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Foreword

Tēnā koutou katoa

Last year, at Te Oru Rangahau Māori Research and Development Conference, I spoke of the need to have quality research and information about the merits of policies and programmes to:

• assist Māori; and
• convince ministers and agencies of their responsibilities to improve Māori well-being.

I’ve also expressed concern more recently over how little information on outcomes for Māori had been included in employment and training evaluations by mainstream departments. The irony is that Māori are among the most researched peoples in New Zealand, yet at the same time there is a lack of robust information to assist policy makers to make decisions about what is happening for Māori in the health, employment, education, and housing sectors.

Last December, the Government identified improving the social and economic status of Māori as a strategic priority. Sound evaluation practices resulting in robust information are crucial elements in meeting this challenge. Therefore, I am pleased to release this report *Evaluation for Māori Guidelines for Government Agencies*. I believe these guidelines will provide a useful resource for agencies undertaking evaluations of programmes that have an impact on Māori or hold an interest for Māori.

Dr Ngātata Love
Chief Executive
Te Puni Kōkiri
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1. Introduction

1.1 Te Puni Kōkiri’s Guidelines

Te Puni Kōkiri is required to monitor and liaise with, each department and agency that provides or has responsibility to provide services to or for Māori for the purposes of ensuring the adequacy of those services.\(^1\) Te Puni Kōkiri’s role also includes advising departments on their monitoring and evaluation systems for Māori.\(^2\)

As part of this role, these guidelines have been developed to assist agencies undertaking evaluations to collect quality information about Māori. The guidelines are presented as a set of minimum critical success factors that agencies should consider when evaluating their programmes.

1.2 Readers of these Guidelines

These guidelines have been prepared to assist those involved in evaluation as policy analysts, evaluators, and researchers working in government agencies.

1.3 Scope of the Guidelines

Te Puni Kōkiri recognises that evaluations in the public sector are carried out by evaluators, researchers and policy analysts with widely differing skills. These guidelines have been designed to reach a wide audience, and include tips for the novice evaluator as well as the expert.

1.4 Structure of the Guidelines

The guidelines outline how quality information can be collected from and about Māori. Section Two of the guidelines examines the reasons as to why it is important that evaluations consider Māori. Section Three identifies ethical issues that arise when conducting evaluations important to or involving Māori.

Sections Four to Seven identify the critical stages of an evaluation including: planning, design, analysis, and reporting and communicating results. Each section is structured around the critical success factors, a commentary of issues, common gaps and a checklist.

2. Review of Te Puni Kōkiri’s Medium to Long Term Role CAB (95) M 12/22.
The checklists itemise important things to remember when conducting an evaluation of interest to or involving Māori. Section Eight provides a list of references relating to Māori, gender issues, research, ethics, and evaluation.
2. Why Evaluate for Māori?

2.1 Introduction

To date, evaluations conducted by mainstream agencies have elicited limited information on the outcomes of government programmes and services for Māori. Many of these evaluations are inadequate due to the processes they have followed (refer Table 1).

Table 1: Characteristics of Government Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Not Involving Māori</th>
<th>2. Involving Māori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ Nil analysis of Māori</td>
<td>♦ Minimal analysis of Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Māori participation or data is not sought or considered relevant</td>
<td>♦ Māori involved as participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Results are thought to have no impact on Māori</td>
<td>♦ Māori sometimes junior members of a research team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Mainstream control and knowledge</td>
<td>♦ Māori data sought and analysed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Use mainstream research methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Mainstream control and knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Focus on Māori</th>
<th>4. Kaupapa Māori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ Moderate to maximum analysis of Māori</td>
<td>♦ Maximum analysis of Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Māori involved as participants</td>
<td>♦ Māori are significant participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Māori typically senior members of the research team</td>
<td>♦ Typically Māori make up all of the research team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Māori analysis produces mainstream and Māori knowledge</td>
<td>♦ Māori analysis undertaken to produce Māori and mainstream knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Knowledge is measured against mainstream research standards</td>
<td>♦ Knowledge meets expectations and quality standards set by Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Mainstream control</td>
<td>♦ Māori control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Te Puni Kōkiri’s reviews of mainstream agencies have found that most evaluations either:

- do not involve Māori (Type 1); or
- contain limited information on Māori and/or have limited involvement by Māori (Type 2).

Type 2 evaluations typically involve Māori interviewers, the analysis of some Māori data, and maybe some form of consultation with Māori experts (often talking with Te Puni Kōkiri is considered to fulfill this function). A focus on Māori in evaluations (Type 3) occurs in small numbers; and Kaupapa Māori evaluations (Type 4) are a rarity.

---

3. Adapted from Chris Cunningham’s (1998) Māori research framework which categorises research into four main areas. Similar categories may be applied to evaluations by mainstream agencies.
For example, an analysis of the effectiveness of employment and training programmes for Māori by Te Puni Kōkiri (1999a) found a lack of quality information for Māori contained within the evaluation reports analysed. Most of these evaluations were Type 1 or 2. Only 10 of the 34 evaluation reports met a minimum standard for coverage of issues for Māori. Seven of the 10 were evaluations of Māori programmes (Type 3).

There have been considerable resources spent on evaluations, yet most of the evaluations are able to make only a few rather general statements regarding how effective programmes are for Māori. This lack of information hinders the ability of Ministers and others in decision-making roles to establish the effectiveness of programmes for Māori and to make improvements.

### 2.2 The Foundations for Evaluating Māori

Māori are an important priority to examine in any evaluation because of the Treaty of Waitangi, the Government’s strategic priorities for Māori, and their status as a ‘target group’.

- **Treaty of Waitangi**
  - The Treaty of Waitangi defines the relationship between Māori and the Crown and provides the fundamental framework for accountability and outcomes between Māori and the Crown.

- **Government’s Strategic Priorities**
  - Successive governments have identified improving the social and economic status of Māori as a strategic priority.

- **Māori as a Target Group**
  - Many government agencies identify Māori as a priority or target group for their services or programmes.

Each of these reasons is expanded in more detail on the following pages.
2.3 **The Treaty of Waitangi**

The Treaty of Waitangi defines the relationship between Māori and the Crown and provides the fundamental framework for accountability and outcomes between Māori and the Crown.

**Diagram 1: Government Accountability and Outcome Frameworks with regard to Māori**

The Treaty has two fundamental objectives:

1. the survival and development of the Māori people; and
2. the right and duty of the Crown to govern the country fairly for the benefit of all New Zealanders.

The first objective involves the protection and enhancement of rangatiratanga. Rangatiratanga is the right of Māori to live and develop in a Māori way, whatever that may mean over time and in changing circumstances. A key feature of rangatiratanga is self-development where Māori can choose their own path and forms of collective organisation - whether that is as hapū and iwi or as other groupings, such as Māori urban authorities.

The second objective involves the rights of Māori to access and receive government services which assist Māori to achieve their full potential and results in Māori achieving the same social and economic outcomes as non-Māori.
These objectives lead to two fundamental outcome questions, for which Māori can and do hold the Government accountable:

1. Do government policies, programmes and services protect and enhance the right of Māori to live and develop in a Māori way?
2. Do government policies, programmes and services result in Māori achieving the same social and economic outcomes as non-Māori?

Evaluations can play a key role in informing the government’s response to these questions.

### 2.4 Government’s Strategic Priorities

A commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi and improving social and economic outcomes for Māori has been clearly set out in the Government’s strategic directions. The current Government has emphasised Māori development within its strategic priorities and stated specifically that it will:

*Extend economic and social opportunities by significantly improving the health, employment, education and housing status of Māori.*

The Government is currently working to develop a set of key outcome indicators for each priority, against which the Government’s achievements can be measured and monitored. Te Puni Kōkiri is providing advice on how indicators measuring Māori status can be included across all the priorities, as well as for the specific priority for Māori mentioned above.

The Government wants to see measurable change for Māori in health, employment, education and housing as well as other sectors. This means that the development and review of programmes and policies will need to be adequately supported by evaluation. Future evaluations will need to examine the effectiveness of government policies and programmes for Māori.

### 2.5 Māori as a Target Group

In addition to Treaty of Waitangi obligations and the Government’s strategic priorities, Māori are identified as a target group by many government agencies. In 1991, the Government introduced a mainstreaming policy whereby mainstream agencies became responsible for delivering services to Māori. As a result of mainstreaming and significant client numbers, many government agencies now identify Māori as a priority or target group for their services or programmes.

As clients or customers of a programme or service, Māori form a unique group with particular needs compared to non-Māori. These needs arise from cultural preferences, as well as the socio-economic

---

position of Māori. In many cases, these needs will mean that the outcomes and impacts of a programme or service will be different for Māori and non-Māori. This also suggests that inferences drawn from information about the total population may not be valid for Māori.

Evaluators must also recognise Māori in all their diverse realities (Durie, 1995). Although Māori form a unique group when compared to non-Māori they are by no means homogeneous. Māori come with different hapū and iwi affiliations, backgrounds, locations, experiences, needs, and issues. Māori are culturally, economically and socially diverse. This means evaluations also need to take account of differences between various groups of Māori as this diversity can affect the outcomes of a programme for each group.

Consequently, there is a need for evaluations to give specific attention to whether programmes or services have:

- increased the accessibility of services for Māori or groups of Māori;
- improved service delivery to Māori; and
- improved outcomes and influenced positive change in disparities between Māori and non-Māori.
3. Consider the Ethical Issues for Māori

Ethics is about safety, respect, comfort, dignity, and confidentiality for the individual, their whānau, hapū and iwi. Ethics does not start and end at the design phase of an evaluation, rather it extends through to the reporting, communicating and actioning of evaluation results. Ethics in Māori research can be explored in the writings of Ngahuia Te Awekotuku, Kathie Irwin, Linda Smith, and Russell Bishop, to name but a few. The titles of their publications are appended. Presented below are some of the key ethical issues Te Puni Kōkiri has dealt with.

3.1 Ethical Issues to Consider

Skills and Competencies

Evaluators with cultural, language/reo, subject and research competencies are required to undertake an evaluation involving Māori. The gender and age of evaluators are also important considerations when undertaking specific evaluations. Government agencies tend to value evaluators with formal qualifications in research design and methodology over and above the cultural, language/reo and subject expertise.

This begs the question - How often do agencies check if their researcher or evaluator is able to relate to and connect with Māori respondents? How do government agencies:

- Value and apply tikanga and manaakitanga principles?
- Identify and appoint evaluators or interviewers who follow tikanga and manaakitanga principles?
- Know if their evaluators or interviewers are treating Māori respondents with disrespect or disregard?
- Identify and appoint an evaluation team which has an appreciation of alternative or more culturally appropriate research methods e.g. hui, collaborative research design and kaupapa Māori research methods?
Working with communities

Evaluation findings should be made available to the respondents, whānau, iwi and hapū as well as to the general public. Reporting back and making information available to those being researched is essential, as ‘research’ can raise suspicion amongst Māori. Government agencies need to ensure that the results of evaluations are communicated back to Māori involved in or affected by the evaluation in a timely and appropriate manner. Ideally, participants and communities affected should not have to wait for years before the results are released to them.

Valid research tools

Applying valid research tools is an important ethical consideration in an evaluation. Interviews, focus groups and hui with individuals and groups of key stakeholders are accepted research tools in Māori research, but are open to criticism because the research method is considered unscientific in Western terms. In comparison, there is little debate over evaluations involving quantitative methodologies. For example, often very weak quantitative customer satisfaction information is presented to Te Puni Kōkiri by agencies as proof that no problems exist for Māori. The validity of using such limited information to inform decision making is questionable.

The use of an experimental design6 for social service delivery programmes involving Māori requires greater discussion. Experimental designs are difficult in close knit communities where people know and are related to each other. Experimental design evaluation tends to cut across whānau and hapū ties and, ultimately, these whānau and hapū ties may undermine the design.

Informed consent

Informed consent is an important ethical principle. However, its application often conflicts with Māori ethical considerations. The standard approach is to send out information sheets and consent forms prior to undertaking the focus group or interview. However, a more appropriate approach is ‘kanohi ki te kanohi’. Communicating ‘face to face’ is the traditional method of communication for Māori, and enables quicker decision-making and more complete information sharing. Applying ‘kanohi ki te kanohi’ practices maybe a more appropriate approach for evaluators where information sheets and consent forms are explained in person. Here the presentation in person becomes much more important and valid than written forms or pieces of paper.

---

6. Put simply, this is where one group receives a service and another group doesn’t. The outcomes from each group are compared to see if there are any differences that can be linked back to the service.
Koha

Koha is an important cultural consideration and means to give a donation or gift. Koha establishes an on-going reciprocal relationship. If researchers value the information they receive from Māori then koha is an integral part of the relationship. However, agencies and some ethics committees may view fulfilling cultural obligations of reciprocity through offering money or gifts as an incentive payment. Koha is neither coercive nor clouds the decision to participate. Koha comes in many forms such as petrol or food vouchers, stationery, flowers, taking participants out for a meal, baskets of food, as well as money.

3.2 Ethical Considerations Checklist

Agencies and evaluators need to:

- Adhere to basic principles of respect, upholding integrity, confidentiality and safety
- Recognise these basic principles and apply these to Māori individuals and to their whānau, hapū and iwi
- Employ evaluators with the necessary cultural, language/reo, subject and research competencies to undertake the evaluation
- Apply valid research methodologies (dependent on the topic and who the Māori participants are)
- Convey clearly to Māori the aims of the evaluation and the anticipated outcomes of the evaluation
- Ensure Māori participants know what will become of the information they have volunteered, and its possible use and application
- Report back to Māori involved in or affected by the evaluation in a timely and appropriate manner
One of the key weaknesses of mainstream evaluations has been a lack of Māori input at the evaluation’s formative or planning stages. The first and most important step to improve the quality of evaluations for Māori is to involve them early at the planning stage. Secondly, evaluation plans need to examine the Treaty implications of the programme or policy. Thirdly, evaluators must analyse the data to estimate the participation (current, potential and future) by Māori, and the implications this data will have on the evaluation.

If these three steps are followed then the potential for producing quality evaluation information on Māori will be significantly increased.

**4. Critical Success Factors for Evaluation Planning**

1. Assess the Treaty implications of the programme or policy (eg, partnership implications, protection of knowledge, cultural property or mana, and potential outcomes).

2. Analyse data to estimate the current, potential and future participation by Māori in the programme or policy.

3. Identify people with an understanding of issues for Māori to be on the planning team, as well as potential Māori stakeholders for the evaluation.

4. Specify clear and realistic objectives for Māori.

5. Estimate the resources, both human and material, required to collect quality information from Māori.

“Develop an evaluation plan for Māori”
4.2 Commentary on Evaluation Planning

These critical success factors are expanded in more detail below.

Assess the Treaty of Waitangi implications

- Establish whether the programme, policy or service has Treaty of Waitangi implications. To do so, an appreciation of the Treaty is required. A Māori or Treaty Unit within an agency may be able to assist an evaluator. Otherwise seek out a person with prior experience of applying the Treaty in a policy or evaluation environment.

- Read the Treaty of Waitangi (pages 11-12) and the ethical discussion (pages 14-16) sections. Both sections discuss Treaty of Waitangi considerations.

- Develop an ability internally within the evaluation unit. Evaluation units should not rely on particular people and a Māori or Treaty unit within their agencies to provide them with such advice. This is a short-term solution. Evaluation units should be looking at developing such capacity amongst all their staff.

Identify people with understanding of issues for Māori

- Identify people who are familiar with the issues for Māori regarding the programme, policy, service or sector. For example, people within the agency commissioning the evaluation, both at a local level and in head office, may be able to give perspectives on what issues exist for Māori, and the implications of those issues.

- Contact other agencies which may be aware of issues that exist for Māori. For example, Te Puni Kōkiri and the Ministry of Women’s Affairs are the types of agencies that are a useful source of information and advice. Other agencies operating in the sector of interest may have worked on issues relating to Māori. This should be in addition to the involvement of Māori stakeholders (see below).

Involve Māori stakeholders

- Identify and involve at an early stage Māori stakeholders who have an interest in the programme, policy, service or sector. Consulting Māori staff within the organisation commissioning the evaluation, or with Te Puni Kōkiri, is not sufficient coverage of Māori stakeholders.

- Recognise that stakeholder involvement is crucial. Stakeholders are an excellent source of information for an evaluation and their involvement allows for greater potential use of the evaluation results. Organisations that represent Māori at a local, sector or national level, iwi and hapū, Māori service providers, Māori
experts in the subject area, and Māori consumers, may be important stakeholders to talk to at the planning stage.

Gender

- Examine gender differences. For example, the differences between:
  - Māori women and Māori men;
  - Māori men and non-Māori men; and
  - Māori women and non-Māori women.

Gender analysis recognises that Māori women’s and men’s lives, and therefore experiences, needs, issues and priorities are different from each other. Furthermore, it recognises that the life experiences, needs and issues of Māori women and men are often different from those of non-Māori women and men. For example, while most Māori women live in urban areas, they are less likely than non-Māori women to do so. Only 35% of Māori women live in the five largest cities of New Zealand, compared with 50% of non-Māori women. (Te Puni Kökiri and Ministry of Women’s Affairs, 1999). These characteristics have implications for policy analysis and evaluations.

Analyse data

- Examine the programme’s administrative data and statistical information to establish how many Māori use the programme, the extent of Māori participation and any recorded outcomes. Relevant information on Māori participants and their whānau should be considered. It is important to take into account the current participation by Māori clients and potential Māori participation on the programme. Identify if there is a gap between the current (e.g., under-represented) and potential (e.g., high representation) participation. What are the implications of this?
• Identify trends within the Māori population and whether disparities exist between Māori and non-Māori. Possible information sources include the Census, Statistics New Zealand surveys, administrative data and research reports. Helpful Te Puni Kōkiri publications include *Progress Towards Closing the Social and Economic Gaps Between Māori and Non-Māori* and the Whakapakari series.

• Be aware of small numbers. Small numbers of Māori participating in a programme may actually mean access issues exist that are affecting Māori participation.

• Examine future trends for participation. Don’t assume small numbers of Māori affected by a programme or policy mean they are unimportant. For example, if a programme for elderly people was evaluated then it would be important to examine the issues for Māori kuia and koroua, despite the younger age structure of the Māori population. Even though numbers are small Māori may have significantly different experiences than non-Māori. This could have potentially major implications for future planning and policies given that the Māori population will age more dramatically than non-Māori over the next twenty years.

**Specify objectives for Māori**

• Identify specific evaluation objectives for Māori. This can be obtained by determining what the programme or policy should be achieving for Māori. Analysis of data, discussion with stakeholders and review of the policy or programmes objectives will help decide if specific evaluation objectives for Māori are required.

• Ask questions which explore whether the programme is effective for Māori, or not. Don’t just include Māori as part of the ethnicity question or as a footnote in the evaluation plan - this is not sufficient. Go one step further and ask the ‘why’ questions - Why is this happening for Māori? Key questions to be considered include:
  ♦ Who is the target Māori population? Is the programme reaching the target Māori population? Why/why not?
  ♦ How well is the service being delivered to Māori? How do we know? How do Māori perceive the service?
  ♦ What are the overall outcomes for Māori?
  ♦ Are there differences in outcomes across different groups of Māori participants? If so, why?
  ♦ Are the experiences for Māori on the programme the same or different for non-Māori? If so, why?
  ♦ What are the differences in outcomes between Māori and non-Māori? How can these differences be explained? What are the implications of these differences for Māori? Does the
programme, policy or service need to be designed or delivered differently for Māori?

♦ Which components of the programme or service are most crucial to ensure positive outcomes for Māori?

**Estimate resources**

- Estimate the cost of collecting quality information from Māori in the evaluation budget. Getting a representative sample for Māori can be expensive and this must be factored into the evaluation planning as early as possible. If Māori interviewers are required then recruitment and training may incur expenses. Koha and reciprocity have to be considered also.

- Ensure budgetary expenditure is planned early and allocated fairly. The budget should match the value placed on information collected from Māori. Some agencies spend large amounts of money collecting information from non-Māori groups and then have to conduct follow-up research on a reduced budget with Māori - this appears as an after thought.

- Be realistic. If there are limited resources, then a minimum level evaluation for Māori may have to be considered. Set realistic evaluation objectives for Māori that match available resources.

**Value Māori expertise**

- Budget for input from Māori. Māori experts and leaders (especially community based) are consultants and advisors in their own right and must be accorded the same fiscal recognition as other advisors (eg, technical advisors).

- Include the actual costs of accessing Māori respondents. Not doing so may result in having insufficient resources and time available to cover costs for Māori. Do not expect the local Māori community or marae to absorb the costs of hosting hui, contacting clients, and picking up clients for meetings, this is the evaluator’s responsibility.
4.3 Common Gaps in Evaluation Planning

Some common gaps are:

- Evaluation plans that assume it is too difficult and/or costly to conduct evaluations which elicit quality information on Māori, without investigating the actual cost or level of difficulty.

- Evaluation plans that stick to policy or programme objectives. Just because the policy or programme’s objectives does not specify Māori, this does not mean that the policy or programme does not have important implications for Māori.

- Evaluation plans that fail to include:
  - an analysis of actual Māori participation on a programme; and
  - a needs analysis to establish potential Māori participation on a programme.

- Evaluation plans that take a ‘one size fits all’ approach. Evaluators may assume that a programme targeting non-Māori participants will suit the needs of Māori participants. This reasoning fails to recognise differences in experiences, especially by Māori of: gaining access to programmes; of the programme itself; and of programme outcomes.

- Evaluations that focus solely on the effects and impact of the programme on the individual participant, without consideration of the impact on their wider whānau, hapū, iwi, and local communities where applicable.

- Evaluation plans that emphasise research design - how to collect information from Māori as opposed to what evaluation questions should be asked of Māori.

- Agencies and evaluators that rely on one person or organisation (such as Te Puni Kōkiri) to provide a Māori viewpoint on their evaluation.

- Evaluators that don’t state up-front what information needs will or won’t be addressed by the evaluation. The possible gap between Māori stakeholder expectations and those of the evaluator is not made clear to all involved.
• Evaluation plans that don’t consider and include the cost of recruitment and training in budgets when using Māori interviewers. Unexpected costs may result in the exclusion of appropriate interviewers in the evaluation process due to financial constraints.

### 4.4 Planning Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluators when planning an evaluation need to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Assess Treaty implications of the programme or policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analyse potential, actual and future participation by Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Get input on issues for Māori by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Involving Māori staff within their agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Talking to other agencies such as Te Puni Kōkiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Involving stakeholders (at a national and local level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify potential Māori stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Specify clear and realistic objectives for Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Estimate resources required for the collection of quality information from Māori</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Build Māori into the Evaluation Design**

Issues for Māori are often overlooked at the evaluation design stage despite the identification of issues for Māori in the evaluation plan. At this stage, it appears the evaluators focus on process, that is making their evaluation well-structured and of a high-quality, and forget to consider and include design issues specifically for Māori. Agencies and their evaluators strive for technically excellent, sometimes elaborate evaluation design yet sometimes overlook the reality of working with Māori as individuals, hapū, iwi and communities.

At the design stage, skilled evaluators and appropriate and reliable data collection methods need to be identified. It is also useful to examine the Statistics New Zealand Principles for Māori data collection.

5.1 **Critical Success Factors for Evaluation Design**

1. Ensure researchers who are skilled in conducting research with Māori are identified and included on the evaluation team.

2. Ensure the research design method(s) will be conducted in a manner appropriate for Māori.

3. Use data collection methods that gather reliable and sufficient information about Māori.

4. Apply the Statistics New Zealand Principles for Māori data collection when collecting information about Māori.

‘Build Māori into the evaluation design’
These critical success factors are expanded in more detail below.

**Skilled researchers**

- Check to see that the organisation or evaluator has the skills and expertise to complete an evaluation which includes analysis for Māori. If not, seek out the necessary skills and expertise by asking other agencies and researchers for contacts or recommendations.

- Identify the qualities or skills an evaluator needs for the evaluation to be successful. A skilled evaluator experienced in conducting research with Māori will always be required. The evaluator needs to understand and apply the necessary cultural, language/reo, subject, and research competencies.

- Select the evaluator or researcher carefully. While the first preference when conducting an evaluation involving Māori may be for a Māori researcher, a non-Māori researcher with the appropriate skills and understanding may be adequate. Always check this out with other evaluation team members and other stakeholders.

- Ensure non-Māori evaluators are knowledgeable about Māori tikanga and world views prior to conducting an evaluation. If they are not, their credibility may be challenged by Māori participants during the course of the evaluation. The integrity and safety of Māori participants and of evaluators (Māori or non-Māori alike) needs to be considered and assured.

- ‘Being Māori’ does not necessarily endow a researcher with tikanga and language skills, nor does it ensure a commitment to Māori progress and development. An understanding and application of these skills and qualities when conducting Māori research or evaluations involving Māori is essential.

- Ensure evaluators are familiar with conducting research with Māori individuals and collectives. They may require skills in both qualitative and quantitative methods and need to consider the implications of both for Māori. The researcher should be involved in every stage of the evaluation - from planning and implementation, to analysis and reporting. Ensure that Māori and non-Māori researchers are well informed, and supported in the environment in which they will be operating in. Evaluators may need to be:
  - briefed on specific iwi and hapū tikanga;
  - introduced to iwi and hapū representatives rather than just arriving on their own; and
• familiar with issues for iwi and hapū as well as issues for Māori.

• Ensure the evaluator can operate comfortably in Māori environments and has considered:
  ✦ the kawa of the marae and associated tikanga;
  ✦ the availability of kaumātua, kaikaranga, kaikōrero and other resources to support the formal proceedings and interviews;
  ✦ the implications of being waewae tapu (new to the marae); and
  ✦ a pōwhiri (welcome) which will have to be factored in.

• If the evaluation or research is with iwi and hapū then they may expect the project to be conducted by iwi or hapū members only or in partnership with the iwi or hapū. Sometimes the opposite occurs, where iwi and hapū affiliations make it more difficult for the researchers. Almost certainly, a validation process with the iwi or hapū concerned will be required.

Build relationships of trust

• Make time to develop relationships. There may be suspicion about the aims and objectives of research amongst Māori due to past experiences. This in turn may contribute to a low level of response. Therefore, it is important to clarify for participants the objectives of the evaluation, who will have access to evaluation results, ownership issues, and how the results may benefit Māori. This will assist to counter suspicion about the evaluation and quite possibly increase the response rate. It also gives a sense of inclusion in the evaluation process.

• Clarify the role and responsibilities as an evaluator, and the parameters of the evaluation. Stakeholders and participants need to understand that even positive evaluation outcomes may result in unfavorable policy decisions or minimal change.

• Invest in building a credible relationship. Credibility is gained by honesty and transparent communications, and meeting participants on their own terms. Evaluators need to be familiar with Māori contexts and willing to use those contexts to elicit information. For example, helping out in the kitchen at hui and contributing to skills development in the community.

• Be flexible. Respondents may be called away to a tangi, on whānau business, or cultural or sporting events. Likewise, pre-booked marae venues may not be available if a tangi occurs.

Thorough ‘desk’ research

• Undertake thorough desk research. A point to remember is that Government agencies often over-research Māori, causing respondent fatigue. Whilst robust information on Māori is important to evaluation, efforts need to be made to minimise the
collection of information already collected. Evaluators should first check existing research in the same area or topic rather than approach Māori communities and expect their participation and enthusiasm for a project.

- Avoid the selection of pilot sites that have already been researched, i.e. avoid ‘site fatigue’. For example, Porirua, Gisborne and Northland are sample sites which are often selected, despite their inclusion in numerous evaluation and research projects.

**Appropriate research design methods**

- Choose data collection methods that are appropriate for Māori, and be aware of the strengths and limitations of each method. Appropriate methods will vary according to the situation. However, face-to-face interviewing (individuals or groups) tend to be the preferred option for many researchers and Māori when conducting research with Māori. Interviewing can also be used to establish issues and concerns - this is an excellent first step in examining issues for Māori.

- Don’t discount using survey tools, which if properly planned and administered, may work just as well with Māori as non-Māori. However, be aware that:

  - some Māori households may be less likely to own a telephone than non-Māori, therefore a telephone survey may discount these groups, under-representing them in the sample.
  - Māori may also be less likely to complete a self-administered mail survey, and may have a higher rate of mobility which makes them more difficult to contact in follow-up surveys.
• Some designs are better than others depending on what is being evaluated. This calls for the evaluator to take account of Māori community dynamics. For example, random control trials may not be feasible where there are close relationships between members of the ‘control’ and ‘treatment’ groups. As a result, the evaluator risks ‘backlash’ from participants and the community as well as contamination of the sample. System approaches may produce more useful information about interactions and inter-dependencies, for example, the effect of the programme on the whole whānau system.

**Appropriate interviewers**

• Have an appropriate interviewer. It is essential to ensure trust is developed between the interviewer and the respondent. Ensure that Māori women are able to choose or are given the option of working with a female interviewer, and Māori men a male interviewer. This is particularly important for sensitive topics such as violence against women or reproduction issues.

• Respect Māori tikanga. Think carefully about the age and gender of the person interviewing. It may not to be appropriate for kuia or koroua to be interviewed by young interviewers, unless factors such as whānau ties and emotional relationships exist which may modify circumstances.

• Match age and gender where possible. Rangatahi (young people) may want to talk with people of their own age and gender. Be aware that 25 may be ‘old’ to a 16 year old.

• Promote the use of te reo Māori where possible. Efforts should be made to give respondents the choice of using Māori language. Māori interviewers may need to be trained and this should be built into the budget. Other considerations include:
  ♦ the appropriateness of having a native speaker interviewed by a speaker of Māori; and
  ♦ the presence of a kaumātua or kuia in the interview to accompany the interviewer. Are the interviewers able to identify themselves? (for example, introductions and pepeha).

• Attitude is everything in an interviewer. Personal characteristics such as being nice, friendly, polite, and not being pushy or intimidating are important qualities that should not be undervalued.

• Ensure that the interviewers have sufficient training to interview Māori respondents and can pronounce and spell Māori names - this is important to get right. Consider interviewer behavior. For example, a ‘Kia ora’ accompanied by inappropriate behavior (sitting on tables etc.) can put the integrity and credibility of an interviewer on the line.
• Be prepared to have whānau members at interviews as support people, to answer the questions or to query on behalf of the respondent. Invite them along.

Location

• The location of the research is an important issue. Appropriate locations will depend on the person being interviewed and the issue being investigated. Don’t assume marae are always appropriate venues to run interviews or focus groups for Māori. Some people feel more comfortable on marae than others.

Reliable and sufficient information

• Ensure that the evaluator can make sound or trustworthy inferences or analysis based on the quality of the data collection method. The choice of data collection method(s) must be satisfactory in terms of collecting reliable and sufficient information from Māori.

• Apply robust sampling methodologies at all times. Subsequent checks should be made to ensure the sample is representative. Inadequacies in the sampling results should be accurately reported.

• Seek advice if there is uncertainty over whether the evaluation is achieving a quality sample frame for Māori. A booster sample may be required. Booster samples are where more Māori are selected than are represented in the population. By interviewing or surveying more Māori (boosting the sample size) the analysis and reporting of issues for Māori should be possible.

• Recognise the sample size will vary for Māori sub-populations. If analysis by age, by location and for clients of specific services is required then this will have an impact on the sample construction. Small samples of Māori populations (less than a 100) are questionable and require specialist analysis. Options are available to reduce sampling errors for Māori. For example, targeting the existing sample to areas which contain a higher Māori population will inevitably increase the number of Māori in the sample. However, issues of respondent burden may then arise.

• Determine how reliable the quantitative data needs to be for Māori. The larger the sample size, the greater the level of confidence, as it is more representative of the total population. The reliability requirements will determine the types of questions being asked, the cost of obtaining the data, inclusion of a representative sample, and the impact of the research findings on clients. High degrees of statistical confidence may be costly to achieve, but may not be necessary for all evaluations. By using spreadsheets to run ‘what if’ scenarios, the impact of errors on various variables can be assessed in terms of the overall desired result. Another option is to take a broad indicative approach and to identify the general importance of various issues, and then
follow this with specifically targeted research, using larger samples, for critical areas.

- Consider response rates. Response rates can be lower for Māori. There are two types of non-responses: refusal and inability to make contact. In the Household Labour Force Survey (HLFS) survey run by Statistics New Zealand both the refusal and non-contact rates are higher for Māori than non-Māori. Since response rates can be lower for Māori it may be better to design for a smaller Māori sample and target this sample for a high response rate (known error) rather than have a large sample with a smaller response rate (unknown error). However, there are risks in having a small Māori sample such as the potential for significant refusal and non-contacts amongst Māori respondents.

- Ensure the sample frame is not under-representing Māori by surveying in towns and cities with relatively small Māori populations.

**Generate quality information**

- Generate quality information by asking questions which will provide answers to the evaluation objectives for Māori. This also means tailoring the questions to the audience (eg, don’t use bureaucratic language to a layperson) and getting an interviewer who can relate to Māori (this will vary according to the situation).

- Think about the order of the questions. Evaluations and programmes often talk about Māori being a priority or of strategic importance. However, when designing a questionnaire or interview schedule, the Māori questions are often placed at the end of a questionnaire. If the questions relating to Māori are last then this may affect the quality of information collected if the respondent has had to answer 20 other questions first.

- Assess whether the relevant people are being interviewed. Do not assume that Māori in leadership roles are the most important to interview, survey or consult during an evaluation. Ensure that Māori women and men from older and younger generations are adequately represented. Be aware that the extent of relevant information for Māori has to also be considered given the whole context of the evaluation. Relevant information may require gathering information on different groups of Māori affected by the programme, for example those who are disabled, sole parents on low incomes, older women, young men, and rural Māori.

- Pilot the data collection method with several Māori respondents first to establish if valid and sufficient information is being collected, to ensure the questionnaire flows and that information gaps are eliminated.

- Be cautious about making unfounded generalisations about the situation or the capabilities of Māori participants. For example, don’t assume that if Māori educational achievement is lower than
non-Māori clients on a particular programme, that Māori clients are for example, less literate than other clients or that Māori are less able to understand and debate complex issues and problems.

**Ethnicity classification**

- Recognise that classifications whether they be age, gender, ethnicity or religion are contentious. Te Puni Kōkiri periodically examines reactions to being asked about ethnicity in our own research and has received many contradictory responses. For example:
  - some HLFS Māori respondents wanted to put their iwi and hapū affiliation, some objected to New Zealand Māori and wanted just Māori, others had no problem with the ethnicity question while some wanted to be categorised as New Zealanders;
  - some Māori ACC clients were suspicious of the agency asking an ethnicity question and were worried they were going to be discriminated against. Others just hoped the information would help get more Māori staff employed by ACC;
  - Māori Income Support (now Work and Income New Zealand) clients were unconcerned about answering questions about ethnicity as they were asked what were considered far more personal and intrusive questions, for example, ‘Who is the father of your child?’; and
  - conversely, Income Support and ACC staff felt that clients didn’t like being asked the ethnicity question. What emerged was that some staff were more embarrassed about asking this question. Staff from these agencies were comfortable asking clients more personal questions around their relationship status.

- Be clear when asking the ethnicity question. Evaluators should be clear about what information is required and ensure that those interfacing with respondents are trained, comfortable and confident about eliciting the information they require.

- Always apply the Statistics New Zealand Principles for Māori data collection when collecting information. Statistics New Zealand has released *Monitoring Outcomes for Māori* which outlines the principles. The uniformity of definitions and data collection processes are essential for accurate data comparison. Also, the Government’s focus on gaps between Māori and non-Māori status means that information should be able to be analysed between Māori and non-Māori.

- Consider how to define Māori entities and groups such as households, Māori businesses, and Māori providers. Increasingly, a need has arisen to classify different Maori entities and groups. Agencies have tended to adopt their own approach to such
definitions as there are no standard definitions for collectives. However, Statistics New Zealand and Te Puni Kökiri are working with a number of agencies to progress such definitions. The Manager, Māori Statistics Unit, Statistics New Zealand is a useful contact for further advice and information.
Definitions

- Think carefully about definitions. For example, methods used to assign family codes can be difficult to apply to Māori households. Household and family classifications have some relevance to Māori, but household composition and extended family classifications are more relevant to Māori. Extended family classification comes closest to defining family groups on a whānau basis. However, not all Māori live in an extended family group so this has to be considered.

- Check if definitions are relevant to the Māori respondents. For example, the HLFS definition of work is relevant to Māori in the ‘labour force’, however it does not include certain types of unpaid work which are incorporated into the Māori concept of work. For example, voluntary marae or whānau work, Māori wardens etc. (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1996b).

- Understand that some definitions may offend. Discussions with Māori during research on the HLFS found that questions on qualifications suggest to Māori that Statistics New Zealand perceives qualifications to be an important aspect of work. However, Māori respondents believe that skills are also an important part of work. For example, there are high profile Māori with no formal qualifications but who have many skills that are essential to their work, including fluency in Māori language.

5.3 Common Gaps in Evaluation Design

Some common gaps are:

- Data collection methods that produce poor, incomplete or minimal information to evaluate the impact of programme or services for Māori.

- Assuming that the use of Māori interviewers equates to Māori involvement and participation in evaluation design. Far more inclusive approaches exist, such as developing research skills in Māori communities and employing Māori researchers as part of the evaluation team or to lead the evaluation.

- Having people on the evaluation team with expertise in Māori issues, but no experience in conducting evaluation with Māori.

- Selecting an evaluator (Māori or non-Māori) that lacks the necessary technical expertise, and the knowledge and familiarity with Māori issues to conduct an evaluation involving Māori.

- Selecting an evaluation design and sampling frame that will generate insufficient numbers of Māori respondents.
• Assuming that it is too difficult or costly to get a reasonable sample size for Māori without actually investigating the options.

• Assuming that it is more cost effective to evaluate without useful or reliable information on outcomes for Māori. Continuing to run programmes which may not be effective for Māori can incur very real costs. This money could be better used on more effective programmes for Māori.

• Evaluations that do not use the Statistics New Zealand Principles for Māori data collection, resulting in incomparable analysis of Māori and non-Māori when using official government statistics.

• Data collection methods that are not piloted with Māori participants in the programme or service and may result in invalid and unreliable information.

5.4 Evaluation Design Checklist

Evaluators when designing evaluations need to:

☐ Involve Māori as:
  - stakeholders (local level, participants etc)
  - researchers

☐ Select evaluators with the necessary cultural, language/reo, subject and research competencies

☐ Collect quality information on and from Māori by:
  - using high quality research designs for Māori
  - getting a representative sample for Māori
  - selecting appropriate interviewers
  - training interviewers to relate to Māori participants

☐ Collect data on Māori women and men

☐ Use appropriate data collection methods for Māori

☐ Use the Statistics New Zealand Principles for Māori data collection
6. Analysis of Information for Māori

At the analysis stage of an evaluation, the analysis of issues for Māori is often skinned over or overlooked completely. Many evaluation reports forwarded to Te Puni Kōkiri for comment contain either simple analysis focused on Māori participation on the programme, a limited analysis of outcomes for Māori, or no information on Māori outcomes at all. Sometimes the data on Māori is available but not presented and analysed. Evaluation reports that examine programmes specifically for Māori tend to contain a higher quality of analysis.

To be able to analyse issues for Māori, evaluators need to have considered Māori in the planning and design stages of their evaluation. Poor planning and design will inevitably result in a paucity of evaluation information from Māori. Alternatively, using a thorough process (with specific objectives and a suitable evaluation design) will ensure analysis for Māori is relatively simple to complete.

6.1 Critical Success Factors for Evaluation Analysis

1. Ensure Māori are involved in the analysis process as researchers, reference groups and/or stakeholders.

2. Ensure information about Māori in the evaluation is appropriately and systematically analysed so that the evaluation questions for Māori are answered and reported.

3. Examine other issues identified by Māori participants during the course of the evaluation.

‘Putting the pieces of the puzzle together for Māori’
6.2 Commentary on Evaluation Analysis

These critical success factors are expanded in more detail below.

Māori participation and involvement

- Validate the analysis by seeking Māori participation in the process. Māori participation does not stop at using Māori interviewers. Researchers (Māori and non-Māori) who have a thorough knowledge of Māori terms, concepts, philosophies, paradigms, and life experiences need to be involved in the analysis process. To do otherwise, is to risk making misjudgments, wrong assumptions or misunderstandings, and may result in creating or reinforcing inaccurate analyses.

- Give Māori stakeholders an opportunity to comment on the draft analysis. Māori stakeholders can verify whether the analysis is valid and appropriate, and thereby add substantial value to the analysis. Māori concepts and terms need to be used in an appropriate way or they could be open to misinterpretation and misuse. Māori stakeholders have the ability to critique the analysis in terms of Māori self-definitions and values.

- Treat Māori stakeholder comments with due respect. It is important that if Māori stakeholders take the time to comment, the analysis process takes account of their feedback and the analysis is modified accordingly. Failure to do so will result in Māori involvement being perceived as token or one way.

Systematically analyse the information

- Ensure analysis of issues for Māori compared with non-Māori occurs. Examine the differences between different groups of Māori. Māori should not be treated as an homogeneous group. Consider conducting a gender analysis as Māori women often have different participation rates, expectations and outcomes from other programme participants.

- Be systematic. Don’t limit analysis to describing patterns of participation. Examine the evaluation information on Māori to explain not only what is happening, but also why.
**Identify other issues for Māori**

- Recognise issues that fall outside the objectives of the evaluation. Sometimes issues arise which are external to the objectives of the evaluation, but are important to Māori respondents. It is important to give recognition to these issues in the analysis stage. For example, while the evaluation may have quite a narrow focus (e.g., the delivery of a specific programme), Māori participants will often see it as part of a wider provision of services by government. They may also see themselves not just as individual recipients, but part of wider communities including whānau, hapū and iwi. Such findings may have implications for future service delivery to Māori.

- Look for the broader perspectives and capture them in the analysis. Te Puni Kōkiri in its own service delivery research has found that to focus only on issues concerning agency service delivery gives half the story. For example, our research with Māori who had received ACC services found that Māori views were tied up with the wider impacts of health sector restructuring. Likewise, our service delivery research on the Department of Conservation could not just focus on the relationship between Māori and the department. Māori respondents kept on emphasising the wider Treaty settlement process. Our research had to take into account that for some Māori respondents their relationship was linked with the wider Treaty settlement process.

### 6.3 Common Gaps in Evaluation Analysis

Some common gaps are:

- Not collecting information from Māori. Without information it is difficult to draw conclusions about the programme’s effectiveness for Māori.

- Evaluations that collect information from Māori but don’t use it. For example, some evaluations specifically select pilot sites with high Māori populations and offer Māori interviewers, but fail to provide analysis of information related to Māori at the reporting stage.
• Evaluations that state ‘ethnicity’ information will be collected and therefore assume results for Māori will be able to be analysed. The resulting evaluation reports are almost always limited to a statistical profile of participation. By comparison, evaluations with specific objectives and clearly defined questions about Māori participation and outcomes produce far higher quality information.

• Evaluation reports that ‘describe’ the uptake of a programme by Māori but do not explain the relevance of uptake or patterns that have emerged from the evaluation, or outcomes achieved.

• Evaluation reports that make unfounded generalisations about the situation of Māori respondents and then misinterpret or misuse Māori concepts, paradigms and terms.

6.4 Analysis Checklist

Evaluators when conducting evaluation analysis need to:

- Involve Māori as:
  - stakeholders (local level, participants etc.)
  - researchers
- Undertake high quality information and data analysis for Māori
- Consider Māori diversity (differences in age, gender, education, and cultural experiences)
- Analyse data for Māori compared to non-Māori
- Recognise issues raised by Māori that fall outside the original objectives
- Look beyond patterns to try to explain what is happening for Māori and why?
- Understand and apply Māori concepts, paradigms, viewpoints and terms to the analysis
7. Report and Communicate Results

One of the functions of an evaluation is to report and communicate evaluation results to the organisation or stakeholders. Evaluation results for Māori should be included in the executive summary as well as in the main findings. Too often, results for Maori are relegated to the report’s appendices or to the very back of the report’s findings.

Agencies need to make greater efforts to better communicate results and findings to Māori. With effective communication and reporting practices evaluators can facilitate learning for Māori individuals, groups, teams and organisations. This can be easily addressed by planning at the initial stages how the results will be used and communicated to Māori.

7.1 Critical Success Factors for Reporting and Communicating

1. Report the reliability and sufficiency of the data and conclusions for Māori.

2. Demonstrate the links between data, conclusions and recommendations for Māori.

3. Communicate the findings effectively for Māori to key audiences (for example, face to face where possible or providing a summary sheet).

4. Communicate evaluation results in a way which encourages follow-through by stakeholders and encourages the improvement of services for Māori.

‘Hit the target - Report and communicate results from Māori’
7.2 Commentary on Evaluation Reporting and Communicating

These critical success factors are expanded in more detail below.

**Reliability and sufficiency of the data**

- Report the reliability and sufficiency of the information collected from Māori. In evaluation reports it is often difficult to establish how reliable or sufficient the information is. Evaluators need to ensure they detail the *processes* they used. This may include, for example:

  - research objectives;
  - methodology;
  - underlying assumptions;
  - calculations used;
  - interpretations and inferences; and
  - conclusions drawn from the results of their analyses.

- Report the potential weaknesses of qualitative data. For example, if only Māori providers were talked to, then report this as a limitation, and consider the implications of only talking to this client group when conclusions and findings are being formulated.

- Report the potential weaknesses of the quantitative data in the design or data analysis, and describe any implications on the interpretations and conclusions. Present the statistical significance when reporting data on Māori. Consider the impact of statistical errors on the evaluation results and conclusions.

**Validity of conclusions**

- Check the evaluators’ interpretation of the data with Māori as a validation process. Involvement by Māori can verify whether the recommendations are valid, viable and appropriate, and thereby add substantial value to the end evaluation. This can be done by:

  - checking the report with Māori participants of the evaluation;
  - involving Māori researchers who have a thorough knowledge of Māori terms, concepts, philosophies, paradigms, and life experiences; and
ensuring Māori stakeholders comment on the final report and recommendations.

**Link the data, findings, conclusions and recommendations**

- Clarify the connection between the data, the evaluation findings and conclusions for Māori. This is essential for audience understanding, report credibility and application. Evaluation reports should clearly describe the *purpose* of the evaluation, for example:
  - what was evaluated;
  - how the evaluation was conducted for Māori;
  - information obtained from Māori;
  - conclusions drawn; and
  - recommendations made.

- Be up-front about the results for Māori. Locating evaluation findings on Māori at the end of a report, or buried deep within it, gives the reader the impression that the results for Māori are not important. The report should demonstrate that the evaluation objectives for Māori have been answered.

- Ensure that conclusions are based on the information collected from Māori and the involvement of Māori stakeholders in the evaluation. Sometimes conclusions for Maori appear to have no connection with the information collected from Maori, which contributes to further distrust of research amongst Maori.

- Directly relate recommendations to the conclusions presented in the evaluation report. If the conclusions and recommendations are not drawn from the analysis of information collected, then their accuracy and reliability is highly questionable and likely to be challenged.

**Communicate findings to key audiences**

- Communicate the findings of an evaluation to hapū, iwi and Māori. It is important to keep in mind that whoever the audience is, what they receive must be meaningful and useful to stakeholders, and in a language which can be accessed by the majority.
• Start with simple communication methods. Appropriate methods to communicate evaluation results may include:
  ♦ letters to participants informing them of results; and
  ♦ meeting with Māori participants, Māori communities and Māori providers at hui or meetings.

Face to face is usually a preferred medium versus paper-based feedback. However, this depends on the logistics of this, and the resources available.

• Share results with Māori. Part of Māori cynicism about research in general is that they have had neither feedback at the conclusion of research, nor seen any improvements in either their own or others’ situations. In research on the HLFS, Māori respondents talked of having their goodwill abused by research in general, and that they were consequently more weary and less likely to participate in future research (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1996b).

• Try to share results with Māori in a timely manner. It is less than ideal to report back to Māori participants and stakeholders 2-3 years after an evaluation has started especially when officials and Ministers have been informed far earlier.

• Think about the timing of communications in terms of budget processes (central government) and funding rounds (local providers). It’s not ideal having evaluation results available well after funding decisions have been made.

Follow-through and improvement of services for Māori

• Encourage follow-through. Evaluation reports which are ‘filed’ in in-trays are not going to encourage follow through by stakeholders. Evaluators should encourage agencies to make their evaluation reports available to stakeholders and present findings in such a way that encourages greater follow through. What was the purpose of the evaluation if not to gauge progress and effect change?

• Present findings in a way which acknowledges Māori as a discrete client group. The Government’s focus on improving the social and economic status of Māori makes results more usable if an evaluation is able to report on findings particular to Māori. Comparisons with non-Māori participants are also useful to monitor progress for Māori.

7.3 Common Gaps in Evaluation Reporting and Communicating

Some common gaps are:
• Reports that do not provide an analysis of outcomes for Māori when Māori are a significant proportion of, or target group of the programme.

• Reports that include Māori evaluation information as an appended attachment as opposed to an integral part of the evaluation report.

• Reports that state the “Figures for Māori need to be treated with caution due to high sample errors”, when the sample errors are not actually calculated or reported.

• Evaluations that fail to make recommendations for Māori affected by the programme and policy. Programme and policy makers are meant to be able to take action or at the very least be informed by the evaluation.

• Evaluations that are reported to Māori stakeholders years after the evaluation has been completed. Delays in reporting evaluation information on Māori, after the main evaluation results have been reported, makes evaluations appear token especially when many of the recommendations and decisions have already been made.
7.4 Reporting and Communicating Checklist

Evaluator when reporting and communicating evaluation results need to:

- Consider Māori diversity (age, gender etc.)
- Highlight Māori viewpoints and the diverse needs of Māori
- Present results which are significant for Māori
- Validate the evaluation results with Māori (as participants, researchers, and stakeholders)
- Report the results and findings of the evaluation for Māori
- Ensure well-structured and concise reporting
- Report results back to Māori
- Distribute evaluation results in a timely way
- Feed results into policy and improvements to service delivery for Māori.
8. References to Read

The references listed below have been the source for many of the points made in these guidelines.

8.1 If you want to know more about Māori research and ethics


8.2 **If you want some simple evaluation handbooks and research guides**


8.3 If you want some useful frameworks


8.4 If you want to access Te Puni Kökiri publications


### 8.5 Other Publications
