SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS: 2015 SYSTEMS (UN)CONFERENCE

October 2015

2015 SYSTEMS (UN)CONFERENCE: OVERALL REFLECTIONS

Summary

Overall, participants enjoyed the (Un)Conference, were wonderfully patient and helpful with technical glitches that arose, and participated in a lively and engaged manner. Each of the three days resulted in rich conversations that we have summarized here.

In the pages to follow, you will find descriptions of what occurred during the sessions offered across the three days of the (Un)Conference. When possible, we have identified resources and links to resources that were shared during the discussions.

We encourage you to browse each topic, check out resources, and let us know what you think. You can always provide feedback and suggestions by mailing the (Un)Conference organizing committee at systemsunconference@gmail.com.

We would like to thank the AEA Systems in Evaluation TIG for graciously sponsoring this event as part of their Systems Learning Network initiative. You can learn more about what the Systems TIG is up to by going to www.systemsinevaluation.com.

Conundrums:

The first-ever virtual Systems (Un)Conference was not without its hiccups. Connection was the biggest hurdle that participants encountered. Many participants had not tested their connection or ran into bandwidth and other technology issues when trying to join the session. Others were able to reach the lobby but then ran into issues when trying to join and/or participate in the individual rooms. Others were unable to locate the link to join – it was in the participants' guide on the Systems TIG website, but was present as a textual link (i.e., click here formatted as a hot link) rather than as the entire URL.

All three sessions were scheduled to occur during weekday afternoons based on US time. Even though the bulk of participants were from North America, the scheduling did make it difficult for international participants to join in.

For 2016, we are planning the following changes:

- The number of days will be reduced from three to two, with one session being held at a time convenient for the Americas, Africa, and Europe and the second session being held at a time convenient for Asia, the Pacific, Australia, and New Zealand.
- At least one practice session will be scheduled a week prior to the 2016 (Un)Conference using the actual (Un)Conference link to allow registered participants to test their connections and practice connecting.

Surprises:

The Systems (Un)Conference drew more interest than we could have imagined. There is a deep desire among our community of systems thinkers and evaluators for connection – to each other, to resources, and to knowledge. We hope we met some of that need.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

INCORPORATING A SYSTEMS APPROACH INTO EVALUATION: CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIES

Summary

Participants in this group were considering how to incorporate a systems approach into evaluation but had not been doing so themselves. The focus of the discussion was on concerns they had about using a systems approach, including how to set up appropriate boundaries and what methods to use. Other topics included the importance of and how to develop a realistic, shared understanding with the client, and how to find places to intervene to leverage change in the system.

Conundrums

One concern was that systems can seem too big, which led to a discussion of ways to map or visualize a system, how to define a system, and how to bound the system for the purposes of the evaluation.

Other conundrums were how to "sell" funders on the systems evaluation approach when they may be focused solely on outcomes attributed directly to their efforts, balancing the need for emergence with the need for continuity and guiding frameworks, and how to budget for systems evaluation.

Resources Shared

Resources included:

- videos that explain or illustrate systems (What is a Systems Story?; Obesity System video);
- pre-mapping (mapping systems before starting the evaluation, then mapping some time later midway through the evaluation with a renewed understanding of the systems to see if there is any change);
- logic tree/model (shows the activities, processes, and outcomes within a program);
- iceberg diagram (shows the visible activities and supporting infrastructure/policies/world views, etc. that support those activities); nwei.org/resources/iceberg/
- multiple linear regression methods;
- social network analysis; and
- identifying boundaries/relationships/exchanges (create imaginary boundaries and identify the relationships or perspectives that influence those boundaries).

USING A SOFT SYSTEMS APPROACH IN SYSTEMS EVALUATION: REAL-LIFE EXAMPLES

Summary

Key ideas that emerged in the session

- Our "common sense" definition of soft systems: situations with multiple players will have multiple understandings of what is going on and what success looks like; there will be multiple theories of change with different desired outcomes and assumptions. Attending to that diversity is important.
- One way to attend to soft systems in evaluation is to evaluate the program (or evaluand) according to different criteria based on the multiple perspectives.
- Soft systems approaches are applicable throughout the project cycle; if we consider multiple perspectives during planning, then it makes sense to consider them again at evaluation.

Conundrums

Key questions that emerged as a result of the conversation that could be explored in the learning network:

- How can we meet the challenge of diverse perspectives and multiple TOCs in an evaluation and be true to all those perspectives?
- How do we resolve the diverse and conflicting perspectives?
- What's the best way to generate and select the perspectives to be considered? How much evidence do you need to accurately represent a perspective?
- How could soft systems approaches be applied in an evaluation of a state-wide program?

Resources Shared

Key tools or resources that emerged in the session to share with the learning network

- Systems Concepts in Action: A Practitioner's Toolkit (Chapter 14, pp 241 - 261) available on Amazon (https://www.amazon.com/gp/product/B005HG5430/ref=dp-kindle-redirect?ie=UTF8&btkr=1)
- Bob Williams' website: http://www.bobwilliams.co.nz/Systems_Resources_files/ssm.pdf

USING A DEVELOPMENTAL EVALUATION APPROACH IN SYSTEMS EVALUATION: REAL-LIFE EXAMPLES

Summary

Participants shared examples of using developmental evaluation (DE) approaches in systems evaluation (e.g., Alliance for Strong Families and Communities). Participants noted that (1) engaging in systems thinking in developmental evaluations is time intensive and evaluators often need to create and hold the space for this kind of thinking; (2) it's important to be aware of "who" is describing the system, client, user, etc.; and (3) collaborative meaning making is important and provides the opportunity to engage multiple perspectives in the systems change process.

Conundrums

Participants noted there are few best practices established in DE. It can also be a struggle to make systems "visible." When you start to uncover the formal and informal systems, where do you stop? How far do you have to go?

Surprises

Several participants had experience developing and revising theories of change and saw them as an opportunity to support systems thinking and developmental evaluation.

Resources Shared

Michael Quinn Patton's book Developmental Evaluation

Evaluating Systems Change: A Methods Brief (Mathematica Policy Research)

Putting the System Back into Systems Change

RSD4 Proceedings: At the Frontiers of Sytemic Design

Strategic Actions for Change: Working with Children and Youth of Immigrant Families

Alliance for Strong Families and Communities (www.alliance1.org/)

USING A COMPLEX ADAPTIVE SYSTEMS APPROACH IN SYSTEMS EVALUATION: REAL-LIFE EXAMPLES

Summary

Participants observed they had come to evaluation and complexity from circuitous paths across a range of different disciplines, and that in some way this is very fitting.

It was noted that many of the models and methods for ecological resilience match with complex adaptive systems – because that's what ecological systems are. It was observed that when ecological systems were left to their own devices, they were adaptive and resilient. It is when humans step in and want something and manipulate to get it (resources, etc) that they go awry.

Participants noted perspective is important at the start of the project. It's important to look at multiple scales rather than a single scale. All systems (and SESs especially) exist and function at multiple scales of space, time and social organization, and the interactions across scales are fundamentally important in determining the dynamics of the system at any particular focal scale.

Participants observed that there do not appear to be any rigorous standards for evaluating change in systems.

Conundrums

People struggle to find appropriate CAS approaches to use in their evaluation work.

As evaluators, participants questioned whether they are there to evaluate (ie, give a "score") or to educate and enable change?

Surprises

Even amongst a group of people who appeared to have quite good understandings of CAS, using these approaches in evaluation appears challenging.

Resources Shared

Stockholm Resilience Centre (http://www.stockholmresilience.org/

Panarchy (Gunderson and Holling, 2003)

National Center for Earth Surface Dynamics (NCED) http://www.nced.umn.edu/

SUPPORT FOR A SYSTEMS APPROACH IN SYSTEMS EVALUATION: STRATEGIES FOR PROMOTING BUY-IN

Summary

The discussion began around the difficulty in deciding between how much "technical" language to use and how much regular language to use in order to get folks working in a more systems focused orientation. It was also noted that it was important to take a step back, think about the questions being answered and the program context, and then find a system approach that matches.

Another suggestion was to show traditional approaches/questions on one hand and systems approaches/questions on the other to highlight the gaps that the systems approaches could fill. How the topic is introduced with a client depends on what stage of the evaluation the systems ideas/concepts come into play. It is useful to consider the capacity and openness of the client – sort of a usability or capacity index. For example, does the organization or project have a culture of learning? Is complexity present? Is there a clear idea of for whom the information gleaned from a systems investigation would be useful? Utilization is important.

One of the big needs expressed was know-how in visualizing systems and programs operating within complexity. Main takeaways from the conversation about engaging buy-in was the use of technical/lay language and how to visually depict the interventions in order to better represent contributional pathways toward programmatic outcomes.

Conundrums

How do we bring to the field a greater respect for the systems lens in all the work we do and thus create an environment where clients will be willing to invest in the "additional" work around systems? It is very much an educational process…the biggest challenge is in explaining what a systems approach really is.

Working in agencies or systems that are strongly geared towards accountability makes using systems approaches more difficult. Certain agencies and cultures strongly favor outcome or experimental studies. In those instances, it is important to meet the bar of the expected type of evaluation but then to recommend systems approaches as a value-added proposition.

We often say that systems approaches can complement traditional approaches, but is that really true? Might not we need a complete paradigm shift in both the design of programs and the evaluations we conduct?

Surprises

Often we use systems approaches or systems thinking rather covertly – without explicitly telling our clients – to shape better evaluation questions or deepen our analyses of the data. But there is both a personal as well as business cost to having to do "additional" work in order to design and implement a systems-based evaluation when clients have asked for a traditional evaluation design. Should only be done if the systems design would better serve the project.

Resources Shared

Tools or methods people felt they had the most success with included:

- Outcome Mapping,
- Outcome Harvesting,
- Social Network Analysis,
- Mapping Systems (somewhat like a program logic model but focusing more on the boundaries and perspectives – what's in and what's out)
- Concept mapping
- "Ripple effect" maps

DEFINING AND DISTINGUISHING SYSTEMS EVALUATION: WHERE ARE THE BOUNDARIES?

Summary

How are evaluations that use systems thinking different than other evaluations? Participants saw some common elements of such evaluations, but did not say that they were unique to systems evaluations:

- the evaluation is done at several levels
- the evaluation uses a mixed methods approach (needs qualitative information from multiple perspectives)
- the evaluation changes and adapts as the intervention evolves
- the context is not static, but interacts with the intervention
- the evaluation is designed collaboratively to answer developmental and formative evaluation questions
- answers the "so what" aspect of systems change.

Conundrums

The session ended with the opposite question - what makes for a BAD use of systems thinking/practice in evaluation?

Resources Shared

Participants discussed methods that are amenable to systems thinking in evaluation, especially in an international context:

- outcome mapping
- developmental evaluation
- social network analysis
- Sensemaker
- participatory systemic inquiry
- most significant differences
- sentinel indicators (USAID)

VISUALIZING COMPLEX SYSTEMS: TOOLS AND STRATEGIES

Summary

Important to decide if mapping an intervention or a system. Range of approaches that can be used – need to not be too narrow or too broad - to frame the part, the whole, and the greater whole.

Some of the criteria for effective use of visualization tools include:

- Did it generate insights?
- Did it make people curious?
- Did it sensitize people to their complexity in a meaningful way?
- Did it generate ownership amongst the participants for the results of the analysis?

Factors that shape whether the techniques are effective include:

- the budget for the technique (it can be pricey and many funders are reluctant to fund this),
- the skill of the evaluator (or subcontractor),
- the use of good sense-making processes to help turn the visualization into meaning,
- an 'appropriate' lag time between process and sense making.

There are some good examples of pre- and post-systems visualization, particularly in social network analysis.

Conundrums

It may be easier to use visualization techniques in the early planning/strategic thinking phases of an intervention - where one can create a baseline understanding of a system - but more difficult to employ it as a post or ongoing tracking of a changing systems. Why?

There are some 'field building' challenges for us moving forward:

- managing expectations of what we can and cannot do with data visualization, particularly given a need to ensure the techniques are effective
- the need to understand all the different software (e.g. Kumu) to assist,
- general capacity building amongst evaluators, and
- expanded support amongst funders to support this work.

Surprises

There are a lot of different techniques that can be used. It's not always apparent what is the best tool for the job. Participants would like an inventory.

Resources Shared

Mapping an intervention (e.g. theory of change, logic models, outcome mapping)

Mapping a system (stakeholder mapping, mind maps, social network analysis, etc.)

Social network analysis

"Pictor analysis" work by Nigel King http://qhr.sagepub.com/content/23/8/1138.abstract

XMind is a tool for mind mapping http://www.xmind.net/

Kumu https://kumu.io/

Sticky dot technology is very useful for gathering stakeholder input

Graphic facilitation is another useful technique; can use pre-existing templates or create fresh

Different system visualization techniques (e.g. rich story, systems dynamics, causal loops, integrated propositional analysis, landscape diagram, beneficiary mapping, social network analysis, mind mapping)

IDENTIFYING SYSTEM LEVERAGE POINTS: HELPFUL APPROACHES

Summary

What comes to mind when thinking about leverage? A lot of interest in understanding how to find leverage points – what system elements become leverage points? where do you look for leverage points?

Importance of leverage points – may have an interesting program model and good data, but what is the practical aspect/learning from this? How can people change their system? How did it get where it is in the first place, where will it go, what is the pathway to do better, to get outcomes desired?

What do we look for in a system when seeking out leverage points? Places to make some change in a system; where can you intervene that will make the most difference? A particular intervention may be focused on just a small piece of the system, but if you go broader, you can find points of leverage that can influence whole system change. You're looking for a place in the system that is ripe and ready for a number of reasons – that's a leverage point.

Measuring stages of change – it's unique to each situation. In general, though, you are interested in what measures line up with the stages of change you are examining. Easier in some service contexts than in others. What is valued is different depending on perspective/stakeholder groups involved, so may be defining different levels of value in different ways or domains depending on perspective taken.

Important to dig down levels below results/activities to norms, policy, infrastructure, and mental models/assumptions –what kind of change in policy/infrastructure/norms is necessary to keep desired results in place? What triggered the shift, what is required to keep it in place? How do you shift data collection and analysis to look at those structures that may be necessary to support that change/new direction?

Conundrums

It's hard to "talk systems" to most people without losing them immediately.

We work with human systems – humans are products of context/history; which is why linear approaches to change and "universal" models so rarely work.

What do you do with a program whose logic model is too much "pie in the sky"? There is danger that the program will end up backing away from lofty goals because it does not believe it can do what is proposed; how can evaluators help to find the "low hanging fruit" that is easier to start with and that provides early successes?

Is there a way to capture emergence? How do you do that in evaluation? How to be methodologically sound with changing methods? Build change and transition into evaluation as well? Is this the role for developmental evaluation?

Surprises

Iceberg metaphor resonated with group as a good tool for communicating observations over time and for documenting shifts in process and implementation.

Resources Shared

We talked about potential tools – the kind that employ some degree of interaction with stakeholders either through interviews or structured activities – mapping was one; rich pictures of things like stakeholders and the stakes they are interested in or formal vs actual organizational flow/structure/hierarchy (also gets to power and influence) was another; also digging down through the levels of a program to get at assumptions, paradigms, and mental models.

The systems iceberg as a model for discovering and understanding points of leverage.

> http://www.nwei.org/resources/iceberg/
> http://www.fusbp.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/systems_thinking-explained.pdf)

Donella Meadows – chapter on leverage point in book on systems thinking; good summary of ways to intervene

Etienne Wenger's work on values creation:

> http://wenger-trayner.com/resources/publications/evaluation-framework/– five different types of value that occur when you're in some activity; immediate value, potential value, applied value, realized value, reframing value – get to certain point, something potentially transformative requiring shift in data collection and what you pay attention to so as not to miss leap people have made; paradigm shift fundamental to shaping whole system

ADDRESSING CAUSATION IN SYSTEMS EVALUATION

Summary

From a systems perspective, how do we consider causation with rigor? Or is causality a sub-component of a larger systems examination? Do we need to attribute a factor to a systems component or is it okay that we just think about the system as it is and not worry about reducing it to a set of components and then saying it's a specific component that was causal?

Pathways and time – what has to occur when, in what order, also in what proximity of time? What is the chain of circumstances that has most effect? Is this where systems thinking brings value? Examining pathways, dynamics, flow of intervention/program to identify what matters. And, very important, theory matters – without theory, it doesn't matter how strong the empirical data is; theory helps to explain what you are seeing and put it into a bigger context than just what you are examining.

What about when the intervention is an attempt to change the system itself? Is this different thinking than looking at a program nested in a larger system that is addressing targeted piece of what's going on in the larger system? Main argument for that is that if the intervention doesn't make changes in the system that supports the intervention, you're not going to have sustainable outcomes; that's the argument behind taking a systems change approach to intervention (and evaluation). As a result:

- Rather than change individual approaches, system in place is changed so that it will serve target beneficiaries better
- But focus is on system over program
- Assumption we often make about programs and needing to change system, but if we don't have tools for testing causality, we may actually not know if it's true

Maybe if taking systems approach, might have to abandon the notion of this one intervention that you did caused this change. By putting things in a systems context, we can say that intervention contributed to change but that other identified systemic factors happened to be in place or have to be occurring as well to achieve the observed/desired outcome(s).

Conundrums

What is role of causation in systems evaluation?

- What is necessary vs what is sufficient?
- Struggling with task at hand – when talking about an evaluation, are we talking about the program happening in the context of the system and acknowledging that context or are we saying we need to know what part of the system causes a successful outcome or acts as a barrier to promoting a successful outcome?

How do we distinguish between things that facilitated/had <u>role</u> in outcomes and those that played a <u>causal</u> role? Do systems evaluations lend themselves to exploring causality? Are there systems tools that can contribute?

One component of systems thinking is we have emergent properties, how do we capture those emergent properties and assign causality (or not) to either the emergence of those properties or the role of those emergent properties in thinking about our system and how it impacts our programs/outcomes?

How do we resolve the notion of truth – the belief that, statistically, we are finding truth in terms of causality? How do we integrate statistical "truth" or "proof"? Many of the situations we evaluate are real-life, in-situ situations that violate critical assumptions around sampling and normality required to statistically establish causality.

Surprises

A systems approach might imply that we no longer can look at linear causation.

Many times clients feel that causation is a central feature of what they want in the evaluation, but it is not the most important/valuable contribution that the evaluation can make. So, perhaps causality is a component of the larger evaluation; we mix the statistics with the systems approaches to broaden how we look at the quality of what happened.

ROLE OF ACCOUNTABILITY IN SYSTEMS EVALUATION

Summary

Some indicators of system change: (a) more inclusivity of the system (involvement of populations not previously included); (b) change in tactics used in the system (new ways of doing business); (c) new points of entry for target populations (attracting new actors); (d) new partners (structure of the system); (e) sentinel indicators (not an end or outcome measure, although could be; (f) imitation (spread of practices and approaches); and (g) dynamics (interactions between system actors).

Feature of systems evaluations:

- Multi-level analysis
- Process evaluation
- Recognition that the initiative will evolve

Evaluators can come up against resistance to systems evaluation because of issues around management and control. Some need management accountability, and others have it imposed on them. The term "systems change" can be distracting or even scary for some. For some it simply means more work they don't want to do.

There's a challenge around collective impact and the need to share accountability; some forces (funders, donors, etc.) still want to see direct accountability from an initiative. Need to deal with how to assign accountability in collective efforts better.

There needs to be a management environment created that is comfortable with systems evaluation and the shared accountability it generates: (a) John Mayne's early work in Contribution vs. Attribution could be useful in this area, i.e. individual programs only contribute to long-term outcomes and cannot be expected to be 100% accountable for them; (b) the Collective Impact movement is starting to make headway in this area.

As evaluators we ourselves have to walk the walk, we can be guilty of creating "islands of perfect measurement". Funders also need to get more comfortable with better systems collaboration at their level. We can consider re-labeling "systems" to be more attractive/less scary:

- "collective impact" is more friendly than "systems", so is "networks"
- sometimes people are doing a systems intervention but they don't call it one
- can ask, "What are you trying to influence?" instead, provides an easier entry point
- need to use the vocabulary that they use to define it
- then steer the conversation away from "accountability" to "learning" and "influence", ask:
  - "What kind of learning can we get out of this?"
  - "Are there others in the field we can influence?"

Conundrums

Challenges in system evaluations:

- Boundaries
- Emergence
- Budgeting
- Managing stakeholders (because of large numbers and differing perspectives on types of outcomes to track)

There's a difference between wanting to achieve impact vs. influence: (a) e.g. how many housing units did we build (impact) vs. did we better leverage funds to make this happen (influence); (b) ORSImpact has a framework that defines the difference between influence and impact.

Can also make it more attractive/less scary by clearly managing boundaries:

- ask, "Although this is in the system, can we really address it or not?"
- make it clear there ARE limits in the system to what is addressed or not
- sometimes knowing this is enough to make people relax
- drawing smaller "bubbles of influence" can make it more friendly, then look at where those bubbles overlap, ask "Is there an opportunity to intervene here?"

Surprises

Systems evaluation is up against traditional management theory in the workplace and moving forward requires major behavior change, need to understand and incentivize collective effort better. Are there management models out there that better incentivize shared accountability?

- the military is one, their management structure is all about contributing to the collective, i.e. you measure the war, not the soldier, soldiers need autonomy in the field, the system is changing all the time for them, but overall you need to manage the war
- same for sales people in a company
- how can we transfer this to social change efforts?

If you think you're going to come up against this barrier:

- take baby systems evaluation steps
- be subversive - do it first, then ask for permission later, managers don't know what they don't know

Resources Shared

John Mayne's early work in Contribution vs. Attribution

- http://evi.sagepub.com/content/18/3/270.abstract

Collective Impact

- http://www.fsg.org/ideas-in-action/collective-impact
- https://collectiveimpactforum.org/what-collective-impact
- http://www.collaborationforimpact.com/collective-impact/
- http://www.strivetogether.org/blog/2012/11/the-difference-between-collaboration-and-collective-impact/

ORS Impact

- http://tamarackcci.ca/blogs/tom-kelly/impact-influence-leverage-and-learning-evaluation-makes-case-funders
- http://orsimpact.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Center_Pathways_FINAL.pdf

THE LINK BETWEEN CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE EVALUATION (CRE) AND SYSTEMS-ORIENTED EVALUATION (SOE)

Summary

The basic systems frameworks (boundaries, perspectives and relationships) fit well in considering a CRE, one often needs to consider boundaries, issues of power, and perspectives. Issue of scale was also discussed. Definitions of Systems Orientation Evaluation:

- Defined in terms of interactions of parts in/with whole, interactions in environment
- Parts of community and organizations and other systems that have influence on projects/programs/behaviors
- Looking at the structures that are driving behaviors – visible and invisible…making visible the parts of the system that are not obvious
- Donella Meadows: "connecting a system more tightly to itself"
- Creating the feedback loops that help the systems function better

When evaluators come to a group for data gathering, often not enough listening and we get the wrong information or we misinterpret it. We need to understand our own implicit cultural perspective/bias and understand how bias is implicit and embedded in our methods in ways we do not recognize.

How to negotiate with clients who might not prioritize being culturally responsive? How can systems approaches help with this? The need to continually practice – both CRE and Systems – and to include in small steps was noted. Some approaches that have been used:

- Concept Mapping with post-it notes to give a visual of actors, boundaries and perspectives
- Rich pictures to get beyond language -- pictures can convey so much metaphorically
- Use of critical systems heuristic...the questions are great for clarifying power -- what is left out; however, need to be careful of the "academic sounding language
- Using complexity approaches to think about changing patterns in system

Where's the interesting edge that people want to explore? Need more opportunities like this to talk amongst ourselves and share ideas. One idea is that many groups, especially indigenous or non-European, already think in a systems approach that is rooted in their culture. There might be great connections and new as if systems TIG partnered more with Indigenous People in Evaluation or the other TIGs devoted to diversity and culture.

Conundrums

A project might be designed in a Culturally Responsive way, an evaluation might be planned similarly; however, the project might be embedded in a larger system that is not culturally responsive. What to do? How to support staff in those situations?

Is social justice to regularly be a part of a CRE?

Policy Questions: Who benefits? Who pays? Who wins? Who loses?

Culture is at the epicenter of all systems...and should have a systems orientation

What does evaluation "mean"? in terms of different cultures? how it needs to be framed in different cultures?

- What are the POWERFUL questions we need to ask?
- WHY are we doing this? What is the purpose? What is this for?

Surprises

Evaluative Capacity – as foundations increase attention and focus on evaluation capacity building, it has focused on technical skills and we have not had a strong enough focus on CRE (and SOE) as part of that capacity building

- What does it look like to build that capacity?
- How do you leave that capacity in the place you are working?
- What do you have to do that is audacious, attention getting, in order to gain attention/raise awareness/change how people view the world?

Resources Shared

Michael Jackson (England) separated systems approaches into 4 based on purpose

- Improving goal seeking and viability
- Explore purposes
- Ensuring fairness ← intersection with CRE/equity
- Promoting diversity ←intersection with CRE

Using evaluation teams with community members

- Asking folks to tell their story, draw contexts, systems – great data gathering method
- Ask everyone at the table to tell their story of how they came to the table
- Graphic recording as data
- Intentionality of narrative, story