Advocacy Evaluation Update

An Innovation Network Publication

Issue # 3 ● March 2008

In This Issue:

What's New
fresh findings/recent resources/current conversations

Looking Ahead
upcoming events / dates to save / work in progress

We define **advocacy** *as "a wide range of activities conducted to* **influence decision makers** *at various levels." This means not only traditional advocacy work like litigation, lobbying, and public education, but also capacity building, network formation, relationship building, organizing, communication, and leadership development.*
–Innovation Network

Greetings!

Welcome to the third issue of *Advocacy Evaluation Update!*

Information and models for evaluating advocacy work have been rapidly expanding in the last few years. Recent American Evaluation Association ("AEA") annual conferences have been an excellent way to share information about those developments. This past November, for example, there were four times as many presenters on advocacy evaluation and twice as many related sessions at the AEA annual conference than at the previous year's conference.

To help keep you up-to-date about advances in the field, *Advocacy Evaluation Update* has produced this special issue, which includes:

- Reports on advocacy evaluation presentations from November's AEA conference,
- Plans for next year's conference, and
- Timelines for getting involved.

We're also pleased to announce improvements to Innovation Network's online collection of free advocacy evaluation resources.

We look forward to hearing any comments on this issue and suggestions you might have for future issues. Please contact us at advocacy [at] innonet [dot] org.

Best,
-Sue

Susan Hoechstetter

Editor, *Advocacy Evaluation Update*
Foundation Advocacy Director,
Alliance for Justice

What's New

(fresh findings / recent resources / current conversations)

Advocacy Evaluation's Home at AEA: An Interview with Advocacy and Policy Change TIG Leaders

Last year, for the first time, those interested in evaluation of advocacy formally had a home at the American Evaluation Association's ("AEA") annual conference. The Advocacy and Policy Change Topical Interest Group (or "TIG") was formed in 2007. AEA TIGs are defined around a special topic of interest to subgroups of AEA members. TIGs coordinate their efforts by reviewing conference session proposals in their area of interest and developing a "track" of topically-related sessions for the annual AEA conference.

The leaders of the Advocacy and Policy Change TIG are:

- Co-chair Julia Coffman, Harvard Family Research Project
- Co-chair Astrid Hendricks, The California Endowment
- Program Co-chair Justin Louie, Blueprint Research and Design
- Program Co-chair Ehren Reed, Innovation Network, Inc.

Advocacy Evaluation Update's **Sue Hoechstetter** interviewed Julia, Justin, and Ehren for this issue. Look for an interview with Co-chair Astrid Hendricks in an upcoming issue.

> *Update*: How did having a policy and evaluation TIG for the first time—and thirteen advocacy-related sessions—affect the 2007 AEA annual conference?

> ***"We know that the TIG workshops filled a gap. One woman told me that last year, for the first time, she felt included at the AEA conference."***
>
> *~ Julia Coffman*

Ehren: Two of the very positive things that struck me about the 2007 workshops were the depth and variety of information presented, and the number of people presenting on advocacy evaluation. The 2006 conference in Portland was really the beginning of a presence for this kind of work at AEA. There were five or six sessions, and a small number of people did most of the [advocacy-related] presenting there. We had about five times as many people involved at the 2007 meeting—more people and more ideas.

Julia: I was really encouraged this past year by the number of people in attendance and by the level of interest in the breadth of workshops we offered. We know that the TIG workshops filled a gap. One woman there told me that she was an evaluator for the Humane Society's advocacy work and, last year, for the first time, she felt included at the AEA conference.

Interview continues on page 5.

Highlights from American Evaluation Association's 2007 Annual Conference

The American Evaluation Association ("AEA") 2007 annual conference in Baltimore, Maryland was the place to be for news about advocacy evaluation. The new Advocacy and Policy Change Topical Interest Group (TIG) of AEA sponsored 13 sessions at the conference, which was held from November 5-11, 2007. Session presenters included experts who have been researching, implementing, and developing better tools for evaluating advocacy. Sessions were well-attended by practitioners working in the field, as well as grantmakers and grantees.

Advocacy Evaluation Update invited a leader from each advocacy-related session to give us a report. We'd like to thank the contributors for keeping you informed of what took place at each session. Each title below links to more session information, including the abstract and details provided by presenters (such as key discussion points, related resources, and contact information for follow-up questions).

- Real Application of a Policy Advocacy Evaluation Tool
  Sue Hoechstetter, Alliance for Justice
- Advocacy Evaluation: Practical Research Findings
  Lily Zandniapour and Johanna Gladfelter, Innovation Network, Inc.
- Advocacy and Policy Change Topical Interest Group: Business Meeting
  Julia Coffman, Harvard Family Research Project
- Evaluation Across Policy Networks: Chronic Disease, Obesity, and Community Design
  Ron Maynard, University of Washington
- Lessons Learned: Wrapping up Our Evaluation of an Advocacy Campaign
  Ehren Reed, Innovation Network, Inc.
- Starting Out Right: How to Begin Evaluating Community Organizing, Advocacy, and Policy Change Efforts Using a Prospective Approach
  Justin Louie, Blueprint Research & Design
- Evaluating Electronic Advocacy and Communications
  Julia Coffman, Harvard Family Research Project
- Advocacy, Community Mobilization and Systems Change: Assessing Unique Strategies to Impact Community Health
  Roberto Garcia and Zoe Clayson, Abundantia Consulting
- Policy Evaluation: Learning About What, When and For Whom?
  John Sherman, Headwaters Group

Highlights continue on page 7.

Advocacy Evaluation Resources Upgraded in the Point K Learning Center

The collection of advocacy evaluation resources at www.innonet.org is now searchable. We're pleased to announce that the Advocacy Evaluation Resource Center—formerly composed of pages that users had to scroll through to find what they were looking for—is now part of the resources section of Innovation Network's Point K Learning Center, at www.innonet.org/resources.

Free registration gets you into Point K, where you can browse resources by category, search by keyword, and rate and comment on individual resources.

- **New users:** Register at http://www.innonet.org/index.php?module=register.
- **Existing members:** If you're already part of Point K, visit www.innonet.org/resources and use your existing login to browse the new system.

This upgrade was made possible by support from The Atlantic Philanthropies and the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

The old, non-searchable advocacy resources center will continue to be available in archive form, but will no longer be updated. All new resources will go into the new system. The new resources section is in its beta testing phase from February 22 until March 31, 2008. Please contact info@innonet.org if you are interested in participating.

Looking Ahead

(upcoming events / dates to save / work in progress)

- **March 14, 2008: Session proposals due for 2008 AEA conference**

  Proposals for sessions related to evaluation of advocacy will be reviewed by the Advocacy and Policy Change Topical Interest Group and are due by midnight (Eastern U.S. time), **March 14** (that's **next week** as this issue of *Advocacy Evaluation Update* goes to press).

- **November 2008: Annual American Evaluation Association Conference**

  Approximately 2,500 attendees are expected at this year's annual AEA event. For more information about attending the conference and about submitting a proposal, visit the AEA website, http://www.eval.org/.

Advocacy Evaluation's Home at AEA: An Interview with Advocacy and Policy Change TIG Leaders

Continued from p. 2

***> Update*:** What plans do you have for the Advocacy and Policy Change TIG in 2008, and will that include anything outside of the AEA conference?

Julia: We want to respond to some of the things we heard from TIG members last year about what they want, like connecting with other topical interest groups. Members wanted to reach out to other TIGs to co-sponsor some workshops. We also want to invite people from other groups to come to our sessions in order to enrich the conversation. Much of what we do at the next conference will depend, though, upon the proposals for workshops that we receive.

Justin: It does really depend on the workshops that get proposed, but my thoughts are on looking to the next level of work as more people have come to understand how to evaluate advocacy. My knowledge, for example, has changed each year based upon what I hear talked about at AEA. I would add that one of the structural challenges at AEA is that it is difficult for different TIGs to collaborate, so it would be helpful if AEA leadership would think more about facilitating connections between the groups.

Julia: We do need more information about how to do this work, such as how to use real-time methods. Each of us is going to take what we hear at the conference and incorporate that into our work, perhaps for the next couple of years.

Ehren: We are not planning to do anything outside of AEA, because the TIG is conference-centric. Bringing information about this topic to a broader audience than it would otherwise reach in order to share our learning is the priority. Another thing we can do back in our organizations is model information sharing and partnering, to contribute to learning in the field. Innovation Network is always trying to do this by putting information up on our website's resource center, and we try to work with others instead of competing with them.

***> Update*:** What are your thoughts about requests for evaluations to show the actual impact of policy changes brought about by advocacy work?

Justin: That exact question came up a number of times at AEA last year. People in the TIG have traditionally done evaluation of policy advocacy, and the question of impact is about the effects once a policy gets approved and implemented. Intensive resources are required for that work, resources far beyond what most foundations are willing to support. That's why big research institutes and government agencies like the Government Accounting Office usually do that work. At the same time, I hear people in the TIG and I hear funders say they need to move towards this kind of learning. Personally, I try to step them back for reasons of resources. For example, I've been working on evaluating the impact of community organizing on school reform. To really understand the impact of organizing on students' achievements requires a different level of effort beyond what funding usually supports. In some ways we are reliant on research already done that says when you get to a certain point with the schools, it is likely that this will lead to improved learning outcomes. At the same time, I think foundations are going to ask for more. We have to look at what that means to us as a TIG and for us as a field.

Julia: I agree with Justin and would add that it's fundamentally about evaluating what foundations are supporting. If they are supporting policy work, that's what we evaluate. If the foundation is funding monitoring and implementing policies, then that's what we evaluate. It doesn't make sense to leap to measuring beyond what is funded. At the same time, we do need to know more about evaluating efforts focused on implementing what comes after policy change.

> *Update*: What do you think should be done next in the advocacy evaluation field? For example, do you have thoughts on how work being done by third-party evaluators can help organizations that cannot afford that kind of assistance?

Ehren: I'm glad you mentioned those that can't afford third-party evaluators, because that's key. Generally we need to expand the depth and breadth of evaluation of advocacy work. I think of four things that we should do:

> ***"I'm glad you mentioned organizations that can't afford third-party evaluators…We need to translate advocacy evaluation learning so it can be used by all nonprofit organizations."***
>
> ***~ Ehren Reed***

- Motivate all organizations to evaluate their advocacy work;
- Promote the evaluation efforts of advocacy organizations;
- Provide more information about data collection and how you do it; and
- Provide more information about using the data once it is collected.

In addition, the conversations we've had to date have largely been around legislative policy and the legislative planning stage. There is good opportunity to expand now to also talk about policy implementation and judicial and grass-roots work.

Finally, our learnings have often come from key opportunities where we work with one organization or coalition and apply it to others. These case studies are labor-intensive and cost prohibitive, and do not necessarily apply to all organizations. We need to translate advocacy evaluation learning so that it can be used by all nonprofit organizations by:

- Creating toolkits to help small and medium-size nonprofits;
- Developing tools for evaluators that are beginning, or have not yet begun, the conversation, so they can build their capacity to work with organizations;
- Learn more from what has already been accomplished on advocacy evaluation in the international field; and
- Learn from government what advocacy works and doesn't work, and apply that knowledge to advocacy evaluation.

Justin: I agree with Ehren that applying information to those organizations that can't afford third-party evaluation should be a priority. I have a sense that is happening as I know that it is a priority for Innovation Network and for Alliance for Justice. In my work, we train nonprofits on how to do their own evaluations. My goal is to translate the tools and systems to a broader field so that more people can use them. At AEA I want to present strategies that are not just for evaluators, but that can be used also by individual nonprofits to do their evaluations. However, the biggest challenge for nonprofits now is not how to implement these tools, but how to implement changes in the culture within their organizations. And, without an external force, that can be difficult.

> ***"The biggest challenge for nonprofits now is not how to implement evaluation tools, but how to implement changes in the culture within their organizations."***
>
> ***~ Justin Louie***

Julia: I agree with that. Fundamentally the approach that all of us use, and that we advocate for, is not just about measurement. It's about using information to inform strategy. Simply putting out tools for organizations is not necessarily going to get us to that point right away. It made sense for us to start where we started, in a lot of cases with organizations that have quite a bit of capacity to measure and learn, and where there were resources for evaluators to come in and help figure things out. We tested and are testing ideas and figuring out what works, and then taking the ideas we develop to find out how they apply to different advocacy organizations. There is a progression in the field and we are getting where we want to go.

> *Update*: Thanks so much for taking the time to talk with Advocacy Evaluation Update!

Please send any questions about this interview to advocacy [at] innonet [dot] org.

Highlights from American Evaluation Association's 2007 Annual Conference

Continued from p. 3

Real Application of a Policy Advocacy Evaluation Tool

Session reporter: Sue Hoechstetter, Alliance for Justice
Email contact: shoech [at] afj [dot] org
Link to session abstract and more information: Real Application of a Policy Advocacy Evaluation Tool

Key discussion points:

1. Organizations should plan and evaluate their advocacy capacity building efforts in the same manner that they plan and evaluate their advocacy campaigns. Capacity building is a natural outcome of advocacy work and should be credited.

2. Community organizing work requires "building from the bottom up" and evaluations should reflect that. For example, building leadership is critical in community organizing and such efforts must be assessed.

3. Blueprint Research & Design and The California Endowment's Hmong Health Collaborative found Alliance for Justice's Capacity Assessment Tool effective in assessing and building the Collaborative's advocacy work once they had adapted it for cultural differences and beginning levels of advocacy knowledge.

Related resources (fee-based): Build Your Advocacy Grantmaking: Advocacy Evaluation & Capacity Assessment Tools

Advocacy Evaluation: Practical Research Findings

Session reporters: Lily Zandniapour and Johanna Gladfelter, Innovation Network, Inc.
Email contact: jgladfelter [at] innonet [dot] org
Link to session abstract and more information: Advocacy Evaluation: Practical Research Findings

Key discussion points:

1. Innovation Network (InnoNet) has found that advocates eagerly engage with advocacy evaluation curriculum, but are quick to point out that evaluation must be practical and helpful to advocates.

2. InnoNet's ongoing research indicates that the language evaluators are using about advocacy is similar to how advocates talk about their work. This may indicate that the low-jargon language being used by many evaluators is appropriate and meaningful to advocates.

3. Additional preliminary research findings were:
   - Only 18% of advocacy organization representatives said that they knew that their groups' advocacy work had been evaluated, compared with 58% that responded that it had not been evaluated and 24% that didn't know, and
   - More than half of organizations that responded to the InnoNet survey stated that they devote 50% or less of their resources to advocacy.

Related resources:

- Information about Innovation Network's advocacy evaluation work: www.innonet.org/advocacy
- Advocacy Evaluation Resource Center at the Point K Learning Center: www.innonet.org/resources (beta, requires free login)
   - (Archived version of old resource center—no login)

Advocacy and Policy Change Topical Interest Group: Business Meeting

Session reporter: Julia Coffman, Harvard Family Research Project
Email contact: jcoffman [at] evaluationexchange [dot] org
Link to session abstract and more information: Advocacy and Policy Change Topical Interest Group: Business Meeting

Key discussion points:

1. The advocacy evaluation field has experienced tremendous growth in recent years. During the TIG's inaugural year, 240 AEA members joined, the TIG received 20 conference session proposals, and sponsored 13 sessions.

2. TIG members identified areas in which we would like to see the field grow, including:
    - Advocacy areas that need evaluation development: community organizing, civic participation, collaboratives and coalitions, and local-level advocacy;
    - Connections to other fields to inform our theory and methodology: political science theories, international approaches to advocacy evaluation, social movements, and systems thinking;
    - Advancements in evaluation practice: methodological innovations, proven real-time approaches, how to approach advocates on evaluation, and examples of how evaluation make a difference.

3. During 2008, the TIG will look for ways in which to connect with other TIGs that work on themes that relate to advocacy, such as: government, international, systems, program theory, nonprofit and foundation, and qualitative methods.

Related resources:

- Composite Logic Model
- Advocacy Progress Planner
- Advocacy Evaluation Update newsletter:
    - June 2007
    - November 2007
- Advocacy Evaluation Resource Center (free login required)
    - (Archived version of old resource center—no login)
- The Evaluation Exchange issue on Advocacy and Policy Change

Evaluation Across Policy Networks: Chronic Disease, Obesity, and Community Design

Session reporter: Ron Maynard, University of Washington,
Email contact: maynard [dot] rj [at] ghc [dot] org
Link to session abstract and more information: Evaluation Across Policy Networks: Chronic Disease, Obesity, and Community Design

Key discussion points:

1. The scale, approach, and strategies that partnerships develop to address changes in their community related to health and the built environment have to be flexible and adaptive.
2. Policy implementation strategies require ongoing assessment that is dynamic and iterative, rather than fixed and linear.
3. Sustainability should be considered from the start, with leverage points identified and acted upon through partnership networks.

Related resources:
- Designing Initiative Evaluation (Kellogg Foundation)
- American Planning Association
- The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation has several resources on health, physical environment, and built environment initiatives.

Lessons Learned: Wrapping up Our Evaluation of an Advocacy Campaign

Session reporter: Ehren Reed, Innovation Network, Inc.
Email contact: ereed [at] innonet [dot] org
Link to session abstract and more information: Lessons Learned: Wrapping up Our Evaluation of an Advocacy Campaign

Key discussion points:
1. Because of the challenges inherent in advocacy work, any evaluation should shift its primary focus from what difference did you make to what strategies are most effective in moving in the direction of policy (or other social) change. Advocacy evaluation requires a balanced emphasis on both process and outcomes. Process evaluation encompasses strategies and measures of the effectiveness of strategies as well as of outputs.
2. Promising data collection strategies include: interviews and focus groups to capture varied perspectives; surveys of groups participating in the campaign; media content analysis and polling reviews; analysis of policymaker statements and votes on key bills; and assessment of internal dynamics and corresponding effects on the achievement of outcomes.
3. Reflections on evaluating advocacy: don't let real-time data collection become overly cumbersome; advocates welcome the perspectives of an outside observer; be creative with your data collection. (See the Intense Period Debrief, below.)

Related resources:

- The Evaluation Exchange issue on Advocacy and Policy Change
- The Advocacy Evaluation Resource Center
  (beta; free registration required)
- The Intense Period Debrief: A data collection instrument for advocacy evaluation

Starting out Right: How to Begin Evaluating Community Organizing, Advocacy, and Policy Change Efforts Using a Prospective Approach

Session reporter: Justin Louie, Blueprint Research & Design,
Email contact: justin [at] blueprintrd [dot] com
Link to session abstract and more information: Starting out Right: How to Begin Evaluating Community Organizing, Advocacy, and Policy Change Efforts Using a Prospective Approach

Key discussion points:

1. The five basic steps to evaluating advocacy, according to the Blueprint report, *The Challenge of Assessing Policy and Advocacy Activities: Strategies for Prospective Evaluation Approach, Parts I and II* are to:
   - Understand the context and policy environment;
   - Develop a theory of change;
   - Define benchmarks of progress;
   - Collect data; and
   - Use findings.

2. Lessons learned, particularly with respect to community organizing groups, include:
   - Spend a significant amount of time in planning, building relationships, and getting buy-in to the evaluation at the front end;
   2. Community organizing is a grassroots process, which in many ways works against the goal setting nature of evaluating outcomes and evaluators need to be adaptable, particularly when definin
   - g short-term outcomes;
   - Assessing capacity building is fundamental and community organizers should track the development of their members into community leaders and the way in which this process feeds into policy or social change.

Related resources:
- The Challenge of Assessing Policy and Advocacy Activities: Strategies for a Prospective Evaluation Approach (2.82 MB .pdf)
- The Challenge of Assessing Policy and Advocacy Activities: Moving from Theory to Practice (1.49 MB .pdf)

Evaluating Electronic Advocacy and Communications

Session reporter: Julia Coffman, Harvard Family Research Project
Email contact: jcoffman [at] evaluationexchange [dot] org
Link to session abstract and more information: Evaluating Electronic Advocacy and Communications

Key discussion points:

1. Advocates are increasingly harnessing the power of technology to achieve policy change and to communicate. Evaluators in the advocacy and policy field are challenged by how to utilize these electronic tools for evaluation purposes—both to assess their use by advocates and to take advantage of them in evaluation methodology.
2. Modern advocacy and social change efforts recognize the Internet's value for engaging and mobilizing large numbers of individuals to action. These efforts generate a wealth of data about the effectiveness of Web-based strategies. Following is advice about how to sort out which statistics to pay attention to and how to use them:
    - Web analytics tend to fall into two main categories:
        - who is using the website and what they are doing, and
        - how they got to the site.
    - Web statistics to assess the "who" and "what" may include visits and visitors, page views, time on site, and that old warhorse: hits. Hits, however, is less useful now because sites are designed so that each time a visitor triggers a request from the server it registers as a "hit." It makes more sense to look at visits and unique visitors now. Time on site also is now a popular measure. It isn't advisable to benchmark time on site with other websites.
    - Statistics to assess the "how" include referrers, (the external links that users follow to get to the site); search keywords (the words or phrases users typed into search engines to get to the site); visitor information (how many are new to the site, the country or region where they're located, the Web browser they're using, etc.); click paths (graphical representations of typical journeys through the site); and tracking registered users (if parts of the site require users to log in, tracking exactly what those users did during each visit to the site).
3. The "eNonprofit Benchmarks Study" from M+R Strategic Services and the Advocacy Institute was the first of its kind to look at the overall effectiveness of nonprofits using the Internet to raise money, build e-mail lists, and influence political causes. The study provides an across-the-board look at how well leading American nonprofits are performing online. It was based on an in-depth review of statistics from 15 nonprofit organizations. Key findings include:
    - Greater online advocacy results: Organizations generating the most online advocacy actions had several key characteristics in common, including larger e-mail lists; longer-lived online advocacy programs; larger online communications budgets; and sending a higher volume of advocacy e-mail messages.
    - Email open rates are declining: Email message open rates averaged 26 percent between September 2004 and September 2005, a decline from the previous 12-month average of 30 percent. Average response rates to email advocacy appeals were 10 percent, while average response rates to email fundraising appeals were just 0.3 percent.
    - Online actions speak louder than dollars: Not surprisingly, more email subscribers took online action than made an online donation. Between September 2004 and September 2005, an average of 47 percent of all email subscribers took at least one online action, while just 6 percent of subscribers made an online donation.

- Blogs are a dynamic medium that allow any Internet user to have a voice and become an active information generator rather than a passive consumer. Blog tracking can be an innovative way of assessing the "buzz" of an advocacy or policy issue. Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP) piloted blog tracking as an advocacy evaluation method as part of its evaluation of the Packard Foundation's Preschool for California's Children grantmaking program. HFRP found:
  - Blog tracking is similar methodologically to media tracking.
  - Tools for tracking blogs reliably are now emerging, such as Google's Blog Search (blogsearch.google.com), Technorati (www.technorati.com) and Blog Pulse (www.blogpulse.com).
  - Because bloggers often cover issues that are making print or broadcast news, patterns of blog tracking results will often mirror print media results.
  - Content analysis increases the value of blog tracking, although as is the case with media tracking, it can be extremely time consuming.

Related resources:
- Continuous Progress
- The Advocacy Progress Planner
- M+R Strategic Services
- The Evaluation Exchange

Advocacy, Community Mobilization and Systems Change: Assessing Unique Strategies to Impact Community Health

Session reporters: Roberto Garcia and Zoe Clayson, Abundantia Consulting
Email contact: rng17 [at] cvip [dot] net and zoeclay [at] abundantia [dot] net
Link to session abstract and more information: Advocacy, Community Mobilization and Systems Change: Assessing Unique Strategies to Impact Community Health

Key discussion points:
1. There are inherent tensions around grassroots community work that are always present, such as differences in language and competition between organizations.
2. The language that has been adopted by the elites, foundations, academics, and government around accounting (e.g., assets, deficits, capital) is not community language.
3. Analysis of community structures via social networks will assist us in illuminating community dynamics.

Related resources:
Poder Popular Model and Abundantia Consulting

Policy Evaluation: Learning about What, When and for Whom?

Session reporter: John Sherman, Headwaters Group
Email contact: jsherman [at] headwatersgroup [dot] com
Link to session abstract and more information:
http://www.eval.org/search07/session.asp?sessionid=7310&presenterid=1770

Key discussion points:

1. Successful policy advocates already evaluate their work in the time frames necessary to be effective, which may be daily, monthly or even annually depending on the forum in which they are advocating. They are constantly assessing what is and what is not working, recalibrating, etc. That is, they are adaptive, nimble, and decisive. This is especially evident when in the middle of a fast moving campaign – their feedback loops are often immediate. It is critical for evaluators to make sure that they understand the context in which an advocacy effort is occurring, and how the advocates already do their evaluations – data they collect, methods, and frequency before developing an evaluation plan.

2. Real time feedback can be important, but be careful about how information from short feedback loops is used. Day-to-day advocacy can be full of drama and intrigue around the give-and-take of policy making (whether legislative or administrative). While the advocates must pay attention, and be involved in these events, evaluators only need to catalogue them as they may (or may not) prove to be important in the final outcome. Funder(s) as the ultimate audience for the evaluation can feel whipsawed unnecessarily by such daily drama, especially when it has no bearing ultimately on the policy outcomes.

3. Experience matters. The greater the policy advocacy experience of the funder, grantee and evaluator, the more quickly key evaluation questions can be identified, and the greater the ability to identify the important data from the momentary drama. The evaluation structures developed by InnoNet, Alliance for Justice, Julia Coffman, and others are particularly helpful when working with funders and/or evaluators inexperienced with policy advocacy.

Advocacy Evaluation Update #3 (March 2008)

Editor and Chief Writer: Susan Hoechstetter/ Advocacy Evaluation Project Staff: Lily Zandniapour & Johanna Gladfelter
Newsletter Implementation: Simone Parrish & Sharon Grevious / Produced with support from The Atlantic Philanthropies and the Annie E. Casey Foundation

Image Credits
Used and/or modified under Creative Commons license:
- "Tools," http://www.flickr.com/photos/tashland/259178493
- "Calendar," http://www.flickr.com/photos/babasteve/166870759/