Safer Nightlife Projects

A European proposition to promote evaluation and share good practices

DEMOCRACY CITIES & DRUGS PROJECT

Safer Nightlife Projects

A European proposition to promote evaluation and share good practices

The Democracy, Cities and Drugs (DC&D) network is the alliance of an association of 300 European cities with organizations stemming from European civil society networks. This alliance aims to promote local and integrated responses to the drug phenomenon. The programme intends to support local partnerships and to set up a sustainable network of exchange of know-how.

The DC&D Safer Nightlife platform aims to improve nightlife prevention programmes and training for professionals and peer workers operating on the front-line with drug users in nightlife settings (music festivals, clubs, raves, etc). Together, besides exchange of practices and different specific topics addressed during our seminars, we have developed different tools:

[·] The guideline "*A European proposition to promote safer nightlife and share good practice*" supporting the development of Safer Nighlife partnerships at the local level;

[·] preventive "ICONS" for the general public of music events;

[·] a short film, "Before Between and After", that underlines the decision making process, covering different specific moments, venues and choices made by party-goers during a night out;

[·] a digital library to share and facilitate the access to different specific documents related with Safer Nightlife front line programmes including: prevention leaflets, new technologies productions, guidelines, programmes' presentations & reports, internal protocols, training documents and evaluation tools;

[·] and this guideline to help Safer Nightlife programmes evaluate their actions by:

- including the evaluation issues from the start,
- involve more stakeholders in the evaluation process,
- sharing good practice at different levels (objectives, strategies, processes definition and tools),
- promoting evaluation and evidence based programmes.

All these tools and documents are available on www.democitydrug.org/safernightlife

Contents

1. Introduction

2. Evaluating programmes

3. Examples of programme evaluations within the DC&DII Safer Nightlife network

01

Introduction

In Europe, the number of Safer Nightlife projects managed by NGOs or by local administrations increases every year. These projects have been contributing largely to the evolution of the Risk Reduction strategies and tools and continue to be a source of creativity to enlarge partnerships and to face new issues. The spaces of intervention as well as the different types of public being reached during fieldwork as well as through the use of ICT tools, are evolving constantly, as do the patterns of consumptions, the substances available (Research Chemicals, Legal Highs) and the ways these substances are being purchased.

Risk Reduction, Community empowerment (including peer work) and Health promotion strategies are the basis of numerous Safer Nightlife projects. There is an increasing recognition and diffusion of these strategies but various specific programmes still need to be defined and evaluated with more precision. Safer Nightlife projects often share a lack of financial resources to fully develop their programmes and to maintain a continuous evaluation process.

Evaluation is necessary at many levels from proving efficiency or re-orientating programmes, to justifying fundings. Evaluation will also allow field workers to communicate about their work and to fill the gap between them and the scientific community. The research and/or evaluation topics covered by the scientific community often differ from the needs of the front line projects and the partygoers. Field workers want to share the results obtained within their projects and need to evaluate them to ensure that they are evidence based before being disseminated.

The DC&DII Safer Nightlife partners have chosen to elaborate this guideline to share information, knowledge and tools to promote the evaluation of Safer Nightlife programmes, to improve the existing ones and to help new projects include these evaluation issues from the start.

This guideline is linked with the Digital Library of the DC&D Safer Nightlife project (www.democitydrug.org/safernightlife) where a variety of documents, tools and reports from the DC&D partners are available on-line to illustrate and complement the topics and examples proposed in this document.

1.1. What is evaluation?

There is a joke shared by evaluators that says: “if you ask 10 evaluators to define evaluation, you will probably end up with 23 different definitions” *(Shaw et al. 2006)*. The aim of this first chapter is not to give an exhaustive definition of evaluation but to offer some interesting conceptual approaches that will be useful to the objectives of this guide.

There is not one single definition of evaluation. As a general concept, we could say that evaluation is:

"a type of disciplined inquiry undertaken to determine the value (merit and/or worth) of some entity -the evaluand- such as a treatment, programme, facility, performance, and the like -in order to improve or refine the evaluand (formative evaluation) or to asses its impact (summative evaluation)" (Lincoln & Guba, 1986).

"the systematic collection of information about the activities, characteristics, and outcomes of programmes to make judgements about the programme, improve programme effectiveness, and/or inform decisions about future programming" (Patton, 2002).

"a time-bound exercise that attempts to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, performance and success, or the lack thereof, of ongoing and completed programmes" (UNPF [1], 2004).

There is not one evaluative purpose but many. These include traditional evaluation agendas of accounting for the results of public programmes and policies, and seeking to determine their efficiency. Evaluation also seeks understanding of how organizations work and how they change, and may develop and assess means of strengthening institutions and improving performance. Increasing agency responsiveness to the public and service users, and working to reform government through the free flow of evaluation information are also central evaluation purposes (Shaw, 1999).

We could link this diversity of purpose to three different conceptual perspectives within evaluation (Chelimsky, 1997):

[·] Evaluation for accountability (e.g. measuring results or efficiency).

[·] Evaluation for development (e.g. providing evaluative help to strengthen institutions).

[·] Evaluation for knowledge (e.g. obtaining a deeper understanding in some specific area or policy field).

As explained in The Programme Managers Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit, of the UN, (PMPMET 2004, Toolkit 2) the main objectives of programme evaluation are:

[·] To inform decisions on operations, policy, or strategy related to ongoing or future programme interventions;

[·] To demonstrate accountability[2] to decision-makers (donors and policy makers).

Other objectives of programme evaluation include:

[·] To enable corporate learning and contribute to the body of knowledge on what works and what does not work and why;

[·] To verify/improve programme quality and management;

1 United Nations Population Fund (2004) The Programme Managers Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit.

2 Accountability is the responsibility to justify expenditures, decisions or the results of the discharge of authority and official duties, including duties delegated to a subordinate unit or individual. Programme Managers are responsible for providing evidence to stakeholders and sponsors that a programme is effective and in conformity with its coverage, service, legal and fiscal requirements.

[·] To identify successful strategies for extension/expansion/replication;

[·] To modify unsuccessful strategies;

[·] To measure effects/benefits of programme and project interventions;

[·] To give stakeholders the opportunity to have a say in programme output and quality;

[·] To justify/validate programmes to donors, partners and other constituencies.

1.2 Evaluation principles

In conducting an evaluation, it is important to bear in mind the following four basic principles which have wide acceptance in the evaluation community. Although they may seem obvious, it is very helpful to refer back to these points to ensure that the evaluation is on the right track. These principles are:

> **Utility**

Perhaps one of the most important considerations which an evaluation should address is whose questions the evaluation is trying to answer. For example, what do stakeholders want to know and how should the results be communicated? An evaluation should be of use to someone!

> **Feasibility**

What resources do you have available to you in order to implement an evaluation? It is essential to conduct an evaluation which is realistic, so questions about available resources, timescales, budgets and priorities must be addressed and, once agreed, should be adhered to. It is better to have a thorough evaluation of one aspect of a programme than to embark on a major evaluation of the whole programme which cannot be effectively conducted due to lack of resources.

> **Propriety**

Consideration should also be given to issues of legality and ethics. Are the activities which you are planning for the evaluation ethical and legal? The evaluation process should never adversely affect those it is trying to help and all investigation must be conducted with regard to client confidentiality.

> **Accuracy**

Is the information you have collected accurate? Accuracy is vital to the overall worth and reliability of the evaluation. An issue to bear in mind here is selection of information. The evaluation may produce information which the audience would not wish to hear or that you are embarrassed about. We would suggest that, in these circumstances, you report honestly but highlight the fact that you are aware of the problem and offer a positive statement on how this may be resolved or tackled.

These four principles should infuse the design and implementation of all evaluations (EMCDDA, 2001).

1.3 Modes of evaluation

Given these general definitions, we can think about different modes of evaluation, in relation to different criteria of approach (Gómez, 2003):

Classification criteria	Modes of evaluation
Moment of the evaluation	Formative evaluation Summative evaluation Initial evaluation Mid-term evaluation Terminal evaluation
Extent of the evaluation	Partial evaluation Global evaluation
Who evaluates	Self-evaluation Internal evaluation External evaluation Mixed evaluation
What to evaluate (objectives of the evaluation)	Evaluation of needs Design evaluation Process or execution evaluation: [·] Implementation and monitoring [·] Effort, coverage, productivity and quality Product evaluation: [·] Effectivity, efficiency [·] Impact results Proactive evaluation Retroactive evaluation

How to evaluate	Experimental design Quasi-experimental design Non experimental design Qualitative methodologies Quantitative methodologies

Related to these different modes, let's see a glossary of terms:

Formative Evaluation: A type of process evaluation undertaken during programme implementation to furnish information that will guide programme improvement. A formative evaluation focuses on collecting data on programme operations so that needed changes or modifications can be made to the programme in its early stages. Formative evaluations are used to provide feedback to programme managers and other personnel about the programme that are working and those that need to be changed.

Process Evaluation: A type of evaluation that examines the extent to which a programme is operating as intended by assessing ongoing programme operations. A process evaluation helps programme managers identify what changes are needed in design, strategies and operations to improve performance.

Summative Evaluation: A type of outcome and impact evaluation that assesses the overall effectiveness of a programme.

Thematic Evaluation: Evaluation of selected aspects or cross-cutting issues in different types of interventions.

Impact evaluation: A type of evaluation that focuses on the broad, longer-term impact or results, whether intended or unintended, of a programme or outcome. For example, an impact evaluation could show that a decrease in a community's overall infant mortality rate was the direct result of a programme designed to provide high quality pre- and post-natal care and deliveries assisted by trained health care professionals. See also "country-level impact assessment".

Mid-term evaluation: A type of evaluation carried out during project or programme implementation. Its principal goal is to assess progress made, to draw initial conclusions for managing the programme or project and to make recommendations for the remaining period. It addresses operational issues of relevance and performance and extracts initial lessons learned. Sometimes referred to as an "ongoing" evaluation.

Terminal evaluation: Evaluation conducted after the intervention has been in place for some time or towards the end of a project or programme to measure outcomes, demonstrate the effectiveness and relevance of interventions and strategies, indicate early signs of impact, and recommend what interventions to promote or abandon.

Ex-post evaluation: A type of summative evaluation of an intervention usually conducted two years or more after it has been completed. Its purpose is to study how well the intervention (programme or project) served its aims and to draw conclusions for similar interventions in the future.

Outcome evaluation: Evaluation that covers a set of related projects programmes and strategies intended to bring about a certain outcome. An outcome evaluation assesses "how" and "why" outcomes are or are not being achieved in a given country context, and the contribution of UNDP outputs to the outcome. It can also help to clarify the underlying factors that explain the achievement or lack thereof of outcomes; highlight unintended consequences (both positive and negative) of interventions; and recommend actions to improve performance in future programming cycles and generate lessons learned.

Internal Evaluation: Evaluation of a development intervention conducted by a unit and /or individual/s reporting to the donor, partner, or implementing organization for the intervention.

Self-evaluation: An evaluation by those who are administering a programme or project in the field.

External Evaluation: An evaluation conducted by individuals or entities free of control by those responsible for the design and implementation of the development intervention to be evaluated (synonym: independent evaluation).

Qualitative Evaluation: A type of evaluation that is primarily descriptive and interpretative, and may or may not lend itself to quantification.

Quantitative Evaluation: A type of evaluation involving the use of numerical measurement and data analysis based on statistical methods.

(PMPMET, 2004, Tool 1 and UNDP, 2002)

02

Evaluating programmes

The evaluation objectives and process must be considered, if possible, in the initial design of any programme, since it has to be planned to respond to the same questions the programme has generated.

The relation between the objectives of the programme and the objectives of the evaluation has to be clear from the beginning; thus is necessary to answer to a sequence of questions that imply the whole programme plan.

We propose here a sequence of questions that can structure the evaluation process of our programmes. We have divided these questions in 3 parts:

Before the evaluation: *what* and *why* we do what we do?

The evaluation: *what* and *why* we want to evaluate?

The methodological approach: *how* do we evaluate what we do?

Answering these questions can be the first step to design and develop the evaluation.

2.1 Before the evaluation: *what* and *why* we do what we do?

The evaluation of a specific programme has to necessarily respond to questions formulated from the objectives of this programme. What are the aims and objectives of this programme? *Why do we do what we do*?

These questions might seem obvious, but they are not. A lot of programmes take their objectives for granted, like something inscribed in the same definition of the organization. It is necessary, tough, to be able to write down what goal does the programme want to reach, and what are the objectives it is trying to achieve.

Clarifying both aims and objectives serves two purposes. While it is extremely important to be aware of what the project is trying to achieve in the short and long term, it is also helpful for projects' teams and management staff to be reminded of specific aims and objectives, particularly to check if these have actually changed or evolved over time. (EMCDDA, 2001)

Once we can express the aims of our programme, it is important to detail the characteristics of it, responding to the question: *How do we do what we do*?

This means writing down an accurate description of the programme: activities, methodology, resources, materials, timing, budget, etc. Besides the description, we need to recognise the expected outcomes of our programme and how can we relate them with our objectives.

This description will allow us to properly define the evaluation aims, objectives and characteristics.

Programme: A time-bound intervention that consists of a set of planned, interrelated activities aimed at achieving defined programme outputs.

Goal: The higher order objective to which a development intervention is intended to contribute.

Objective: A generic term usually used to express an outcome or goal representing the desired result that a programme seeks to achieve.

Aims should be understood to be a general statement about the end or ultimate goal of the intervention.

Specific Objectives are more specific targets that will need to be met in order to achieve the wider aim.

(PMPMET, 2004)

2.2 Evaluation questions: *what* and *why* we want to evaluate?

Before evaluating a programme, the reasons for the evaluation should be clearly defined. If the purpose is not clear, there is a risk that the evaluation will focus on the wrong concerns, draw the wrong conclusions and provide recommendations which will not be useful for the intended users of evaluation results (PMPMET 2004).

2.2.a What are the aims and objectives of the evaluation? Why are we evaluating?

[·] To acquire better knowledge about what we are doing?

[·] To improve the service?

[·] To know the impact of the service among users?

[·] To know the opinion of the users about the service?

[·] To give accountability of our programme?

[·] ...

The first question to ask before embarking on an evaluation is why your programme should be evaluated. It may be that you are at a stage when you feel that the programme needs to be reassessed, perhaps because the client group is changing or you need to clarify or redefine your aims and objectives.

In some instances, the impetus for an evaluation comes from within the programme team itself, because staff and managers are interested in improving operations. It may be felt that the programme is attaining its goals but there is no clear way of measuring the impact that has been made. In other cases, the evaluation is demanded by external funding bodies that are anxious to see that their financial contribution is making a difference. (EMCCDA, 2001)

2.2.b Who needs or requests the evaluation?... and who is the audience for the evaluation?

Once we have defined why we want to evaluate our programme, it is important to identify the main target audiences for the information from the evaluation. Obviously, these will include projects' teams themselves and funding bodies, but other groups likely to be affected are present and potential clients. (EMCDDA, 2001)

Be aware how these groups may influence the aims and objectives of your evaluation. What will they want to learn from the evaluation? How can the evaluation help them to offer their contribution? Although it will not be possible to consult with all of the persons/groups who may be interested, it is a good idea to canvass a cross-section of stakeholders to gauge what aspects of the evaluation they are interested in and how they might want to become involved.

2.2.c What do we want to evaluate?

Having agreed on who the evaluation is for, it is essential to establish exactly what parts of the project are to be evaluated. To do this there must be a clear understanding amongst all stakeholders of what the different parts of the project are and what they aim to achieve.

2.2.d What we want to do with the results?

The kind of data we want to reach from the evaluation process can strongly determine the methodology we have to use, and the type of analysis and data treatment. It will be useful to define what kind of product we want to produce and what use we will give to it.

2.2.e What are our resources to do the evaluation and Who will carry the evaluation?

How much time and money is potentially available? Though the decision of who is going to carry the evaluation is not necessarily related to the resources we count on, sometimes this defines if we will carry an internal or an external evaluation.

Thus we can decide on:

[·] hiring an external consultant;

[·] using (a) current staff member(s); or

[·] teaming a staff member with an external consultant brought in to assist.

Not all projects require an independent outside evaluator and, indeed, these guidelines are written specifically to assist project staff to evaluate their own interventions on a regular basis.

Nevertheless, there are times when it might be better to contract an outside person, someone with an external viewpoint and evaluation experience. The main advantages to this are that he or she probably has access to more resources than internal evaluators and is likely to have considerably more valuable evaluation experience than an internal staff member. One further advantage is that external evaluators can offer a fresh perspective on the project that should be welcomed by staff. External consultants can be found at universities and other tertiary education institutions, state health departments or the private sector.

There are also potential disadvantages when bringing in an external evaluator. They may, for example, specialise in a kind of evaluation that is not very appropriate to your service. Since external consultants are not directly involved with the project, they are likely to have a limited understanding of the project's daily activities. They also cost money! (EMCDDA, 2001)

2.2.f What is our temporary plan to develop the evaluation?

It is necessary to define from the beginning the timing of each evaluation so that their results in each case or in combination can be used to take important programme related decisions.

2.3 The methodological approach: how are we going to evaluate?

This part will discuss how the information necessary for an evaluation can be collected and analysed. This information is often referred to as data. Many people think that the term 'data' refers to numerical information only, but it can also be used for things such as facts, statistics and observations. In order to depict the differences between types of data, and the methods used to collect this data, the terms 'quantitative' and 'qualitative' are used. Rather than understanding qualitative and quantitative approaches as polar opposites, it is useful to consider the data and methods as being placed on a qualitative/quantitative continuum.

Thus, in this part of the evaluation process, we need to give answers to the following questions:

[·] What kind of data do we want to look for?

[·] What kind of data can we reach?

[·] What kind of data do we want to produce?

[·] What methodology, methods and techniques do we want to use?

[·] How can we design the evaluation process?

'What distinguishes one evaluation methodology from another is not methods, but rather whose questions are addressed and which values are promoted' (Greene, 19984).

Methodologies and methods are not the same thing. Methodologies are strategies that lay out the means for achieving the goals of research, whereas methods are the techniques used in the service of achieving those goals. Methodologies are the blueprints; methods are the tools.

The word approach is much less formal than paradigm and a more general term than technique, method, or methodology. An approach is composed of a set of assumptions, goals, and methods. Qualitative is one kind of approach.

What are the characteristics of a qualitative or a qualitative approach? In what evaluation circumstances might we use each inquiry?

To this question, the EMCDDA guide provides us a very good explanation:

Very simply, qualitative methods collect data that will show the situation through the eyes of those involved. The qualitative approach aims to observe and understand events within a context, paying particular attention to the complexity of the interactions which result in an event or situation. Qualitative approaches tend to favour methods such as participant observation and interviewing to uncover the more holistic and complex network of interactions which work together to create situations.

Quantitative methods aim to collect data that can describe and represent events, concepts, situations, etc., using numbers. This type of data tends to be used to highlight trends and patterns and is also helpful for comparative purposes.

Qualitative data are very useful for the evaluation of outreach programmes. The nature of outreach work means that, although quantitative data is important, it must be put into context. For example, a street work programme may have 50 contacts in one week and 25 referrals, but this data says nothing about the type of contact, the outcome of the interventions, the level of success with individuals with complex needs and so on. The numbers are meaningful only if augmented with other information. So, referring back to the idea of a qualitative/quantitative continuum, a solution may be to develop an approach which is a balanced mix of both methods.

When selecting methods of data collection, it is important to always bear in mind the aims and objectives of the evaluation. This should be the driving force behind the decisions on methodology. It may sound trivial, but practice shows that it is easy to lose sight of the aims and objectives of the evaluation when the issue of methods is under discussion. A second important point in this decision-making process is the incorporation of cost and feasibility into the discussion, as certain methods are more expensive and/or require more specific expertise in using them. Methods must be chosen which are within the available resources.

As a rule of thumb, it is useful to begin by listing the existing data held by the programme which may be suitable for the evaluation. Based on this overview, it can subsequently be decided if any additional data collection is required and, if so, what methods would be most appropriate.

It is important to realise that all methods will have strengths and weaknesses and that no single method can provide all the information required. Therefore, it is recommended that several methods be used simultaneously. However, it may be better, initially, to apply a few methods in a good way rather than many methods in a bad way!

The following table gives an overview of a variety of data collection methods, structured according to the actual practice of outreach programmes in Europe. It begins with data collection methods which are often already in place and subsequently mentions some additional methods for consideration.

Method	Purpose	Advantages	Challenges
Client Contact Sheet	Standardised recording clients' details and socio-demographic characteristics, often in relation with type of intervention, eg contact or referral (mainly for aggregated quantitative purposes)	> easy to administer > easy to analyse > can hint at client progress	> does not give any information about context > not suitable for all types of work
Computer-based data collection	For recording general information –usually quantitative– about clients' characteristics and type of intervention. Often based on client contact sheets	> makes analysing and manipulating data quickly easy	> requires trained personnel > requires suitable hard-and software > requires maintenance
Feedback forms for clients	For brief snapshot information about client views and impact of intervention	> allows clients to feedback anonymously > quick and easy to administer	> possible low return rate > difficulty of following up individual issues especially if anonymous – question of utility > assumes literacy etc.
Case notes	Information on preselected individual aspects of clients (mostly qualitative/non standardised information)	> provide individualised information on clients' characteristics and relevant contextual information	> aggregation of individual information
Log books/diaries	Provision of in-depth-information on individual clients' and observations about changes in target groups, often used in a informal way for team meetings	> in-depth and contextual information	> can be time consuming and requires commitment from all staff > less easy to analyse and aggregate
Minutes of internal group meetings	Accountability	> provide information on process development, issues at stake and agreements made	> requires people to make the minutes in a regular manner
Stock taking records – eg for needles or condoms provided, publication materials distributed.	For indicators of output	> provides insight in output and can function as part of outcome measurement > can give an indication of patterns and trends > function also as audit requirements	> cannot function directly as outcome indicator

Auditing financial records and accounts	For information about efficiency and cost effectiveness	> good practice anyway > vital to ensure money is properly spent and accounted for	> does not indicate impact or quality of service
Method	**Overall Purpose**	**Advantages**	**Challenges**
Analysis of existing documentation: internal: eg annual reports, publicity about project, external: eg about other projects and stakeholders of importance scientific and grey literature	Selection of information potentially suitable for the evaluation purpose	> using existing resources to highlight value > another source of useful contextual information to complement other data > avoidance of reinventing the wheel > relatively little interruption of project's activities	> could be difficult to collate and analyse > can be time consuming > data restricted to what already exists
Surveys	Obtain information for evaluation purposes among a sample of the target population	> information can be provided anonymously > administer to many people > relatively easy to analysis	> depending on the type of survey, survey experts need to be hired
Face to face interviews with clients	Gathering more detailed information about the impact of the service from the client's perspective or unmet clients' needs	> possibility of gathering depth information about the impact of the service > additional benefit: can strengthen worker's-client interaction	> time + cost consuming > requires trained interviewers > interviewer can bias client's responses > depending on topic investigation access to target group can be difficult (eg HIV/AIDS
Face to face interviews with staff	Looking for process information about internal management and working practices	> in-depth information not captured by already documented information	> requires trained interviewer > may create tensions
Face to face interviews with other stakeholders	For detailed information about the relationships the service has within a wider network and perceptions of stakeholders about the project	> provides a usefulperspective on how the service is perceived externally	> can be time consuming > may need external consultant – expensive > may create/exacerbate tensions
Focus group	Explore the relevant issues among stakeholders (clients/other agencies etc.) either among one group of stakeholders or a mixture	> can be efficient way to get much range and depth of information in a short time	> needs a good facilitator > scheduling may be difficult

Ethnographic observation/participation	Gather insight into how project/ intervention/target group operates	> information from the inside-out and bottom-up	> requires trained workers in order to interpret what is seen > access > time and cost expensive > can influence behaviours of those concerned
Case studies	In-depth understanding of a target group of clients, including similarities and differences	> information about clients experiences of the intervention > enables comparison > if depicted in a good way, enrich the portray of the intervention to outsiders	> time consuming > provides more depth rather than breadth

A combination of methods collecting both qualitative and quantitative data, selected according to the needs of the evaluation, is the most useful approach.

The debate between qualitative and quantitative researchers is based upon the differences in assumptions about what reality is and whether or not it is measurable. The debate further rests on differences of opinion about how we can best understand what we “know,” whether through objective or subjective methods.

The simplest way to distinguish between qualitative and quantitative may be to say that qualitative methods study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of the meaning people bring to them (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994) describing kinds of characteristics of people and events without comparing events in terms of measurements or amounts. Quantitative methods, on the other hand, use numbers and statistical methods; it tends to be based on numerical measurements of specific aspects of phenomena; it abstracts from particular instances to seek general description or to test causal hypotheses; it seeks measurements and analyses that are easily replicable by other researchers (King, Keohane, Verba, 1994).

2.3.a The qualitative approach: methods and techniques

Within the qualitative approach, there are currently seven predominate methodologies: ethnography, ethnomethodology, reception studies, ecological psychology, symbolic interactionism, cultural studies, and textual analysis. (Potter, 1996)

The qualitative approach essentially relies on three types of evidence-gathering methods: document examination, interview, and observation. The second and third of these, which identify people as the subject of the investigation, often show considerable overlap.

Each of these three major types is presented individually in the sections that follow so that their main characteristics can be clearly highlighted. Each type has its own special strengths and weaknesses. Many research programmes use more than one type of method, because a combination of methods will provide the researcher with more different kinds of evidence thus making comparisons richer and more contextualized.

> **Document Examination**

When texts are the focus of the investigation, documents must be examined. There is a wide variety of documents, including diaries, letters, memos, notes, photographs, audiotapes, videotapes, films, articles, books, manuscripts, and the list goes on. In general, documents are any preserved recording of a person's thoughts, actions, or creations.

> **Interviewing**

Interviewing is the technique of gathering data from humans by asking them questions and getting them to react verbally. There are several ways of characterizing interviews. For example, interviews can be structured or unstructured. They can be casual or in-depth. Marshall and Rossman (1989) explained: "Typically, qualitative in-depth interviews are much more like conversations than formal, structured interviews. The researcher explores a few general topics to help uncover the participant's meaning perspective, but otherwise respects how the participant frames and structures the responses".

Another form of interviewing is called the ethnographic interview, which differs from friendly conversation in several important ways. It is not balanced as most conversations are. Instead, the ethnographer informs the interviewee of the purpose of the interview and then takes control by asking questions and probing the person's responses. This type of interviewing is structured like survey interviewing; the key difference is that it is responsive to situations rather than standardized. Nondirective questions are open-ended and designed to get the interviewee talking about a broad topic area. Directive questions are designed to get a specific fact or opinion. Interviewers must be careful not to ask leading questions, and the accounts produced by the interviewees must never be dismissed as ideological distortions; even inaccuracies are themselves data.

> **Focus Groups**

A group of usually 7-10 people selected to engage in discussions designed for the purpose of sharing insights and observations, obtaining perceptions or opinions, suggesting ideas, or recommending actions on a topic of concern. A focus group discussion is a method of collecting data for monitoring and evaluation purposes.

> **Observation**

Observation is the technique of gathering data through direct contact with an object-usually another human being. The researcher watches the behaviour and documents the properties of the object. It is a very important method of data collection used by both qualitative and quantitative researchers. Quantitative scholars usually have an a priori highly structured plan that directs them to remain aloof (such as in laboratory experiments) and observe certain behaviours. In contrast, qualitative researchers usually observe from a phenomenological perspective; they immerse themselves in natural environments and watch a situation as a diffuse, ambiguous entity and allow themselves to be struck with certain peculiarities or interesting happenings.

As for researcher activity, some observers are unobtrusive as they watch from outside the group being studied; sometimes the people in the group are not even aware they are being observed. Other observers are intrusive, as in the case of participant observation where the observer is present on site to participate, observe, and/or interview.

2.3.b The Quantitative approach

Quantitative methods aim to collect data that can describe and represent events, concepts, situations, etc., using numbers. This type of data tends to be used to highlight trends and patterns and is also helpful for comparative purposes (EMCDDA.2001).

Quantitative researchers seek explanations and predictions that will generalize to other persons and places. Careful sampling strategies and experimental designs are aspects of quantitative methods aimed at produce generalizable results. In quantitative research, the researcher's role is to observe and measure, and care is taken to keep the researchers from "contaminating" the data through personal involvement with the research subjects.

> **Survey**

Systematic collection of information from a defined population, usually by means of interviews or questionnaires administered to a sample of units in the population (e.g. person, youth, adults etc.). Baseline surveys are carried out at the beginning of the programme to describe the situation prior to a development intervention in order to assess progress; Mid line surveys are conducted at the mid point of the cycle to provide management and decision makers with the information necessary to assess and, if necessary, adjust, implementation, procedures, strategies and institutional arrangements, for the attainment of results. In addition, the results of mid line surveys can also be used to inform and guide the formulation of a new country programme. End line surveys are conducted towards the end of the cycle to provide decision makers and planners with information with which to review the achievements of the programme and generate lessons to guide the formulation and/or implementation of a new programme/ project.

03

Examples of programme evaluations within the DC&D Safer Nightlife network

The partners' specific evaluation tools and reports related to each of the following examples are available on the DC&DII Safer Nightlife Digital Library: www.democitydrug.org/safernightlife

3.1 Drug-checking

Example proposed by the Jugendberatung Streetwork, City of Zurich - Switzerland

3.1.a Before the evaluation: define and describe your project

a.1 What are the aims and objectives of our project? Why do you do what you do?

General aims

[·] Improving outreach and contacts with party drugs users

[·] Providing facts related to party drugs consumption

[·] Change attitudes and practices related to drug consumption and other health related practices

[·] Increasing the knowledge about the quality of party drugs (purity, cutting agent etc.) and about consumption risk behaviour (mixed consumption, dosage, consumption practices)

[·] Sharing knowledge about the drug market with other services to increase benefit towards public health

[·] Sorting out the problematic users or those wishing specific medical or therapeutic services

Specific objectives

[·] Increasing the user knowledge concerning the "quality" of party drugs, adulterants, dosages and effects.

[·] Providing information about the specific risks concerning the quality of party drugs (cutting agent, purity etc.)

[·] Publishing warnings related to unexpected substance content, highly dosed tablets or powder and new upcoming substances (for example Research Chemicals)

[·] Provide information about drugs consumption, related risks and other information related to health promotion

[·] Answering questions related to the substances and their quality

[·] Discuss, examine and influence attitudes and practices related to consumption and other practices

[·] Respond to users needs to know the quality of the substance bought on the black market or on the internet a.2 What are the characteristics of the project? How do you do what you do?

Drug–checking is the term to describe the analyses of mostly illegal substances bought on the black market (illegal) or on the internet (illegal or legal). There are different kinds of drug-checking methods, HPLC, Marquee, Thin layer and others. A drug-checking facility can be offered on site (in the club, venue or festival) or in a drop-in centre!

The integration of the drug-checking facility:

Setting: on site (clubs, raves, festival?) or stationary?

Streetwork offer two different drug-checking services on site, clubs and events, and stationary at the drug information centre (DIZ).

Number of interventions (on site drug-checking)?

Streetwork is present on site with a drug-checking facility between 8–10 times per year.

Number of opening days and hours (stationary service)?

The DIZ is open every Tuesday (exceptionally over Christmas time), with a minimum of fifteen time per year

Share with other projects?

The mobile (on site) lab is shared with other nightlife prevention institutions; the lab for the DIZ works at the moment exclusively for Streetwork, between 5.30 PM and 8.30 PM

The detailed services:

Analysing technique?

Both labs with which Streetwork work are using the HPLC technique

Type of results?

The results are qualitative and quantitative

Accuracy of the results?

The accuracy of the results is 99%

Analysing time?

On site immediately (20 minutes) and three days (until Friday) at the DIZ

Ways of transmitting the results

The results are transmitted orally (on site) and/or by phone or e-mail at the DIZ

Information inside the transmitted result?

The user will be informed about the substance analysed (quantitative) and the purity (qualitative)

Which results are transmitted to the general public?

Warnings, and from time to time tendencies reports about specific substances (Cocaine or XTC tablets)

Concerning the evaluation of the other services related to the environment in which the drug-checking facility is located – have a look at the on site interventions and drop-in centre evaluation examples.

Description of the assigned staff:

Professional internal staff

The assigned employees of the youth counselling Streetwork are between 30 and 38 years old. All have a Bachelor in Social Work and internal or external trainings on the specific risks related to drug consumption.

Professional external staff

The external staff is mostly working for the lab which is doing the drug-checking. They are mostly experienced lab assistants.

Non professional staff (volunteers / peers)

Streetwork does not work with volunteers and peers.

<u>a.3 What are the outcomes of your project?</u>

X visitors/year? 1.694 visitors in 2009

X analyses/year? 462 analyses in 2009

X warnings/year and which percent of the collected samples are warnings? 86 warnings in 2009 = 18.61%

Number of recipients of the warnings (E-mail contact, Website download etc.)? 1.800 single user website and 321 e-mail address in the warning system 2009

X filled out questionnaires/year? 475 in 2009

X longer counselling session (longer than 15 Minutes)? 702 in 2009

3.1.b Evaluation questions: what and why we want to evaluate?

<u>b.1 What are the aims and objectives of the evaluation?</u>

General aims

[·] Showing the importance, specially for public health, of the service

[·] Increasing the knowledge about party goers drug-market

[·] Trends on substance use

[·] Increasing knowledge and influence consumption behaviours

Specific objectives

[·] Evaluating the type of public who use drug-checking

[·] Evaluating the content of the counselling sessions within the drug-checking services

[·] Evaluating the reaction of the user after the result feedback

b.2 Who needs or requests the evaluation?

Internal request

[·] Enhancement of the services

[·] Further development of the services

External request

[·] Results for administrations which are financing the service

[·] Improve the significance of the service towards financing administration and/or policy decision takers

[·] Other nightlife prevention specialists

b.3 What we want to evaluate?

> The integration of the drug-checking service
> Acceptance/attractiveness in general
> Did drug-checking respond to the need of the target group

Accessibility

Adequacy of the frequency and opening hours: which days, which schedule, how long (different for specific target groups)?

The adequacy, efficiency and use of the services

[·] The duration of the analysis

[·] The range of substances that can be analysed

[·] The way results will be submitted

[·] The consistency of the results – did they trust the results

[·] The explanation of the results

[·] The visibility of the warnings

[·] The comprehension and impact of the results/warnings

The workers

[·] The number and types of workers / volunteers / peers needed for the interventions

[·] Number of contacts each worker has during an intervention

[·] Their competences: nightlife, health, drug, social, counselling, communication…

b.4 What do we want to do with the results?

[·] Convince policy makers or other decision takers about the necessity of drug-checking

[·] Use of the project's annual report

[·] Present it in conferences

[·] Improve the quality of the evaluated service

b.5 What are the resources to do the evaluation? Who will carry the evaluation?

If you wish for an evaluation to show the necessary evidence of your service or for collecting better information about the users (target group) you first need professional support. This will help you to develop adequate questionnaires and evaluation tools. After this work a Project Manager and an internal staff member can be in charge of the evaluation.

3.1c How are we going to evaluate? methodology, methods and techniques

c.1 What kind of data can we reach and produce?

Quantitative information:

Accounts of visits

[·] How many first visits

[·] How many visits for each person

Duration of the visit

[·] Average

[·] Range

Type of visitor

[·] Sex

[·] Age

[·] Education

[·] Employment status

How the person learned about the existence of the place

[·] Website

[·] Advertising

[·] Flyer

[·] Personal information (peer to peer)

Quantity of asked questions

[·] Numbers of material distributed

[·] Numbers of leaflets distributed

[·] Numbers of workshops, exhibitions, parties...

Qualitative information:

Content of asked questions

[·] About substance use

[·] About substance quality

[·] Health problems

[·] Counselling, therapeutic and medical support

[·] Small talk (public relations)

Feedback related to the service

[·] Positive things

[·] Negative things

Individual risk reduction strategies

[·] Risk reduction strategies adopted in relation with the drug checking results

[·] Influence of the drug checking results on behaviors/consumption

[·] Pre test of a small amount of substance

[·] Information about a specific substance from/for peers

[·] Origin and ways of purchasing the substance

Opinion of external partner

[·] Aid Services

[·] Poison control centre

[·] Security services

[·] Hospital

[·] Local Police

[·] Other prevention specialists

<u>c.2 What methodology, methods and techniques do we want to use?</u>

Anonymous questionnaire

Paper

Electronic version (online):

[·] Website statistics

[·] Data collecting sheets

[·] Existing networks of external partners for focus group c.3 How do we design the evaluation process?

Every participant is obliged to fill out the anonymous questionnaire together with one person from the counselling team during the analysis process. Beside this data collecting, questionnaires will be completed during opening hours from a responsible staff member. During annual network meetings, questions related to the offer can be transmitted externally for the purpose of a focus group. More specific inquiries are made according to needs (new service, modification of opening hours…).

Example of a data collecting sheet:

Nr	Gender			Origin			Counselling topics							Contact information					
Internal Number	Male	Female	Age	City of Zürich	Around Zürich	Other	Drug-cheking	Drug-information	Addiction	Small-Talk	Health in generl t	Social topics	Result explaining	First contact	Following contact	e-mail counselling g	Phone counselling	Shorter yhe 15 minutes	Longer the 15 minutes
xxx	X		21	X			X	X				X			X			X	
Xxy		X	23		X		X		X					X					X
Xyy	X		33			X		X			X		X	X					X
Total	2	1		1	1	1	2	2	1		1	1	1	2	1			1	2
Date:																			
Responsible person:																			

3.2 Leaflets

Example proposed by Check In, APDES - Portugal

3.2.a Before the evaluation: define and describe your project

a.1. What are the aims and objectives of our leaflet?

General aims

[·] To reduce risks related to drug use by partygoers

Specific objectives

[·] To reach partygoers / to promote interaction with our target group

[·] To increase knowledge about drug use

[·] To disseminate risk reduction information

[·] To change attitudes and practices related to drug use

[·] To promote our project and services

a.2 What are the characteristics of the leaflet?

CHECK!N has 14 different leaflets about drugs for partygoers. The leaflets are available in every CHECK!N intervention at parties, as well as on our website, forum and social networks. All the leaflets include information on effects, doses, contraindications, mixes, and risk reduction strategies. The research for the leaflets was done by the project staff and volunteers. All the leaflets are peer-reviewed. Due to budget constraints, all these leaflets are "home made", printed at the office with coloured paper and without professional design. In average we take about a month to complete a new leaflet.

We also have other leaflets done by professional designers and professionally printed: a booklet about sex and drugs and another about responsible decision making concerning drug use. Budget:2600€(design+ 5000 leaflet each)

Recently we have organized a design contest to create a postcard about alcohol and driving to be included in a designated driver campaign. Budget: 1000 €(design + 5000 leaflet)

The research, necessary to develop a specific leaflet, can be made by professionals and volunteers. You can also organize a contest (open to partygoers and/or only for volunteers) for the leaflet's design.

In terms of resources you will need a computer and an internet connection for online research. If you promote the contest you will need more resources, like contest prizes and ways of promoting the contest (on the project's website, Facebook, posters).

In terms of time, a month should be enough to create a leaflet - adding printing time; it will obviously take longer if you organize a contest. The budget will depend a lot if you print your own leaflets or you send them to a professional printer, if you pay a professional designer or use internal resources

a.3 What are the outcomes of your project?

In relation to your objectives (2009)

8673 Number of people reached at the stand

21554 Number of leaflets distributed

In terms of results and/or products

17 leaflets on different topics

3.2.b Evaluation questions: what and why we want to evaluate?

b.1 What are the aims and objectives of the evaluation?

General aims

Verify the efficiency with which the leaflet reaches people, increase their knowledge about drug use and change their attitudes and practices related to drug use

Specific objectives

[·] Evaluate the acceptance and aesthetics of the design by partygoers.

[·] Evaluate if the language used in the leaflet is adequate

[·] Evaluate if the readers promote the leaflet to others

[·] Evaluate the use made by the readers of the information in the leaflet

b.2 Who needs or requests the evaluation?

Internal evaluation is needed to validate and improve the leaflets

External evaluation is needed to get financing from public entities

b.3 What we want to evaluate?

In a leaflet we can evaluate several things: the content, the design, the utility for the user, the utility in the outreach work, if the message and language are appropriate for the target population, etc.

It is also important to carefully analyse distribution methods of the leaflets, where they are available, to whom they are directed, if they are associated with other activities (counselling, drug testing, etc) as all these factors will help us understand the type of data we want to collect as well as to "read" the collected data.

According to this and to the WHY we want to evaluate, we are now able to ask specific questions about WHAT we want to evaluate. Here are some examples:

CONTENT

[·] Do the leaflets increase the knowledge about a subject (drugs, harm reduction strategies, etc)?

[·] Do the leaflets change attitudes towards a subject (drug use, safer sniffing)?

[·] Do the leaflets change behaviours towards a subject (drug use, safer sniffing) ?

[·] Do people recognize the credibility of the information found in the leaflets?

[·] Do people understand the message in the leaflet?

[·] Do people find the content useful (for their own drug use …) on a short and/or long term basis?

USEFULLNESS

[·] Will the leaflets be useful to reach people in a party?

[·] Will the leaflets be useful to give publicity to the project, web page or other services?

[·] Will the leaflets be useful to begin a counselling activity in an info stand?

ATRACTIVENESS

[·] Is the design adequate in this kind of context?

[·] Do target groups like the leaflets?

[·] Do target groups find the leaflet easy to read (appropriate language, good content, well indexed …)?

[·] Do target group find the leaflet user friendly (handy, portable …)?

[·] Do target groups find the leaflet fun to read?

[·] Do target groups get curious about the leaflets?

<u>b.4 What do we want to do with the results?</u>

Improve the leaflets

Publish a report

Make use of the results for communication in seminars and conferences

Write articles

<u>b.5 What are our resources to do the evaluation?</u>

You need material (computers with specific software, ex: SPSS; Nvivo, etc, printers, office equipment, etc) and human (staff to build, pass and analyse the evaluation instruments) resources;

b.6 Who will carry the evaluation?

An external consultant;

current staff member(s); or volunteers

3.2.c How are we going to evaluate? methodology, methods and techniques

c.1 What kind of data can we reach and produce?

Quantitative data and qualitative data:

Quantitative data

[·] Number of people visiting the stand

[·] Number of leaflets distributed.

[·] Number of leaflets given per topic (drug, sex, etc)

[·] Level of knowledge about a subject (drugs, harm reduction strategies, etc)

[·] Attitudes towards a subject (drug use, safer snorting)

[·] Behaviour changes

Qualitative data

[·] Have people reached the information easily? Was it easy to find?

[·] Were the leaflets successful in the party? Have they been read?

[·] How did people use the leaflets?

[·] Was it easy to talk to the people and give information?

[·] What do people think about the leaflet? Do they like to receive this information?

[·] Did they already know about the leaflets?

[·] How do they relate the leaflet with their practices?

[·] Do they know other leaflets? in another party? other parties?

[·] Do people recognize the credibility of the information in the leaflets??

[·] Do people understand the message in the leaflet??

[·] Do people find the content useful (for their drug use …) on a short and/or long term basis?

Resuming the questions:

[·] Has the info reached people?

[·] Have they understood the information?

[·] What do they think about it?

[·] What is the influence of the leaflet info in their practices?

3.2.d How do we design the evaluation process?

d.1 Create a data base for the quantitative data to be filled by each party.

d.2 Create data sheet to the qualitative data to be filled after each intervention

Short description of the location

Short description of the party

Short description of dynamics in the info stand area

Short description of the use given to the flyers

d.3 Organize focus groups

Different kinds of notifications: email contact in their party, snow ball, peer to peer contact, three level contact away...

Different kinds of criteria when choosing the people in the focus group (examples of criteria: they know the project or not, they use drugs regularly or not…).

Record the focus group's session

Content/speech analysis

d.4 Design a questionnaire based on the conclusions of the focus groups.

Implement it in parties and online.

3.3 Drop in / project venues example

Example proposed by Modus Vivendi – Belgium

3.3.a Before the evaluation: define and describe your project

a.1 What are the aims and objectives of our project? Why do you do what you do?

General aims

[·] Increase knowledge about drug consumption and health promotion among partygoers.

[·] Change attitudes and practices related to drug consumption and other health practices.

[·] Link problematic users or those who wish it, with health services.

Specific objectives

[·] Offer partygoers the possibility to take time to inform themselves and discuss the matters in a calm and confidential place.

[·] Discuss about their attitudes and practices related to consumption and other practices.

[·] Respond to their needs, questions and problems about drugs use, sex and health, on the spot or by directing them towards social, health, school and\or cultural structures.

[·] Provide information about drugs consumption, related risks and other information related to health promotion.

[·] Provide material and services allowing the reduction of risks related to drug consumption and sex.

[·] Identify drug users having problems and improve their accessibility to health services, general or specialized, according to the specificity of their needs;

[·] Value the knowledge and the skills of the drug users by their full integration in the venue by the community and participative work.

<u>a.2 What are the characteristics of the project? How do you do what you do?</u>

A project venue is a stationary place offering services for the target groups, with a public opening schedule.

The place

[·] Opening hours: which days, which schedule, how long (different for specific target groups?) ? Modus Fiesta opens on Wednesday and Thursday from 4PM to 8PM and on Friday from 6PM to 10PM.

[·] Visits on demand ? No visits on demand, except urgent situations.

[·] Situation (near the city centre or nightlife venues) / visibility (street level or other floors), shop window. Modus Fiesta is located in the city centre of Brussels, with a shop window on street level.

[·] Design of the place: decoration, tables, bar, sofas, art exhibitions, music, lights... The premises are composed of different areas: a place with sofa's for discussions, a desk with leaflets and information tools, a bar, a library and a separate place for drug checking.

[·] Room: there is a main room and a separate office, a bathroom, a kitchen, a cellar.

[·] Size : more or less 60m2

[·] Share with other projects? We share the premises with another association, which opens earlier in the day, and promotes antiprohibition.

The services

[·] Materials offered? Modus Fiesta offers leaflets, sniffing kits, condoms and ear plugs.

[·] Information services:

- health and drugs, prevention, sexual life, etc.
- redirection to other services (social services, first aid, etc…).
- nightlife scene

[·] Private counselling: with harm reduction workers, psychologist and social workers (in a separate space).

[·] Drug checking: a drug checking service will be available every Friday from January 2011.

[·] Meeting place / Hang out / Chill out place

[·] Volunteers meeting place / Active participation as a volunteer. The venue is available for volunteers who wish to organize meetings, workshops or activities. We also organize a specific volunteers' meeting every first Thursday of the month.

[·] Workshops. We propose workshops on : health, law (drugs, squatting…) and artistic activities.

[·] Cultural exhibitions: painting, DJ-ing, photography…

[·] Bar (soft drinks or with alcohol) : the bar is open every Friday.

[·] Parties: "After work", dancing party, exhibition openings.

The workers

[·] The number and types of workers / volunteers / peers.

[·] Their competences: nightlife, health, drug, social, counselling, communication…

[·] To welcome the public, there is always a mixed staff composed of a harm reduction professional and a volunteer.

[·] Sometimes, there is also a health professional (psychologist or social worker) in order to facilitate the redirection towards health services.

[·] To manage the venue and all the services, we have a ¾ working time on the Project.

[·] There are more or less 20 active volunteers.

<u>a.3 What are the outcomes of your project?</u>

X visitors: in 2009, 436 persons came to Modus Fiesta. 83% were drug users.

X leaflets given: we provided information about: cannabis, alcohol, ecstasy, cocaine, heroin, psychedelics, amphetamines, GHB, ear safety, affectivity and sexual life.

X material given: we provided condoms, sniffing kits and earplugs.

X persons relieved towards health services

X active volunteers / new volunteers: we are collaborating with more or less 20 active volunteers and trained nine new volunteers last year.

X participative activities: we organized, in association with the volunteers: two workshops, five exhibitions, one social information session, one art activity and one movie club. The volunteers were consulted each month, during a specific meeting, about the venue and the activities.

3.3.b Evaluation questions: what and why we want to evaluate?

b.1 What are the aims and objectives of the evaluation?

General aims

[·] To improve the drop-in centre and the services.

Specific objectives

[·] To evaluate the type of public who spend time in the venue.

[·] To estimate the adequacy between the proposed services and the needs of the public.

[·] To know about the use of the services amongst partygoers.

[·] To evaluate the number and the efficiency of the relays.

b.2 Who needs or requests the evaluation?

Internal requests to improve the service in relation with partygoers' needs.

External requests mandatory for administrations financing the service.

b.3 What we want to evaluate?

The place

Acceptance/attractiveness:

[·] Design of the place

Accessibility:

[·] Adequacy of the opening hours: which days, which schedule, how long (different for specific target groups)?

[·] Need of visits on demand?

[·] Situation within the city

Visibility:

[·] Street level or other floors, shop window, lights?

The adequacy, efficiency and use of the services:

[·] The material

[·] The information service

[·] The redirection to other services (social services, first aid, etc.)

[·] The private counselling

[·] The drug checking service

[·] The use by the volunteers and their active participation

[·] The workshops, cultural exhibitions and parties

The workers:

[·] The numbers and types of workers / volunteers / peers.

[·] Their competences: nightlife, health, drug, social, counselling, communication...

b.4 What we want to do with the results?

Include the results in the project's annual report.

Give a feedback to the volunteers.

Present it in conferences.

b.5 What are the resources to do the evaluation? Who will carry the evaluation?

No specific budget. More or less one week of working time.

A Project Manager and an internal staff in charge of the evaluation.

3.3.c How are we going to evaluate? methodology, methods and techniques

c.1 What kind of data can we reach and produce?

Quantitative information

[·] Accounts of visits: how many first visits and how many visits for each person. Evolution of the number of visits according to the month.

[·] Duration of the visit.

[·] Type of visitor: sex, age, drug user.

[·] How the person knows the existence of the place.

[·] Accounts of specific questions asked.

[·] Accounts of direction to other services (social, medical...).

[·] Accounts of people asking to become volunteers.

[·] Number of materials distributed.

[·] Number of leaflets distributed.

[·] Number of workshops, exhibitions, parties...

[·] Number of volunteers' meetings.

Qualitative information

[·] Knowledge and quality of the services provided.

[·] Pre-test (during the first visit) and post-test (during a next visit) about the knowledge of the public concerning risks related to drugs use and sex.

[·] Adequacy of the design of the venue.

[·] Identification of the needs of the target public.

[·] Opinion of the volunteers.

c.2 What methodology, methods and techniques we want to use?

Questionnaire, Focus Group, Project data collecting.

c.3 How do we design the evaluation process?

A small questionnaire is completed during opening hours, for every person who comes.

Meetings take place every month with the volunteers.

The data of the project are collected (account of visits, account of leaflets…).

More specific inquiries are made according to needs (new service, modification of opening hours…).

The encoding and the evaluation of the data are made once a year by the professional workers.

3.4 Special campaign example

Example proposed by Jellinek - Amsterdam

3.4.a. Before the evaluation: define and describe your project

a.1 What are the aims and objectives of the special campaign? Why do you do what you do?

General aims

[·] Raise awareness on a certain topic

[·] Put it on the (political) agenda and make people talk about it

Specific objectives

[·] Make target group aware of a certain topic

[·] Get target group to think of this topic

[·] Change behaviour on this topic

a.2 What are the characteristics of the special campaign? How do you do what you do?

Description/Resources

A special campaign can consist of various components with the same slogan or message:

[·] Posters/ Banner/ Flyers/ Stickers

[·] T-shirts/ gadgets

[·] Websites

[·] Social media

[·] Media campaign

[·] Etc…

Methodology

A special campaign has to be focussed on the target group:

[·] broadcasting: lots of people have to know the message (eg. posters, media campaign with television commercials)

[·] narrow casting: only a very specific target group has to know the message (eg. flyers and posters at specific parties, social media campaign)

Timing/ budget

Depending on the size and length of your campaign you have to think about timing and budget.

<u>a.3 What are the outcomes of your project?</u>

In relation to your objectives

[·] x people heard of the campaign

[·] x went to the website

[·] x took flyers

[·] x newspapers/television programmes gave attention to the campaign

[·] etc …

In terms of results and/or products

[·] development of a campaign plan/ strategy

[·] development of slogan

[·] development of material like flyers, banners, website

[·] development of a media plan

[·] development of a distribution network

3.4.b Evaluation questions: what and why we want to evaluate?

<u>b.1 What are the aims and objectives of the evaluation?</u>

General aims

[·] How many people have seen, remembered and understood the key message of the campaign

Specific objectives

a. How many people of the target group were reached by the campaign?

b. Does the target group remember the campaign?

c. Did the target group understand the message of the campaign?

d. What did the target group think of the campaign?

e. Did the target group discuss the topic with other members of the target group? And in what way?

f. Did the campaign change the opinion/ attitude of the target group on the topic? And in what way?

g. Did the campaign change the behaviour of the target group? And in what way?

h. Were there outside factors that influenced your campaign (good or bad)?

i. When this campaign is repeated will it give the same effect?

b.2 Who needs or requests the evaluation?

Internal evaluation is needed to see the effect of the campaign and improve it for future

External evaluation is mandatory for administrations financing services

b.3 What we want to evaluate?

Before campaign

[·] Knowledge of target group on topic beforehand

[·] Attitude on topic beforehand

Message/campaign

[·] What association does the target group have with message/ campaign

[·] Does target group like message

[·] Does target group like look of campaign

[·] Does the target group feel like they are addressed by this campaign

Spread of campaign

[·] Amount of material spread (flyers, posters etc)

[·] Amount of people who came into contact with the campaign

[·] Amount of stakeholders involved

External factors that might have affected the campaign

[·] What are the outside factors that might have affected the campaign for good or bad (e.g. other news items, technical problems, weather?

Effect of the campaign: What effect did the campaign have on the target group?

[·] Do they remember the campaign/slogan

[·] Do they have more knowledge on topic

[·] Has their attitude changed towards the topic

[·] Has their behaviour changed on this topic b.4 What we want to do with the results?

Include in report

Send to financing service

Present in conferences and scientific publications

b.5 What are our resources to do the evaluation? Who will carry the evaluation?

[·] Internal (staff/ volunteers/ internships)

[·] External (university)

III.4.c How are we going to evaluate? Methodology, methods and techniques

c.1 What kind of data can we reach and produce?

Quantitative data

[·] pre-test

[·] numbers on spread of campaign

[·] questionnaires on campaigns answered by target group

Qualitative data

[·] focus group

[·] reaction of stakeholder

[·] process report

c.2 How do we design the evaluation process?

A research design where you measure baseline knowledge, attitude and behaviour of target group with a questionnaire. And after the campaign, ask the same target group once again over their knowledge, attitude and behaviour with a questionnaire. Preferably make sure there is also a control group who has not been in contact with campaign to measure outside effects.

3.5 Fieldwork Stand activity

Example proposed by Tips&Tricks, Harm Reduction Unit, Department of Social Policies, City of Venice - Italy

3.5.a Before the evaluation: define and describe your project

a.1 What are the aims and objectives of our project? Why do you do what you do?

General aims

[·] To give information to increase knowledge about drug consumption and health promotion

[·] To give information to change attitudes and practices related to drug consumption and other health practices

[·] To reduce risks in nightlife settings concerning drug and alcohol use, sexuality and general quality of night

Specific objectives

[·] To provide information through leaflets.

[·] To provide materials such as condom, ear plugs..

[·] To explain the philosophy of the project

[·] Monitoring trends of use and be present to observe

[·] To exchange information with people on site: give but also collect information

[·] To collect information about the context of nightlife

a.2 What are the characteristics of the stand? How do you do what you do?

An onsite intervention is an outreach activity to contact actively or passively, to inform and assess specific target groups or individuals within their specific nightlife scenes.

Construction of the stand (structure, design, spaces, materials)

Resources needed: lights, decorations, postal dispencer.

Location of the stand

[·] logistical aspects related to the site, the weather or time conditions (the stand is inside or outside, it is hot or warm, it is during the day or night so covers may be needed, heating, lights)

[·] Timetable for stand activity

[·] Visibility of the stand: mark the position of the stand with signs, arrows; give a flyer with a map at the entrance; choose a place where it's easy to talk and hear people;

Functioning of the stand

[·] General rules of the stand: keep place clean, not leave glasses with alcohol, take turns to eat, to rest.

[·] The internal functioning: keep a sufficient number of materials to give away, ensure that there is always someone who can give information…

[·] How you manage the people: let people quietly discover the stand, take material and be ready to respond to any requests..

Services provided

Materials and goods offered:

[·] Printed materials: leaflets, flyers, books and posters

[·] Video and image projections

[·] Give aways (condoms, sniffing kits, lubricants, ear plugs, syringes etc …)

[·] Attractive gadgets: T-shirts, stickers, pins etc.

[·] Food: water, fruits, coffee, tea, lollypops, gums etc.

Individual services:

[·] Personal talks or private counselling

Information services:

[·] Directing to other services (toilets, first aid area, taxi etc ...)

[·] Health and drugs risk prevention

[·] Veterinary information for dog owners

[·] Bluetooth communication on mobile phones during the event

Recreational services:

[·] Animation (games, DJ sets, VJ-ing, performances…)

Other services provided:

[·] Drug checking

[·] Alcohol test

Human resources:

[·] Staff, volunteers, peers depending on the type of the event, on the target of party goers, on the estimated number of the party goers

[·] Competences required: nightlife context and drugs knowledge, team working capacities, relationship building competences, specific information knowledge on targets concerned, problem solving capabilities, technical knowledge about drug checking and alcohol testing a.3 What are the outcomes of your project?

Behavioural change – safer practices by partygoers

Better awareness + decision making about risky substances by partygoers (harm reduction)

Customer satisfaction on how the event is managed

Increase the awareness of the club owners about topics concerned (harm reduction)

Changing club infrastructure

3.5.b Evaluation questions: what and why we want to evaluate?

b.1 What are the aims and objectives of the evaluation?

General aims

[·] To verify the impact of the stand as a tool to inform partygoers about drugs and related risks

Specific objectives

[·] To evaluate the attractiveness of the stand

[·] To evaluate the adequacy of the types of services provided

[·] To evaluate the usefulness of the information and services provided

b.2 Who needs or requests the evaluation?

Internal request

[·] Coordinator/person in charge of the project

External request

[·] Financial partners

[·] Other sponsors

[·] Other nightlife prevention specialist

[·] Club owners or event organizers

b.3 What we want to evaluate?

Quantitative process indicators:

[·] Number of people in the party

[·] Number of people in the stand

[·] Number of contacts in the stand

[·] Number of male/female, age...

[·] Number of information

[·] Number of counselling

[·] Number of material distributed

[·] Number of alcohol tests

[·] Number of drug checking

Qualitative process indicators;

[·] Types of information

[·] Types of counselling

Quantitative results indicators:

[·] Number of conversations with people

[·] Number of counselling

Qualitative results indicators:

[·] Impressions, comments, reviews of people interested in evaluation (people at the stand, people of the event's staff, organizers, volunteers, operators..)

[·] Outcomes of drug tests (quality of drug checking)

[·] Outcomes of alcohol test (results of test and all possible comparison with target group...)

b.4 What we want to do with the results?

Convince policy makers or other decision takers about the necessity of these types of services

Use them for the project's annual internal report

Present them in conferences to promote the project

To improve the quality of the evaluated service

To offer a feedback to club owners, party organizers

3.5.c What are the resources to do the evaluation? Who will carry the evaluation?

Project Manager and an internal staff can be in charge of the evaluation

An external agency or professional

3.5.d How are we going to evaluate? Methodology, methods and techniques

d.1 What kind of data can we reach and produce?

Qualitative and quantitative data.

d.2 What methodology, methods and techniques do we want to use?

Quantitative Tools

[·] Questionnaire

[·] Collect data in apposite schedules and carry them forward to the specific data base

Qualitative Tools

[·] Observations during the event

[·] Field diaries reporting impressions of people and collected during the event

[·] Focus groups after events

[·] Feedbacks on the web (ex. Facebook, email, forum...)

[·] Interviews during the event: for example double interview, video box (free, structured or semi-structured)

[·] Box to collect all comments of people

[·] Debriefing of the event

d.3 How do we design the evaluation process?

Depending on what you want to evaluate and what kind of tools you use, it's important to plan the actions concerned by the evaluation process (ex. meetings, time planning, tools building).

3.6 Volunteers' training

Example proposed by Crew 2000 – UK

III.6.a Before the evaluation: define and describe your Volunteer Training

a.1 What are the aims and objectives of our volunteer training? Why do you do what you do?

General aims

Crew2000 volunteer training aims to prepare volunteers for the range of activities they are asked to undertake as part of the organisation. As well as key skills and knowledge the training also aims to ensure that volunteers share the core Crew2000 values.

Specific objectives

[·] To train the number of volunteers required by Crew2000 to deliver services

[·] To cover the key areas of basic training- drugs awareness, crew history and ethos, sexual health and peer support skills

[·] To boost volunteer confidence

[·] To help with building the morale and togetherness of the volunteer group

a.2 What are the characteristics of the volunteer training? How do you do what you do?

Accurate description of the training: activities, methodology, resources, materials, timing, budget, etc.

Background and Methodology

Crew was founded as a peer-education organisation focused on drugs and has remained true to its core values as it has grown. All our services are non-judgemental and based around the needs of the individual.

Our volunteer training is no exception to this and seeks to identify the needs of individual volunteers by making the training as interactive as possible. As such our training often uses group-work, presentations by volunteers and acting out of scenarios as a way of reinforcing learning and showing the trainer where volunteers require extra training.

With regards to the methodology we follow, it is based on 'The Skilled Helper' by Gerard Egan; training volunteers in a person centred way of working. In addition to training volunteers in peer education and peer support skills we also train them in drugs information, sexual health information and Crew history and ethos.

This comprises the basic volunteer training but in addition to this volunteers can also receive additional training such as 'further drugs information', 'further sexual health', 'legal highs' and 'training for trainers' as well as a range of training packages provided by other companies.

Activities

Our activities include short presentations made to the volunteers on issues around ethos and history of the organisation or on organisational procedure.

Most of the rest of the training is done by open interaction with questions asked of the group and discussions happening around the contributions volunteers make.

Because the training is seeking to boost skills as well as knowledge, it is also vital that we get volunteers to 'act' various scenarios. This ensures volunteers have truly developed the key skills we need them to.

Resources and Materials

With regards to volunteer training the resources needed are listed below:

[·] Suitable venue for training

[·] Staff and volunteer trainers

[·] Training plan and handouts

[·] Expenses for volunteer travel and food

[·] Evaluation forms

a.3 What are the outcomes of your project?

In relation to your objectives: achieved / planned. For April 2009- April 2010

[·] 25 Volunteers joined us in this period and were trained

[·] 2 intake training packages made up of 5 training sessions each were delivered to two groups of volunteers.

In terms of results and/or products for April 2009- April 2010.

[·] Over 40 trained volunteers providing a range of services

[·] Producing a new training package for online work.

3.6.b Evaluation questions: what and why we want to evaluate?

b.1 What are the aims and objectives of the evaluation?

General aims

To ensure that volunteers are trained to a high standard and feel suitably equipped for the work they will be doing.

Specific objectives

[·] To measure the satisfaction of 25 volunteers per year receiving training

[·] To ensure all 5 sessions of basic volunteer training increase the knowledge of volunteers attending

[·] To measure the change in confidence of volunteers attending the training sessions to do the tasks required of them.

[·] To measure staff satisfaction with training packages delivered

b.2 Who needs or requests the evaluation?

The evaluation of volunteer training is not a requirement of any external body but is very valuable to Crew 2000's ongoing development and ensuring quality of both our workers and our work

b.3 What we want to evaluate?

Project evaluation questions

The effectiveness of each individual session in the basic training course

The effectiveness of the basic training course as a whole

b.4 What we want to do with the results?

The results will help us improve our training packages over time

The results will help us keep the training relevant to the work that we do

The results are useful in showing external bodies that we invest in our volunteers

The results are a demonstration of the quality of our workers

b.5 What are our resources to do the evaluation? Who will carry the evaluation?

Questionnaires and verbal feedback are used to evaluate the training.

Evaluation is conducted by staff members

3.6.c How are we going to evaluate? Methodology, methods and techniques

c.1. What kind of data can we reach and produce?

Data on outputs from the training are easy to gather. Things like changes in knowledge, understanding of key concepts and attendance levels.

Data can also be gathered on the outcomes or impact of training on the lives of volunteers and the clients they see. This is likely to be more qualitative in nature.

c.2 What methodology, methods and techniques do we want to use?

Questionnaires

These are used to identify data on what volunteers felt were the most useful and best delivered aspects of individual training sessions. It is also a chance to find out what was least useful to them.

Support sessions

We offer individual support sessions to each of our volunteers once every 6 weeks. During the first of these sessions we ask them how they found their training sessions. This gives them the chance to offer detailed qualitative feedback on what they thought of the training and the impact this has had on their confidence and ability to perform in the volunteer role.

Feedback from service users

The questionnaires filled out by our service users ask how knowledgeable, skilled and friendly our volunteer workers are. This gives us indirect feedback on out training and the results this produces.

Knowledge based quizzes

These are perhaps the best tool we have for measuring the impact of the training sessions. By giving the volunteers the same quiz to complete at the start and end of training sessions we can see how much their knowledge has increased over the course of the session. Each quiz is of course based on content that will be delivered in that training session.

Role playing

Asking volunteers to act out various situation where they might work with service users helps show trainers to what extent they have understood and are able to apply the skills and knowledge the training sessions have introduced. As this is done during training sessions it allows trainers to better focus the remainder of the training session on areas of greatest need.

Open discussions

Discussions held at the end of the training sessions allow us to determine which sections of the training the group as a whole found most and least useful. Though this form of feedback can 'drown-out' quieter voices it is useful for promoting discussion and addressing any remaining misunderstandings.

Volunteers leading training sessions

This helps to cement in place the knowledge old volunteers have gained from their past training sessions. It also helps to make sure the training is communicated in a way that is culturally credible and up to date as it is being delivered peer-to-peer.

c.3 How do we design the evaluation process?

Think about the key features of the training you want to evaluate

[·] To evaluate knowledge gained- The best way we have found to do this is to design a short quiz (10 questions or less) based on the information covered in the training session. Give out this quiz at the start and end of the session asking volunteers to complete it, write their name on it and hand it back. Compare the quizzes at the start and end of the session to determine effectiveness in delivering information.

[·] To evaluate increases in confidence- Think about the specific tasks you want the volunteers to feel more comfortable doing after the training. Create short scenarios about these tasks that you can ask volunteers to act out at the end of the training sessions. Observe how well these are delivered and offer constructive feedback. As the volunteers in support sessions how much more (or less) confident they fell to deliver these tasks after receiving training.

[·] To determine suitability of the course- Ask volunteers to complete a survey 1 month after finishing the training. This survey should ask them what the key components of their role as volunteers are. It should then ask them to rate how well the course prepared them for each of these components. If the rating is high then the training is suitable for the purpose.

[·] To evaluate skills gained- Creating scenarios for the volunteers to act out (as described above) can help you evaluate the skills they have gained and how well they can use these.

[·] To evaluate long term retention of training material- Give volunteers the same learning quizzes described above (used at start and end of training sessions) three months after the training has been completed. This will test the long term retention of information covered in the training sessions.

Think about how this information will be used

[·] To improve training packages- If any of the ways of evaluating training described above indicate that your training package needs to be improved, try to get volunteers involved in the process of re-designing and delivering these training packages. This will help make it more relevant and interesting.

[·] To identify where volunteers need extra training- If support sessions for individual volunteers and other means of feedback indicate that specific volunteers need additional training in some areas, try to work with these volunteers to determine the best way of delivering this information to them.

3.7 Website example

Example proposed by Energy Control – Spain

3.7.a Before the evaluation: define and describe your Website

a.1 What are the aims and objectives of our Website? Why do you do what you do?

General aim

[·] To reduce the risks related with drug use in party scenes

[·] Specific objectives:

[·] To contact partygoers, including drug users

[·] To disseminate risk reduction information

[·] To derivate to other services

[·] To give access to the a specific forum and a drug checking service

[·] To answer specific questions

[·] To promote substance alerts

[·] To receive information on party scenes and drugs

[·] To promote the image of Energy Control

[·] To do fund raising

[·] To promote interaction with our public

a.2 What are the characteristics of the Website? How do you do what you do?

Accurate description of the project: activities, methodology, resources, materials, timing, budget, etc

[·] A Website 2.0 including a forum, a drug checking service, video and documents downloads, contact possibilities by phone and E-mail, Facebook, Twitter and various internal and external e-groups.

[·] The Website is managed by a professional with the collaboration of various volunteers. Necessity of access to a computer with an internet connection and various specific free license programmes.

[·] For this issue, Energy Control Budget for 1 year is: 15000 euros (17 volunteers; 2 external collaborators; 1 Energy Control professional; 1 contracted webmaster)

a.3 What are the outcomes of your project?

In relation to your objectives

[·] 400.000 visits per year

[·] 4.500 members of the forum / 1.200 new ones per year / 3.200 new messages per year

[·] 200 downloads related with substances analysis per month

[·] 600 direct mail request received and attended per year

[·] 4 alerts / 250 downloads

In terms of results and/or products

Evolution of the Website toward a 2.0 site

Development of online services

3.7.b Evaluation questions: what and why we want to evaluate?

b.1 What are the aims and objectives of the evaluation?

General aims

[·] Evaluate the acceptance/attractiveness of the Website

[·] Evaluate the content and services of the Website

Specific objectives

[·] Evaluate the acceptance and aesthetics of the design by heterogeneous target groups

[·] Evaluate the numbers and quality of the interaction possibilities

[·] Evaluate if the language used in the website is adequate

[·] Evaluate what type of publics use the Website

[·] Evaluate if the visitors promote the website or some contents to others

[·] Evaluate the use done by the visitors of the content and services

[·] Evaluate the impact of the contents and services

b.2 Who needs or requests the evaluation?

Internal request to improve the service and to keep it dynamic and up to date

External request mandatory for administrations financing the service b.3 What we want to evaluate?

What we want to evaluate will depend on the type of Websites (organization, project, specific campaign) and the type of target groups (specific or general public). Some elements that can be evaluated are:

Acceptance/attractiveness of the Website

Look & Design / Uploading rapidity / User friendly structure

Interactive parts

Possibility to subscribe to: the project's specific activities, training, receive newsletters... / Funding possibilities: Paypal donation, merchandizing sales, be a supportive member,... / Research: online questionnaires / Private areas for workers and volunteers / Downloads: pictures, articles, audio and video files for general, specific public and Media / Contacts: E-Mail; phone; on-line / Forums (open and private)

Content

Health information / Analysis results / Project's description (team, value, objectives...)

Information about nightlife scenes / News / Calendar of activities

Workers

Who responds to the emails, moderates the forum, manages the website or sections of it (workers, volunteers, partners)

b.4 What we want to do with the results?

Include it in the project's annual report

Present it in conferences

Do a scientific publication related with some of the services provided

b.5 What are our resources to do the evaluation? Who will carry the evaluation?

Internal resources (professionals / volunteers / students internships)

3.7.c How are we going to evaluate? Methodology, methods and techniques

c.1.What kind of data can we reach and produce?

Automatically generated data

Quantitative data

Qualitative data

c.2 What methodology, methods and techniques do we want to use?

[·] Acceptance/attractiveness of the Website online questionnaire

[·] Number of external links to the project's website

[·] Rank of the website in search engines

[·] Organising focus groups (onsite, Chats, Facebook)

[·] Question the public during the nightlife intervention

[·] Show the website to the people and discuss it

[·] Analyse the time people spend on each section of the site, the number of visits…

[·] Promote online questionnaires

c.3 How do we design the evaluation process?

Mainly designed internally by professional workers

04

Bibliography

Chelimsky, E. Shadish, W. (1997) Evaluation for the 21st century: a handbook. London: Sage.

Denzin, NK & Lincoln, YS. (1994). "Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research." In NK Denzin and YS Lincoln (Eds.) Handbook of Qualitative Research (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (2001) Guidelines for the evaluation of outreach work. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. http://www.emcdda.org

Gómez, M. (2003) Evaluación de los servicios sociales. Barcelona: Gedisa.

Greene J. (1998) Qualitative program evaluation. In: Denzin N. Lincoln Y, editors. Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials. Thoasand Oaks: Sage.

King, G.; Keohane, R. Verba, S. (1994) Designing social inquiry: scientific inference in qualitative research. Princeton, New jersey: Princeton University Press.

Lincoln, Y., and E. Guba. 1986. Research, Evaluation, and Policy Analysis: Heuristics for Disciplined Inquiry. Policy Studies Review 5 (February 86).

Marshall, C; Rossman, G. (1989) Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, EUA: Sage.

Morgan, D. L. (1988) Focus Groups as Qualitative Research. London: Sage.

Patton, M.Q. (2002) Qualitative research and evaluation methods. London: Sage.

Patton, M.Q. (1988). Paradigms and pragmatism. In D. M. Fetterman (Ed.) Qualitative approaches to evaluation in education. The silent revolution. New York: Praeger.

Potter, W. (1996) An analysis of thinking and research about qualitative methods. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Shaw, I. (1999) Qualitative evaluation. London: Sage.

Shaw, I.; Greene, J. Mark, M. (2006) Sage handbook of evaluation. London: Sage.

United Nations Population Fund (2004) The Programme Managers Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit.

United Nations Development Programme evaluation office (UNDP). Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. (2002). New York: Evaluation office. http://www.undp.org/evaluation/

Alfred Uhl, Richard Ives and Members of the Pompidou Group Prevention Platform. (2010) Evaluation of Drug Prevention Activities: Theory and Practice. Reference of the document: P-PG/Prev(2010)6.

Other references

The Programme Managers Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit

http://www.unfpa.org/monitoring/toolkit.htm

United Nations Development Programme Evaluation Office (UNDP)

http://www.undp.org/evaluation/

Evaluation Instruments Bank (EIB)

The Evaluation Instruments Bank (EIB) is an online archive of freely available instruments for evaluating drug-related interventions. Details regarding copyright and/or possible use restrictions are specified for each instrument. Instruments are generally classed according to the intervention field they are designed to be used in (treatment, prevention, or harm reduction), though some instruments may be usable in more than one field.

http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/eib

Guidelines for the evaluation of drug prevention: a manual for programme-planners and evaluators.

These guidelines give detailed, step-by-step advice to programme-planners and evaluators on how to assess the different stages of drug-prevention interventions. Recently evaluated as one of the Centre's most utilised publications.

EMCDDA, Lisbon, October 1998

http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/manuals/prevention

Guidelines for the evaluation of outreach work: a manual for practitioners

Policymakers and practitioners around the world acknowledge the importance of outreach work in the drug field, but the fact that it is a good idea does not mean that every project is of the same standard. Clients, policymakers and project staff need ways of assessing whether projects are fulfilling their aims and objectives. These guidelines aim to help outreach projects: to understand their aims and objectives; to understand and value their activity; to improve that activity; and to show themselves and others their worth.

EMCDDA, Lisbon, December 2001

http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/manuals/outreach

W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Evaluation Handbook, 1998, http://www.WKKF.org/

This Handbook is designed for evaluations at project level. It provides a framework for thinking about evaluation as a relevant and useful program tool and outlines a blueprint for designing and conducting evaluations. It also provides basic information to allow project staff to conduct an evaluation without the assistance of an external evaluator.

The Healthy Nightlife Toolbox

The Healthy Nightlife Toolbox (HNT) is an international initiative that focuses on the reduction of harm from alcohol and drug use among young people. The core of the online Toolbox is formed by three databases (evaluated interventions, literature, and details of experts within the field) and a Handbook providing guidance on creating a healthy and safe nightlife.

http://www.hnt-info.eu/

The DC&DII Safer Nightlife Digital Library

The DC&DII Safer Nightlife digital library is a resource hub growing every month to facilitate the access and to share different specific documents related with Safer Nightlife Risk Reduction fieldwork projects.

http://www.democitydrug.org/safernightlife

This guideline has been developed by the DC&DII Safer nightlife workgroup partners. The theoretical part has been written by Noel Garcia Lopez from Spora Synergies (Spain).

The DC&DII Safer Nightlife workgroup is coordinated by Stephane Leclercq from ABD-Energy Control (Spain)

We wish to express our gratitude for their implication in this guideline to: Carlos Paulos from CePT (Luxembourg), Alex Buecheli from Jugendberatung Streetwork, City of Zurich (Switzerland), Floor Van Backum from Jellinek (Nederland), Chiara Sovigni from Tips & Tricks, City of Venice (Italy), Thierry Charlois from Fêtez Clairs (France), Emilie Coutret from Techno Plus (France), Muriel Allart from Modus Vivendi (Belgium), Filipa Soares from Check-in (Portugal), Mattew Straw from Crew 2000 (Scotland), Ana Menezes from Energy Control (Spain).

This publication is funded by the European Commission.
This publication express the views of its authors and the European Commission
is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.