objectives	Indicators	Verification sources	Other evaluation questions – conditions, risks	Relations between content - process
Activities	(Establishment of organisational structures) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - proposal and approval of the umbrella management structure - proposal and approval of management and expert teams - proposal and approval of coordination teams - proposal and approval of the management and administrative background of organisational structures - proposal and approval of the evaluation team 	(inputs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - informed and competent members of organisational structures - relevant and well balanced representation in organisational structures - organisational structure chart proposed in accordance with CP methodology and project management principles - justified costs of the management and administrative support for the activities of the organisational structures and evaluation, allocated funds - staffing for the management and administrative support of the organisational structures - staffing for efficient evaluation 	(verifiable means) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consents of the proposed members, references of the entities that they represent - Preliminary analyses of the provider and user environments - Organisational chart of the project management Proposal for the meeting of executive and advisory bodies of the ordering entity - References of potential contractors - training of monitoring participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the quality of day-to-day management (of the budget, observing timelines, personnel, information) - costs and value for money - quality of monitoring - any risks to be overcome Were the indicators well set up? If not, did the management try to amend them? 	Any management failures caused or joined by the lack of observing the principles of good governance?

<p>(Preconditions for meeting the objective)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - legislative framework - reasonable stability of public budgets - reasonable stability of the non-profit sector - available basic information on the structure of potential commissioners, providers and users 	<p>Did the preconditions allow the management of the process in accordance with CP principles?</p> <p>What obstacles were encountered? How were they overcome?</p>
---	--	--

<p>(Preconditions of the initial phase: PROCESS)</p> <p>CP LFM – preparation phase: PROCESS</p>				<p>Recommendations based on the evaluation of the preparation phase discussed, realistic proposals of their implementation or reasonable justification of their rejection</p>	
LEVEL	Objectives	Indicators	Verification sources	Other evaluation questions - conditions	Relations between content - process
General objectives	To ensure a successful drafting and implementation of the community plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Positive evaluation statement - Executable evaluation recommendations for the content of the drafting phase 	Evaluation report, outcome of its discussion in the umbrella organisational structure	<p>Was the cooperation of the evaluation participants good? Did they understand the purpose of evaluation for their further work?</p> <p>Were the indicators well set up? If not, did the management try to amend them?</p>	<p>Did the attitude of the participants towards evaluation reflect CP values and principles? Did the attitude of the participants affect the quality of the evaluation? Any records of management failures, which could disturb continuing in participation process in the following stage?</p>

LEVEL	Objectives	Indicators	Verification sources	Other evaluation questions - conditions	Relations between content - process
Specific goals	Motivation of the participants to have a community plan and participate in the drafting phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support of the local bodies of the ordering entity - Support of all commissioners - Support of most providers - Support of most users - Support of all the participants involved in the evaluation process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support shown by the results of the votes within the bodies of the ordering entity beyond the governing coalition - Minutes of the meetings of local bodies, monitoring of the media, comments of individuals and institutions submitted to the self-government bodies - Commissioners have arranged the participation of their representatives in organisational structures - Providers have designated competent representatives for organisational structures and enable their active participation - Users have designated competent representatives for organisational structures and require their active participation - All stakeholders cooperate openly with the evaluation team 	<p>How were comments and counterproposals, presented during the discussion of the decision to have a CP, discussed and taken into account?</p> <p>Is any of the potential participants claiming bigger rights or other procedures than the decision envisages – what is the reaction?</p> <p>Were the indicators well set up? If not, did the management try to amend them?</p>	May possible discussions and/or counterproposals have been caused by any management inconsistencies?

LEVEL	Objectives	Indicators	Verification sources	Other evaluation questions - conditions	Relations between content - process
Outputs	Functional organisational structures established in accordance with CP principles and values	<p>The organisational structures can work accordingly to the principles of good governance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transparency and openness - Participation and representativeness - Democracy and equal opportunities - Competence and qualification - Capability and will to react to target group needs - Legality (rule of law) and responsibility - Ownership and commitment 	All the activities that have been performed show compliance with the expected quality indicators, if not, it is justified and proved that this will not affect the quality of the subsequent process	<p>Any unplanned outputs?</p> <p>Were the indicators well set up? If not, did the management try to amend them?</p>	Were there any failures in the negotiation process caused by inconsistency of the project management?

LEVEL	Objectives	Indicators	Verification sources	Other evaluation questions - conditions	Relations between content - process
Activities	(preparation of the environment)	(inputs)	(key process quality indicators)		
	(Establishment of organisational structures) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - proposal and approval of umbrella management structure - proposal and approval of management and expert teams - proposal and approval of coordination teams - proposal and approval of the management and administrative support of organisational structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions between commissioners, providers and users, initiated by the responsible representative of the ordering entity Discussions between commissioners, providers, users and the professional public, facilitated by the initiation team Discussions between commissioners, providers and users, facilitated by the initiation team Internal discussions of the ordering entity with the participation of the initiation team and the supposed members of the umbrella managing group 	(verification sources: minutes of meetings, evaluation interviews) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - transparency – level X - participation – level X - competence – level X - transparency – level X - participation – level X - competence – level X - ownership – level X - participation – level X - competence – level X - ownership – level X - transparency – level X - competence – level X - legality – level X - participation – level X 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the quality and reliability of the data records regarding the fulfilment of the process criteria - the consistency of applying of the principles by the management - any unplanned results <p>Were the process quality indicators defined adequately? If not, did the management try to amend them?</p>	<p>Any good governance lacks caused or joined by the failures of the project management?</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - proposal and approval of the evaluation team 	<p>Internal discussions of the ordering entity with the participation of the organisational units responsible for the running and control of the self-government bodies that are not directly involved in the CP process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - transparency – level X - competence – level X - legality – level X 		
--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>(Preconditions for meeting the objective)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - functional tools of mutual communication - reasonable political stability - public interest - existence of a generally perceived problem 	
---	---	--