plenet
public legal education network

Public legal education

Improving lives, empowering communities

Researching and evaluating public legal education: principles and practice

Contents

Part One
Evaluating public legal education:
what it's about, where we are now, and where we want to get to 2

PLE in context 2
Evaluation of social actions 2
Project evaluation in more detail 3
Shaping PLE project evaluation 4
How most PLE evaluation proceeds now 6
PLE evaluation today 7
Next steps 8
And finally... 10

Part Two
A practical framework for evaluating public legal education projects 11

A guide to PLE evaluation – key issues 12

1.1 The benefits of good PLE evaluation 12
1.2 What is specific to evaluating PLE outcomes/impact? 12
1.3 Practical pointers when planning PLE evaluation 13
1.4 How Plenet will support the development of PLE evaluation 14
1.5 Plenet's broad approach to PLE evaluation 14

Designing a PLE evaluation 15

Step 1 – Plan the evaluation as a team effort 15
Step 2 – Write an overview of the evaluation planning process for the project 16
Specify who the evaluation will engage with – audiences/users and others 17
Devising indicators of success 18
How to attribute changes to project activity 19
How to devise the evaluation methods to be used 20
How to develop evaluation indicators 21
Identify and deal with common difficulties 22
What to avoid 23
Some evaluation tools 24

Appendix 1 25

Research and knowledge issues of relevance to PLE evaluation: key points 25

Appendix 2 26

Examples of evaluation tools 26

Footnotes 28

Part One
Evaluating public legal education: what it's about, where we are now, and where we want to get to

PLE in context

Public legal education (PLE) is now in a positive phase of development in this country. To further facilitate the growth of PLE, Plenet is looking to government to ensure that all possible actions are taken to improve people's abilities to deal with their day-to-day lives, as well as helping them deal more effectively with problems. Early decision-making and earlier resolution of problems are now key to legal services policy, not least because costs can be in part attributed to delay. And government commitment to better health and to better financial health give good cause for expecting a similar commitment to better legal capability in the future.

There is now good evidence[1] to show that an inability to deal with legal issues is associated with both social disadvantage and lack of knowledge – in short, the poorest people get the worst deal. And so PLE, with its emphasis on building confidence and skills as well as knowledge, chimes too with the government's anti-poverty programmes.[2]

Among many legal advisers there has been, over the years, a strong sense that empowering the public is an essential part of the task of making advice-giving more effective, of securing what has been known for some years as 'access to justice'.[3] Among educators there is now a body of experience of the value of promoting legal capability,[4] both as a tool for the improvement of the lives of communities, and for growing a more effective cadre of professionals for the future.

In its 2007 report, *Developing capable citizens: the role of public legal education*,[5] the PLEAS Task Force identified a number of obstacles to the growth of PLE. One of these was the failure to develop the good practices essential to providing good quality PLE:

> *PLE providers have not been able to develop good practice and use it to raise the overall quality of PLE initiatives across the board. The main reason for this is that there has been so little of the systematic evaluation of PLE initiatives essential to the identification of good practice. Evaluations of PLE are found only in some better-resourced initiatives[22] but are rarely known about or drawn on by other practitioners.*[6]

Evaluation of social actions

The literature on evaluation is very substantial, and evaluation may take many forms and operate with many different approaches and methodologies, often using complex models. Evaluation may also be specific to often complex areas of knowledge – for example, economic development, education, the natural sciences, social sciences, health – each of which has its own body of knowledge, practices and values.

We do not propose in this paper to explore even the smallest part of this wider world of evaluation. Instead, at this stage in the development of PLE, what is most needed is a focus on project, programme, (and perhaps) policy evaluation. This is typically described as *managerialist* in its approach: asking questions about, and measuring, outputs, outcomes and impact around the goals of a project. How this works in practice is discussed in more detail later in this paper.

This approach is not because we have no interest in theory-based evaluation for PLE, or in developing research-based knowledge of PLE and how it operates to create 'legally capable' individuals and communities. Rather, we believe that developing an evidence base for what PLE can achieve through 'good practice' is by far the most the pressing goal for our work now. And we do want this managerialist approach to borrow from other broader evaluation concerns as and when it seems useful.

Today's 'narrow' focus will not therefore totally preclude learning from different kinds of research into PLE, and theories of PLE and theory-based development of knowledge about PLE will certainly have an important role to play in its growth in practice. Plenet is committed to ensuring that as research into PLE and new PLE practices develop, we reflect on, and factor in, all new findings from that research and those practices. In this general 'model', development will be in the form of a series of loops. We are not turning our backs on knowledge about PLE, or fixing the development of PLE in a managerialist mode of evaluation for all time.

For those who are interested to read more there are many accessible texts on social project evaluation available on the internet. The websites of the Charities Evaluation Services and the Evaluation Trust both offer clear explanations of simple evaluation.[7] Later, we will discuss and illustrate managerial evaluation with examples from recent projects.

One further point. The wider literature on evaluation reveals not only the potential complexity of evaluation practices, but also the difficulties that evaluation language can bring. Of course, some evaluation is distinctly technical, and as we have already described, requires detailed knowledge from specific disciplines. But whatever the challenges, our commitment is to support the development of good evaluation using, as far as possible, the simplest language. Where we do think it is useful to suggest the value of any 'technical' terms, we will explain why we think it useful to adopt such terms, and what their value is for evaluation development.

Project evaluation in more detail

We want now to turn to programme and project evaluation. We can see in the literature on project evaluation that there is a broadly shared core of definitions that describe the elements of good evaluation. Although there are some variations in terminology, the four pillars of project evaluation are, broadly speaking, monitoring, process evaluation, cost-benefit assessments, and impact evaluation.[8] Some accounts separate monitoring from evaluation, others merge process and monitoring together. But these four elements are always likely to be present in an all-round evaluation.[9]

Each of the four is in some ways distinct from the others. For example, monitoring looks at whether a project is being implemented as it was intended and ensures feedback and adjustments across the life of the project. Process evaluation focuses on problems in the delivery of the product or service – is it doing what it says on the tin? Value-for-money evaluations assess project costs/benefits, including (ideally) the costs of alternative uses of the same resources. Finally, impact evaluation looks at the effects on its target audiences, and whether these effects can be attributed to the project's activities. At its best, impact evaluation also explores unintended consequences, whether positive or negative, on audiences.

We also want to flag up the importance of developing project evaluation as both a practical and a knowledge process. Although this is discussed in more detail later, here we want only to make the broad point that to effectively evaluate, it is essential to understand what we are examining, why, and how. Good evaluation is much more than a mechanical process, and planning an evaluation only as a series of practical tasks will not produce the good results we are hoping for. To get it right, we have to ensure that an entire process is followed from start to finish: from project goals to evaluation goals; from those to the propositions we want to test and to the indicators we will use to test them; and finally to the methods that will collect the data we need to do the evaluation.

Project evaluation needs to be convincing – to ourselves, to policy makers, to funders, and to other practitioners. It needs to be rigorous. And if we are to advance the cause of PLE, it needs to be rigorous not only for public effect, but so that it can be understood and used by others – adopted, modified or developed – to sustain the circle of good practice development which will bring the most benefit to PLE in its current phase of growth. And good practice is practice for whose success there is good *evidence* – that other pillar of the assured growth of PLE over the next few years.

Managerialist programme evaluation itself is not necessarily simple. It has its own categories and divisions into 'types', and we will need to think through the relevance of these to PLE evaluation. In the literature we find, for example, 'formative' and 'summative' evaluation, plus 'participatory', 'collaborative' and 'empowerment' evaluation. At this stage it seems certain that good PLE evaluation is likely to benefit from more than a single 'type' of project evaluation.

Project evaluation is often a matter of forced choices. In a few cases, a project may hire external evaluators right at the start, and leave the thinking through of all of these issues to them. With huge budgets, this may be both valid and do-able. But more often than not – in the 'real world' – it will be a choice of what to do oneself, what one can afford, what to get advice and support on, when to commission, and so on. We return to these issues below.

Shaping PLE project evaluation

What then is specific about *PLE* project evaluation? The PLEAS report touched on the particular difficulties that evaluation of PLE initiatives present:[10] PLE is about creating 'legal capability', and so is about effecting changes in attitudes, confidence, and behaviours. Changes in any or all of these are famously difficult to assess, and perhaps even more difficult to attribute to a specific programme or project. In tackling the task of developing better PLE evaluation, we are taking on the difficult issues both of *measuring* outcomes that are about social and personal changes – and of *attributing* these to project activities. In other words, ascribing *impact*.

Measurement of social changes, whether for individuals or groups, requires some reflection. The literature on social and personal change stretches back over a century and reveals very different assumptions about what 'social reality' is and so how it can be studied. Although they tend to be very much a minority, post-structuralist, postmodernist, and other 'sceptical' evaluators, adhere to understandings of 'reality' which, if applied to programme evaluation, would lead to very different approaches and findings.

'Managerialist' evaluation tends to assume what is known as a 'critical realist' perspective – the assumption that 'reality' can be examined and conclusions drawn about it in a fairly straightforward way. *External study* by people separated from a project or programme itself is seen as most likely to produce the most reliable results – '*objective*' results.

What might these 'alternatives' to 'objectivity' be? And are there likely to be alternatives which are suited to PLE evaluation? As a general rule, 'sceptical' evaluators will assess from a range of perspectives, and will try to construct their evaluation by developing an 'account' (discourse, narrative) of the project from each perspective they can identify as necessary. This approach is more than ensuring that different outcomes may be sought by different 'stakeholders' with different goals: there is also a core assumption that there is no 'objective' truth waiting to be 'discovered'.

We don't propose to say any more about this here – it is a complex subject that is better tackled separately. Whilst summary descriptions of post-structuralism and postmodernism can be found in, for example, Wikipedia, the (far more interesting and relevant) texts on *post-modern (etc.) evaluation* are available only in subscription journals. Appendix 1 describes briefly Plenet's intention to offer more on broader issues of theory and evaluation, and we hope in the near future to prepare a paper on *approaches to evaluation* that will provide an overview, with examples, of the practical implications for evaluation of these (and other) distinct social theories.

For PLE, it seems likely that much evaluation will adopt a managerialist approach, but we do also anticipate a need to borrow from other perspectives at times. And in developing different supports for PLE evaluation, Plenet aims to offer guidance that will enable practitioners and managers to understand how such 'theoretical' issues can influence the decisions they will need to make in planning an evaluation.

PLE is also distinguished by its application to a variety of practices and subjects, giving it much to 'borrow' (or perhaps we should say 'learn') from other sectors and other disciplines. Acquiring 'legal capability' involves for example processes of learning, around which there is already a substantial amount of knowledge of both how to do it and how to evaluate it.[11] Some of these will be transferable to PLE evaluation. Similarly, notions of 'identity' (legal identity?) and the place of these in 'capability' may well play a part in PLE development and so offer a focus for measurable changes. For example, poor self-image for disadvantaged people is likely to contribute to their difficulties, and making changes to their poor self-image may be part of the effort made in PLE projects. Evaluation can then test changes in self-esteem – a well documented practice from education and psychology – and learn from the results of those tests.[12]

Similarly, information disciplines offer understandings of how knowledge is absorbed and used from different kinds of information delivered through different media – knowledge that will potentially inform PLE evaluators about possible indicators for evaluation of information-based PLE projects. Perhaps more broadly, knowledge of behaviours and how these may change will tell us a lot about how to shape PLE projects for maximum impact. Such knowledge may reside in marketing, psychology, economics, sociology or many other places. Creating a body of knowledge around PLE will, over time, allow the harnessing of more reliable indicators of effectiveness to PLE project evaluation.

The Task Force itself looked in the main to the research into the nature of indebtedness undertaken by the Personal Finance Research Centre for the Financial Services Authority for its best fit model. This research proposed 'domains' of knowledge and behaviour within which financial capability can be understood, giving potentially a much more predictive understanding of how people in debt can move out of it. Evaluation of change can be framed and evaluated within these domains. We do not yet have 'domains' for legal capability, but it may be that we will make good progress towards such useful notions in the coming year. Work on such broader, more academic/theoretical issues requires a parallel stream of PLE development.

A further aspect of the intertwining of PLE with other disciplines is evident when we see how PLE is often only one element in a project whose goals are not expressed in 'PLE terms' but are about a specific social goal towards which PLE can offer some movement. PLE evaluators are therefore likely to be faced with the practical issue of how to assess the effects of the PLE 'strands' of a project in terms of the project's own goals. This is discussed later in this paper.

The current underdevelopment of PLE means that any potential for larger scale changes in the wake of more substantial initiatives lies in the future. Demographic changes are achievable and detectable only when major efforts have been made to influence large numbers of people. We cannot yet grasp what a legally capable population would look like, and as with theories of evaluation, so our perspective and stance on society will condition how we see this future phenomenon. Might it mean, for example a population of 'confident consumers' in a market legal 'economy'? Or might we, when better informed, engage more widely and willingly, and start a process of democratised change to the institutions of the state and its core legal systems and practices – a radical shift? In the same vein, we can speculate about what a legally capable individual might look like.

And so we are not at all looking at a blank slate for PLE evaluation. Nor will we be borrowing only evaluation techniques. We can learn from other initiatives with similar goals about their entire approach, which will of course include evaluation, but also much more: health campaigns, financial capability initiatives, legal advice projects and so on.

How most PLE evaluation proceeds now

In practice, an evaluation plan will consist of a series of proposals for the evaluation of each project activity or delivery method. The combined evaluations will together make up the results of the overall evaluation plan. In devising a plan, it will be necessary to identify each activity clearly, together with its goals and how these relate each to the other. This will require a good deal of thought. Once these have been elaborated as distinct activities or products, we can then assess the relations between their goals and develop an overview of evaluation goals.

However, here we come across a common difficulty for much social evaluation, including PLE evaluation. Rather than assessing project activities as a route to an overall evaluation plan, the evaluation often proceeds instead on the basis of each specific project activity, without the essential reflection on the overall process and its goals.

Most real projects will be seeking to deliver their products using more than one method. But even when there is only a single delivery method, there is a tendency to base evaluation planning decisions primarily on the delivery methods used. A match is typically sought between project delivery methods and evaluation methods. If there is more than a single delivery method, then the overall evaluation will be a combination of all of these 'matched' methods. This produces two problems. First, the evaluations undertaken may not complement one another. Second, without a sound basis in the project goals, evaluation goals, and the indicators of success that should guide an evaluation, it may be more difficult to interpret the success of the project through the evaluation findings.

For example, when a delivery method is training, or another type of interactive session, where feedback sheets or feedback discussions at the end of the sessions are chosen as the method or tool. Similarly, if users download information from a website, then the choice may be a combination of a web-based survey, followed by interviews with a selection of users later on. Of course, all of these are valid methods of evaluation, and may yield good results. But the chances of getting good evaluation results will be much improved if evaluation planning decisions are made on the basis of the 'goals-indicators-methods' model we have outlined in this paper.

By focusing on products, we risk sidelining the goals of the project. If the product is a training course, a pamphlet, or a new website, there seems to be an almost irresistible temptation primarily to evaluate users' opinions of the 'quality' of the product. Now there's nothing wrong with assessing users' views – it's an essential part of evaluation. But for PLE, what we need to know is what *effects* it has had on users – and this is a more difficult, but in the end, more rewarding, goal to pursue. Knowing user views on the project product will perhaps tell us a little about whether we have helped them to move closer to 'legal capability' – but only a very little. The formula 'assessment of user views = assessment of improved legal capability' is simply not valid. And so, as PLE evaluation develops, we will be devising and testing more reliable and affordable ways to evaluate progress towards legal capability.

It is also common for organisations to be obliged to 'monitor and evaluate' by their funders, or by higher agencies who control their activities and funds. For example, government departments and agencies are typically tasked with providing evidence of the quality, effectiveness, and value-for-money of what they do. Similarly, third sector agencies are more-or-less always required by their funders to submit reports on performance and cost, often needing to make great efforts to do this.

It does seem understandable that the 'purposes' that any organisation brings to its evaluation activities can be readily constrained by these realities. Plenet is naturally supportive of the need to work with the requirements of funders and others to ensure maximum use of already existing data for PLE evaluation: there is no special merit in re-inventing anything or doing it twice. But to work only to funder and other constraints can easily produce results that are not good PLE evaluation.

A prime example is the more or less universal requirement to 'consult users' – a very desirable and essential commitment that somehow becomes a goal rather than a means to an end. When it does become a goal, user consultation can easily lend itself to substituting feedback exercises for good evaluation, at least where PLE is concerned. Leaflet production, already highlighted, is a very good example.

PLE evaluation today

Before we go on to suggest what should be done next in PLE evaluation, we want to review where it is now. We need to take a brief look at current practice in PLE evaluation. A good starting point will be the results of the PLEAS Task Force's own investigations. This is not to imply, however, that PLE evaluation began with the Task Force, or indeed with Plenet – rather, we are committed to building on what has gone before.

The Task Force's view was that the limited amount of PLE evaluation undertaken has, to date, been primarily about monitoring and process evaluation, with some output quantification, and the routine use of user/audience feedback in projects. The Task Force also found a *commitment to evaluation* among PLE practitioners, even if resources have to date been quite limited.

The picture looks very similar today, as shown by the examples set out below. PLE projects are most likely to monitor 'outputs' – how many of something was undertaken, delivered or achieved – combined with some assessment of user views, either through 'feedback' at the time of the delivery of the programme (at the end of a 'session') or later though user and intermediary interviews and discussions.

The examples we describe briefly here are familiar to Plenet – and we expect that such evaluations have been replicated by others many times. It may also be that there are other PLE projects which Plenet is not familiar with, fortunate enough to be able to fund more substantial evaluations. We hope that where this is so, they will make contact with Plenet and share their experiences with the network.

Advicenow evaluates its 'self-management' guides – available on the Advicenow website[13] and via the Legal Services Commission's Community Legal Advice website – through monitoring of signpostings, page views, and downloads, and in several cases through feedback interviews with users and intermediaries involved in the issues dealt with in the guides.[14]

The Citizenship Foundation has recently produced an evaluation of its guide for young asylum seekers and refugees[15] which used feedback questionnaires and focus groups for both users and support workers/teachers, and individual (follow-up) interviews with the support workers/teachers.

The *Possession Prevention Project*, which is discussed in some detail in the next section, used a similar cluster of evaluation methods: training session feedback forms, (follow-up) questionnaires to trainees, a feedback from for the PPP conference, at least one interview with a key intermediary.[16]

Streetlaw at the College of Law evaluates the responses of both students and the users of the legal 'sessions' delivered, through feedback forms/questionnaires. A key feature of this evaluation is the emphasis placed on the benefits to students, the College, and to communities as a shared experience. As a result, evaluation of student responses is as important as evaluation of user responses, and development of the programmes is dependent on both.[17]

The practitioners quoted here comment on practical difficulties such as response rates to questionnaires and securing enough participants for interviews and group discussions: difficulties familiar to all evaluators, and which do need to be addressed in the practical planning of evaluations in the future.

The picture in other jurisdictions is more varied, and we find some examples of more elaborated evaluations in several countries. For example some US Streetlaw evaluation has sought to test impact with 'before' and 'after' assessments:

> *"The evaluation of the Save our Streets program was designed to assess the program's effectiveness by comparing youth knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviours before and after the program participation"*[18]

In general Streetlaw in the United States is very positive about evaluation:

> *"Street Law, Inc. recognizes the value of program evaluations. Evaluations are a valuable learning tool that help the organization measure its achievement of program objectives and understand and improve the effectiveness of its work. At every Street Law training, participants complete surveys rating the sessions, offer comments on what did and did not work, and suggest improvements for future trainings. Whenever possible, Street Law utilizes the professional help of outside experts to conduct evaluations".*[19]

In Australia, a New South Wales guide to community legal education also envisages before and after techniques:

> *"Community legal education may be constantly evaluated. Every opportunity may be taken to gather information, either anecdotal or data-based, about effectiveness. Document what you hear. Do not underestimate its value. Design the evaluation at the beginning of the community legal education process. Select the indicators of success and work out the different ways in which information can be gathered, and from whom, or where.*
>
> *The timing for gathering may be:*
>
> - *before the community legal education, for comparison at a later point during, or immediately after, the community legal education to give you some early indicators of success*
> - *sometime after the event to provide an indication as to whether people's behaviour has changed over time in the way that they wanted."*[20]

Next steps

How might we think about the next steps in developing PLE evaluation? If we are starting from a position where the primary focus of evaluation has been how well a project has been able to deliver its outputs, with some user feedback, where do we need to go now, to build on that base?

We believe that the route that PLE evaluation must now take can be mapped out by acknowledging and drawing on four key issues. First, PLE evaluation must try to get to grips with how the different strands of a project – and the PLE strands in particular – will contribute to its goals. Second, PLE evaluation must seek to be replicable and generalisable (if such a term exists!) so that each evaluation can learn from its predecessors. This may sound simple, but in practice it needs a good deal of creative thinking, if seemingly disparate goals and techniques are to be of benefit to one another. Third, PLE evaluators must avoid the temptation to start from scratch: we can and will need to 'borrow' from others for everything, from entire evaluation 'models' to specific evaluation techniques. And finally, we must acknowledge and put into practice the vital role of the user or audience and the practical contexts in which our project will interact with them when we design the evaluation.

A project with a *single clearly measurable goal* will inevitably make accurately assessing the extent to which the project goal has been achieved its primary aim. A prime example of a specific and measurable PLE goal is to be found in the Possession Prevention Project,[21] whose aim was to reduce the rate at which social housing tenants were evicted for rent arrears. Success for PPP was defined first of all in terms of that primary goal, and as the eviction rate fell, there is a broad sense that the project reached its goal. This success makes PPP a valuable model that can be *replicated* elsewhere, with continuing evaluation and refinement, to eventually offer help to all tenants and all mortgagees who have difficulties with payment, across the country. Plenet is hopeful that government will see the huge value of this approach, and join with us and our partners to make it happen.

What is not, however, assessed by the bare statistic of a reduction in evictions, is the contribution played in this success by the different components of the project – one of which was PLE. It would be right to say that for PPP this really did not matter. But to refine and extend PPP, we do need to know which factors contributed in which proportions to the reduction in evictions, even though we make the *reasonable assumption* that the combination of factors in the project was its strength. And in replicating PPP elsewhere, it will be opportune to establish a more substantial model with a detailed evaluation plan attached.

At the end of the next phase of such a development, we would know much more about how to shape the PLE elements than we did before. However, a note of caution must also be sounded here. It is possible that developing such models will prove too difficult, both in terms of concept development, and in terms of measurement. At this stage, this is indeed quite likely, and we should be cautious about feeling that we have failed in some way because it proved too difficult.

How might PLE work with less obviously measurable PLE outputs, and how might the success of PPP help to shape such a project? Take, for example, the goal of reducing knife crime. Let us assume that there is a PLE role here – say, in the sort of work done by the Galleries of Justice, the Bar Council, or the Citizenship Foundation. Assuming we think that reduction in knife crime is a good focus for PLE (as one part of a combined approach), how will we know what to suggest in the way of PLE elements to a programme?

If we look at PPP, we can, for instance, see that the PLE elements of PPP had three audiences: community agencies; local authority housing staff; and tenants. Changes made in the knowledge and abilities of all three groups seem to have been important. If we assume that we can propose that ‘engaging with all of the key players’ is a useful approach, we can begin by asking not ‘what should we do?’ but ‘who are these people?’ – in the world of knife crime. Of course, we don’t know that – but we could find out. Who might the groups be? Gangs with knives? Families of gang members? Neighbours of gangs? Teachers? Police? Local authority park keepers? Clearly, approaching one group only will be much weaker than a multi-group approach. There will also be many people who will have a good idea of who to work with. Indeed, might an injection of concerted PLE into, say, Crime and Safety Partnerships, be a good starting point?

More specifically, once we start to look into such matters for specific PLE projects, we may find that there are already existing tools for evaluation of some aspects of the project’s goals. We touched on this in general terms earlier. One very obvious example lies in individuals’ abilities to read and understand texts. Reading skills can be assessed for PLE using readily available schemas, and ‘before and after’ techniques to assess changes. Similarly, comprehension can be tested using ‘before and after’ so that the degree of enhanced ‘legal capability’ can be assessed.

It may be something of a stretch to borrow wholesale from other disciplines to examine potential behaviour changes, but it should be relatively easy to transfer techniques used to assess say, measurement of changes in heath-promoting behaviour, and apply these to the measurement of legal capability. Of course, studies of behaviour change over time are likely to be prohibitively expensive, and so more than likely outside of the scope of current PLE evaluation possibilities.

One last point. The audiences or users of PLE projects are a key factor in PLE evaluation. The importance of being clear about user/audience is a key point made in the PLEAS Report.[22] We know that different users/audiences will benefit from different delivery techniques as well as having different needs. Indeed, even perhaps where needs are the same, different groups will benefit from different delivery methods: for example, Advicenow's podcasts on topics around its guidance to appellants to DLA Appeal Tribunals[23] is aimed perhaps at its more internet-capable users.

What this suggests is that the techniques selected to engage with particular users targeted by PLE projects are also crucial to the character of an evaluation. Techniques should as far as possible be driven by user needs, capacities, and their 'situation'. So, the key question is not only 'what do we want to transmit?' but also 'how might they best receive it?' Every social interaction occurs from a number of angles, and PLE evaluation will need to identify and knit together the patterns within which the project operates to identify the 'crossover' points at which interactions with audiences might permit evaluation activities to take place. Such decisions are made as part of the building of the project.

Audiences and users, like anyone else, are unlikely to have readily honed and tuned up insights to offer about their increased legal capability and the role a PLE project has played in that. If changes have occurred, insights into their nature and causes will most often need to be teased out with some care. The best way to achieve this is to use collaborative, participatory and generally interactive evaluation methods.

And finally...

To grow in its current phase, PLE needs to demonstrate its value as a tool for helping to achieve outcomes that originate in other work or concerns. What we mean by this is that we are not trying in this phase to create 'pure' PLE projects unrelated to other social agendas. For example, we will not be seeking to identify particular groups that need to know more or do more about some aspect of legal capability, but rather we will ask how PLE can contribute to, say, reducing the difficulties experienced by young homeless people, or helping new arrivals to the UK to find their way around in our society. PLE evaluation goals will form only one part of the goals of wider projects.

As we have already argued, evaluating PLE is about social and personal changes, and outcomes measurement is both costly and elusive. But there is perhaps a more important characteristic of PLE that turns evaluation in a particular direction – its focus on the relationship between knowledge and changes in behaviour, underpinning which is the assumption that individuals will react differently to different actions. The dynamics of this characteristic mean that evaluation cannot rely only on passive contributions from audiences/users, but needs to engage much more actively with them to understand what has changed for them and how.

Plenet is committed to developing evaluation tools that are useable and affordable. Outcomes evaluation can be costly, and resources to fund PLE evaluation are often limited. Furthermore, small-scale evaluations – the most affordable kind – are notoriously dismissed as 'unrepresentative'. Plenet will bear both of these factors in mind in its future development work. By testing the products as they develop, we can ensure that we do not create evaluation tools that are neither useable nor affordable.

In the second paper in this series *An initial practical framework for evaluating PLE projects,* we set out the key principles and actions required to design the best possible evaluation models within resources available. This is very much a work in progress, and will benefit from being picked up, used and critiqued by as many Plenet members as possible.

Part Two
A practical framework for evaluating public legal education projects

This paper sketches out the beginnings of an approach to public legal education (PLE) evaluation. It draws on three sources:

- general approaches to PLE project evaluation
- the specific character of PLE, and
- the development needs of PLE now

There are two parts to the paper:

A guide to PLE evaluation – key issues is a guide to the benefits of PLE evaluation, the specific character of PLE and the development of needs of PLE

Designing a PLE evaluation outlines the steps needed to design an evaluation

A guide to PLE evaluation – key issues

1.1 The benefits of good PLE evaluation

- Developing new good quality evaluation for PLE contributes to the sustained development of PLE by adding both to the experience of successes, and to our knowledge of both good practice and of what to avoid
- If evaluation development is shared across the PLE network, everyone will learn from it and the network will be strengthened
- More evaluated PLE projects will enable us to develop both new good practices and new knowledge about PLE
- Good evaluation can demonstrate success, and successful projects provide evidence of what PLE can achieve and how
- Adding to the numbers of successful PLE projects will help to promote a culture of success around PLE

Successful PLE

- will demonstrate its the value as a tool for improving people's lives in many different ways
- opens the way to engage effectively with new or different audience/users/groups/communities
- can improve user/group/community experience of making good use of their legal capabilities, and so enable them to do more in more ways

1.2 What is specific to evaluating PLE outcomes/impact?

- If we see PLE as 'making an intervention' we can see that it is not a question of taking a blank slate and writing something on it. When we are seeking to influence a social situation or personal circumstances, we need to have an appreciation of those circumstances and of what is particular about them. This involves familiar notions like needs, of course, but it also involves asking questions about audience/user circumstances, existing capacities, interests and so on
- Because PLE is likely to form only a small part of an organisation's work, PLE evaluation must advance the organisation's wider goals if its results are to be of value
- In the current phase of PLE development, we would expect PLE often to make up only one element of a project. PLE evaluation will need to address the goals of that project, which may not be 'pure' PLE goals. The contribution of PLE to those goals will be the primary focus of the PLE aspects of the evaluation
- Some of what we need to consider when drafting an evaluation plan must come from our growing knowledge of PLE and PLE evaluation – how it works, what it means to different people, what the needs of different people might be and what it has achieved so far. Scoping existing knowledge and examples is an essential first step in evaluation planning
- PLE project goals tend to involve changes in the lives of individuals/groups and communities. Some of these changes will be easy to identify and evaluate, others will be more difficult
- Most PLE aims to effect changes in a spectrum of attributes – confidence, skills, attitudes and knowledge. Working out how to assess changes in these attributes and abilities will be difficult and will require a lot of thought and discussion

- The degree to which PLE outcomes/impact can be easily measured is hugely variable. In this guide we have placed special emphasis on the more difficult end of this measurement spectrum
- The best indicators of the success of a PLE project may be difficult to work out. Whilst some of these may be self-evident, others may require a good deal of thought and discussion
- Evaluation of the outcomes/impact of PLE in projects is more feasible when projects can engage actively with defined audience/users and with other project participants. In the current phase of PLE development, Plenet believes that projects designed around such active engagement will facilitate better PLE evaluation
- Engaging with audience/users requires at least some of the evaluation methods that are used to be interactive/participative
- Because PLE can embrace a huge range of social issues, audience/users, and methods, PLE evaluation can benefit from systematic 'borrowing' from other disciplines or subjects
- In these early days, we should always expect the unexpected. Right now, our knowledge of how to create good PLE and how to evaluate it is limited. We must keep our eyes and ears open, and leave the door open at every stage of the project for the unexpected to walk through

1.3 Practical pointers when planning PLE evaluation

- There are many different evaluation methods or techniques and most of them will be useable in PLE evaluation at some time
- PLE projects will often involve direct interactions and different forms of participation. These types of project activity offer the opportunity to engage with audience/users face-to-face for more effective and meaningful evaluation
- Understanding what people think has changed for them is difficult, and assessing such views is probably best done by professional evaluators
- If we want to measure changes to people's skills, knowledge, confidence, or behaviours, then *before and after* evaluation is desirable, if we can make it work as part of the delivery of the project
- Some approaches to evaluation are not feasible for PLE at the moment. A good example of this would be an experimental project that set up control groups and controlled environments so that comparative data can be reliably gathered and analysed
- Similarly, we are not yet in a position to undertake larger scale evaluations that could track the influence of improved PLE, over time, on population samples large enough for statistically reliable conclusions to be drawn
- There is a strong shared view among evaluators that if we use a range of evaluation methods, we can compare the results and so be more confident about our 'findings'. This is called 'triangulation' – but we don't propose to call it that in our PLE work. It is, however, a good idea to keep this in mind when thinking about how to design the evaluation model

1.4 How Plenet will support the development of PLE evaluation

- We want to enter into discussions with existing providers of general evaluation guides to produce 'editions' tailored specifically to the evaluation of PLE. In this way we will remove the need for projects to 'reinterpret' general guides to fit their own circumstances
- We will develop, over time, and in collaboration with PLE projects, specific tools for PLE evaluation suitable for as full a range as possible of PLE projects
- We will produce accompanying guidance in the use of each of these tools
- Both tools and guidance will draw on our growing understanding of PLE, what it is, and how it works
- As we progress, we will draw out the commonalities in evaluation that span different types of PLE activities and goals, and so in time devise general propositions and possibly general models for PLE evaluation
- Although our current goals for PLE evaluation are modest, we will keep in mind the feasibility and desirability of developing more elaborate evaluation models, drawing on our shared understanding of PLE and PLE good practice over time

1.5 Plenet's broad approach to PLE evaluation

- The evaluation process for PLE is, in many ways, no different from that for other projects that promote change for individuals, groups and communities
- The design for any project evaluation, including PLE, should be worked up as part of the initial project development. Trying to evaluate after the event is much less likely to be successful than building it in from the start. Successful evaluation must span the life of a project
- We appreciate that resources for evaluation are often limited. However, even if resources for evaluation are sparse, knowing what they are, and working to these from the start, will offer the best chance to use them to good effect
- A good evaluation does not have to mean a 'full' evaluation. If projects can only undertake limited evaluation, this will still be valuable if done well
- In the current phase of development of PLE, Plenet expects that it will be only one element of a wider project. PLE evaluation will need therefore to address a project's wider goals and assess how PLE contributes to their achievement
- All evaluation requires a cycle of establishing evaluation goals, developing indicators for assessing these, devising evaluation methods, collecting and analysing information, and using that information to assess outcomes/impact
- The processes and results of our PLE evaluations must be useable by others, and be, as far as possible, transferable to a variety of situations. To achieve this we will need to be able to think beyond the specifics of one project evaluation and describe what we have been doing in more generalised terms.
- In this early phase of PLE development it is vital that all progress in evaluation be shared as widely as possible. Plenet is committed to working to ensure that PLE evaluation remains an open, shared and participatory activity, whose benefits can be spread around the PLE 'movement' as effectively and quickly as possible

Designing a PLE evaluation

Step 1: Plan the evaluation as a team effort

A team effort: discuss/review and design the evaluation of the project

A PLE evaluation plan should be developed through contributions from a range of stakeholders, and should not just be produced by one or two people. This is because it is important to ensure that as many issues and possibilities as possible are thought through in shaping the final design.

Designing an evaluation may therefore involve:

- group discussions
- facilitated debates
- visits to other projects
- looking at other evaluations, including your own earlier ones
- consultations with PLE practitioners and evaluation specialists, including Plenet

Plenet will be increasingly useful as a source of examples and guides as we are able to add to our website.

Do start from first principles, and work your way through the process...

> *"Let's get together and have a good look at the project's goals, and see what part PLE will play in helping to meet them..."*

Don't let evaluation methods or techniques are the leading factor in the decisions:

> *"Well, why not do a survey... or what about a focus group or two..."*

Step 2:
Write an overview of the evaluation planning process for the project

Issues to keep in mind

Some types of evaluation and some evaluation activities are relatively straightforward. Others are more difficult to think through, set up, and carry out

Some require specialist input, and in some cases are best done by evaluators rather than project staff

Key decisions in the planning process

- What is it you want to evaluate? Set out the project's goals, and if needed, separate these into more specific elements
- Consider what types of goals the project has. How concrete and how easy to measure do they seem? Are they immediate, longer-term, or both? Are they focused on individuals or groups?
- Identify the various project beneficiaries – your own agency, audience/users, other involved agencies or individuals, funders – and their role and interests in the project. Will you need to evaluate goals for some or all of them?
- Understand the audience/users in more detail. What is the project assessment of their needs, interests, and abilities/capacities? Why does the project think that it can achieve something with them? What might they be interested in doing that might help undertake the evaluation? What could they tell you in relation to the goals?
- Who else will be involved in the project? Will they be able/willing to help or take part in the evaluation?
- List the proposed delivery methods the project will use. Some delivery methods facilitate some types of evaluation more than others. What opportunities do these methods offer for evaluation?
- Specify the context or situations in the project that seem favourable to evaluation and work out how particular techniques will fit into those contexts

Specify who the evaluation will engage with – audiences/users and others

Issues to keep in mind

Generalised or vague ideas about who the project is aimed at are not very helpful for evaluation. You will need to think this through from many angles

Bear in mind that the target audiences/users of the project deliverables may well be only one of the participant groups the evaluation will benefit from engaging with

Key aspects of audiences/users and others

- When the project is being designed, it will specify its audiences/users – for instance, 'young people', or 'people at risk of eviction', or 'people who live in this area'
- These general categories will be refined by developing better understandings of people's needs, knowledge, skills, capacities, and attributes. These will then help to see how they will be able to benefit from the project's goals
- Evaluation will use the project's notions of the audience/users as the starting point for assessing whether the project has been able to promote change
- Audiences/users will come into contact with the project's outputs in specific ways. These 'contexts' provide opportunities for evaluation to engage with audiences/users
- Projects often include a range of participants in the delivery of its products – often known as 'intermediaries'. All intermediaries need to be identified and their potential role in evaluation worked out
- The contexts in which intermediaries are involved in the project are the focus for any role part they may agree to play in the evaluation
- Intermediaries should be involved in these discussions

Devising indicators of success

Issues to keep in mind

Working out the indicators you will use to measure outcomes/impact can be difficult. It's easier if the project goals are very specific – for example, to assess reduction in rates of eviction, monitor the rates

However, if the goal is to enable people to make, say, better relationship decisions in mediation, measuring such personal changes will need much more thought

Possible indicators of success

- Specific assessable 'facts'
- Identifiable changes in behaviours
- Identifiable changes in views, opinions, and attitudes
- Assessable new knowledge acquired
- Assessable new skills acquired

How to attribute changes to project activities

Issues to keep in mind

Evaluation needs to attribute PLE success to the project's activities – things may well have changed anyway, without your project. It's a bit like people who try to make money through property improvements. In a rising market, they might as well just buy and wait and then sell – they will make money from the rising market. But people believe they can make money by improving property, so they make a huge effort to do this. Often, however, the price of the property would have gone up anyway

Of course, it is often difficult to know for sure, and we should not worry too much about absolute proof at this stage of PLE development. It's OK in the end to say that the project's influence is the best available explanation for the improvements that you've found

Reasonable ways to attribute impact

- Control groups. Experimental projects have control groups – that is, groups similar to the ones the project is targeted at, but who are not actually being targeted in this instance. The effects of the project can then be measured by comparing the two groups. PLE is not yet in a position to operate with control groups, but we may be able to use them one day
- Immediate assessments. If projects are delivered through interactive or participative methods, then immediate changes can be assessed at the time of the project activity. In this way, you can be fairly sure that changes have resulted from the project activity
- Using more than one evaluation method. If you have discovered changes of the sort the project is trying to promote, you can try to verify the relevance of the project to these changes by using other evaluation methods. At this stage this will probably involve asking audiences/users what they have been doing since the project, and what their views on the 'causes' of the changes are

How to devise the evaluation methods to be used

Issues to keep in mind

Evaluation of project goals will be done in different ways for different goals.

Each project goal is being delivered through specific methods, and this exercises a strong influence on the evaluation techniques you can use.

Some of the broader goals of PLE are intrinsically difficult to measure: confidence being a very good example. But other broad PLE goals are likely to prove less difficult to evaluate: for example, increases in knowledge can be readily assessed, and any new skills acquired can also be tested fairly easily.

Key steps in devising evaluation methods

- Decide on the criteria against which the PLE element of the project is to be assessed
- Develop ways of measuring or judging whether and how those criteria were met
- Devise processes for collecting the information needed to make those measurements and judgments
- Devise the procedures for analysing that information
- Develop a framework to apply the analysis to the project in order to understand and improve on good practice
- Develop ways of making the results transparent and available to others for further use and refinement

How to develop evaluation indicators

Issues to keep in mind

Working out the indicators of outcome/impact is probably the most difficult aspect of evaluation, but it is this, if done correctly, that will really help to understand how to do PLE well

It's unlikely that this knowledge will emerge fully through a single project. But with Plenet's approach of learning from each other through the network, and building on what has gone before, we will, in time, create and share such indicators

Key steps in developing indicators

- Sketch out each outcome you want to assess
- Identify each by 'type'. Some outcomes are about numbers of occurrences, some about personal characteristics, some about knowledge and skills, and so on
- Decide, in more detail, what sorts of changes you are hoping for. For example, what rate of change, or what sorts of personal changes?
- Think through how these specific changes might be recognisable to you
- Be creative about this, and consult with other professionals. For example, acquiring the skills of negotiation is often a key change in legal capability. Are there existing professions where indicators of improved negotiation skills are already developed and potentially available for use in PLE?
- Think through what opportunities the project offers to apply the indicators to the outcomes
- Decide if all the indicators are useable. Does the project offer the contexts for each indicator to be used? Can the project afford to use all of them?
- Ideally, one or two indicators will give you most of the answers you want

Identify and deal with common evaluation difficulties

Issues to keep in mind

Some evaluation difficulties arise from the overall project, and some from failures of evaluation

It is hard to evaluate some types of PLE, and we won't always succeed

It's expensive, and we might not have had adequate funding to start with

We may not know yet what the right way to evaluate is – we're still in a piloting experimental phase

We also know that PLE can get forgotten when it's part of a wider project. It may have been neglected during the life of the project, leaving you little to evaluate

When things have not gone well, it may be hard to work out why that was

Identify what went wrong

- The project did not manage to deliver to the predicted/estimated numbers of audience/users – leaving you very little to actually evaluate
- The project did deliver in the ways intended, but the audience/users were not receptive to the outputs and so to the evaluation
- The audience/users were receptive, but no changes seem to have ensued for them
- The evaluation techniques used failed to engage sufficiently with the audience/users

Remedies and lessons

- If the delivery mechanism was not a good vehicle for these project goals, at what stage was this acknowledged, and what was done to recover the situation?
- Did these reviews allow the evaluation to be tweaked? If changes to the mechanisms were made, could you change the evaluation strategy and recover?
- If the project's goals were of little or no concern to the audience/users, has the project engaged with them to find out more about what is needed?
- If the issues the audience/users were concerned about were different from those which the project had anticipated, was it possible for the audience/users' actual concerns to be addressed in this project, or was a different approach, perhaps a different project, advisable?
- Did the project allow for such emerging differences and for the tweaking needed to prevent a gap opening up that would inhibit reaching and evaluating the outcomes?
- If your chosen evaluation techniques had poor response rates or uptake, why do you think this was?
- What steps have you taken to write this up clearly, to enable others to learn from it?

What to avoid

If you can't evaluate the PLE parts of the project, you should resist the temptation to evaluate something else in the project instead

Avoid making unwarrantable claims for your findings. If you can't find out what you'd like to know, don't interpret what you have found out to mean things it can't mean. No one but you will be convinced or impressed by this!

Don't underestimate the value of your findings. Right now, little is known about how PLE can work well and what it can achieve. Findings from any well-designed evaluation – even those involving only a modest number of examples or audience/users – will be a positive addition to our store of knowledge about PLE

Some evaluation tools

To get feedback from users and others

- Self-completion questionnaires – by post or online
- Face-to-face or telephone interviews
- Group discussions, including focus groups
- Intermediary or user diaries of activities and impressions
- Participation/interaction/collaboration events with audiences/users and/or intermediaries

All of these techniques will benefit from input from evaluators. Some – those that involve face-to-face interaction with intermediaries or users – are best undertaken by independent evaluators. If interviews are carried out by the people who delivered the project, it risks biasing people's responses.

Less interactive techniques, such as self-completion questionnaires and diaries, are less liable to skew responses, and so can be done without external help. However, you will still benefit from the input of an evaluator to get the most out of them.

To understand how things worked in practice

If you want to know how the project worked in practice, or to relate processes to the effectiveness of the outputs, you can:

- Observe informally – being around and watching what goes on, usually with a crib sheet of things you're looking for
- Actively observe people doing things – intermediaries and users together, or users engaging with the project
- Set up specific interactions – users with the project products – both to observe and discuss

Such techniques are extremely valuable because they show how things work in the real world. But good observation is very difficult to do well and, again, will still benefit from the involvement of independent evaluators.

To assess changes

- Before and after assessment 'tests' of changes, administered to audience/users
- Analysis of data collected over time about project performance
- Reviews of relevant written accounts: for example, file notes or case notes that show what happened

Appendix 1

Research and knowledge issues of relevance to PLE evaluation: key points

The development of in-depth knowledge of PLE and what it can achieve will take many years. So far, Plenet has begun to look at a whole range of issues that can be progressed by more research and by bringing to bear knowledge from other disciplines. The paper touches briefly on some of these and this appendix sets them out in greater detail.

- PLE is about increasing 'legal capability' for individuals, groups and communities. Issues of 'identity' and of the 'legal subject' will play an important role in thinking around PLE in the future
- Development of knowledge about PLE and PLE evaluation will mean engaging with interdisciplinary developments in broader theoretical fields, including perspectives such as post-structuralism and postmodernism
- PLE will add an important strand to our understanding of how the law impacts on people, and PLE will in time be capable of altering the trajectory of these impacts
- In the future we will seek to measure the impact of particular legislative changes and isolate ways in which PLE interventions change the way the legislation functions.
- Over time it will be possible to design studies that give a life-span picture of the need for PLE at different junctures in life
- PLE may, over time, have many theoretical partners. Without precluding any, we suggest at present that socio-legal studies and education are the most likely source of fruitful collaboration over the coming few year
- We don't yet know what a legally capable population would look like, but an early consequence of PLE evaluation development will be the growth of a stronger sense of the character and effects of this phenomenon

Appendix 2

Examples of evaluation tools

Example 1 Sample guide to a self-completion questionnaire

To find out what participants in 'training' sessions on decision-making for couples who are not married or civil partnered

As a rule of thumb, questions should be kept to a minimum and kept simple, unless you have substantial evaluation resources and are using (or are closely supported by) experienced evaluators.

Questionnaires are generally used to find out what sort of involvements individuals have had, and what their assessments of the project's outputs are. Besides knowing what your user thinks of the product, you may need to understand what they did, and also how they were involved.

If you limit the questions to yes/no answers, this keeps it simple, but does make it difficult to cover everything you want to evaluate. You can expand the possibilities by giving options to tick, and by having a space for comments or explanations. But remember that it will be easier to analyse yes/no responses than free text written by the respondents.

You will want responses on four themes:
- Who the respondent is
- What their involvement with the product was
- What they thought of it
- What effects or influences it has had on them and on their views

Theme 1: Identify the respondent

Agency name; individual name; other.
In some cases, you will want to allow for anonymity.

Examples of types of respondent are: end user; intermediary; sister agency.

Theme 2: Identify their involvement

Specific questions will depend on the details of the project, and will include what they did, how many times, what for, and who with. The level of detail is up to you. Remember: the more detailed, the more difficult the analysis.

Theme 3: Find out what they thought about the session

Was it enjoyable/informative/ difficult etc? Were some parts better or less helpful than others?

Ask for more details about which parts were better? Why? Ask for more details on which parts were less helpful? Why?

Theme 4: Find out if it brought specific benefits to the respondent

Offer a list of the sorts of benefits the sessions might bring and ask for responses to each.

Suggest options to prompt the user to think about what they have gained. For example, do they feel more confident; able to use the knowledge to deal with problems; now able to help others – friends, family etc?

Theme 5: Who are your respondents?

You may want to understand more about who is responding to your questionnaire – for example, by age, income, ethnicity, disability, geography, and so on. If you do ask these questions, try to keep them to the minimum needed to meet the goals of your evaluation. You should put them at the end, and reassure your respondents with a clear statement about confidentiality.

Example 2 Observation schedule for study of project sessions

An observation schedule allows the evaluator to form 'live' impressions of what takes place in the project's delivery sessions. This is evaluation technique can offer insights into how the content is delivered and received – what works well and what does not. The observer's conclusions from observation can be compared with participants' views on the session, which can in turn be gleaned through interviews or feedback questionnaires.

Observation needs a guide to what you want to note during the session. It can be difficult to do, as taking notes might be intrusive and distracting. Observers should have a specific role which outlined at the start of the session to those participating.

"Jane is here to observe the session, to help us to improve how we do it. She'll give us her impressions about it later on, and we can compare these with what you think…"

Example 3 Scenarios for assessment of user knowledge and skills

You can assess changes in users' knowledge and skills through 'before' and 'after' testing. The basic technique is to assess respondents' specific knowledge or skills before they take part in sessions, and then again afterwards. This will help you to understand what respondents have gained from participation.

Because the goal of PLE is to increase 'legal capability' this is the broad focus of any assessment. One very useful way to do this is to offer what are called 'scenarios' – descriptions of problems or life situations which are relevant to the content of the sessions. These must be taken from real life, and not invented.

You will be assessing different things with different projects, from a range of possibilities:

- Knowledge of the main 'legal' issues raised by the scenario
- A sense of what sorts of practical issues might arise or decisions need to be made in dealing with the scenario
- Awareness of which are the most difficult, or easiest to deal with
- An awareness of the main risks people might face in the scenario
- Knowledge of the sorts of questions that need to be asked, or further information obtained, to deal with the scenario
- Ability to sketch out possible solutions or ways forward, and discuss what might be involved in doing each of these
- Awareness of what sorts of help, advice and support might be needed, and where to get it

It's important to have a clear picture of what sorts of responses to these scenarios will indicate changes in 'legal capability' This goes back to being clear what the sessions are trying to do, in some detail.

You will need to do this very carefully, and make sure there is agreement on the responses you identify as positive indicators.

These 'before' and 'after' sessions may be one-to-one, or group discussions. In most cases these will be more effective if undertaken by people not directly involved in the delivery of the project.

John Seargeant
February 2009

Footnotes

1 *Education Implications from the English and Welsh Civil and Social Justice Survey*, Alexy Buck, Pascoe Pleasence, Nigel J. Balmer, LSRC April 2007

2 See, for example, the recent *New Opportunities White Paper* (http://www.hmg.gov.uk/newopportunities.aspx) and the Social Exclusion Task Force policy paper *Aspiration and attainment amongst young people in deprived communities (http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/109339/aspirations_evidence_pack.pdf)*

3 For example, the Access to Justice Alliance has funding for education as one of its campaign objectives (*http://www.accesstojusticealliance.org.uk/campaign.htm*)

4 See for example, the work of Streetlaw projects, the Citizenship Foundation, NCCL Galleries of Justice and many other agencies

5 http://www.pleas.org.uk/news_852-6107-1056.html

6 PLEAS Report para.66

7 Charities Evaluation Services: http://www.ces-vol.org.uk/; The Evaluation Trust: http://www.evaluationtrust.org/

8 The evaluation trust has a basic walk through at: *http://www.evaluationtrust.org/evaluation/evaluate*

9 This is explored further in *An initial practical framework for evaluating PLE projects*

10 PLEAS Report paras.66-71

11 There are many examples. Two clear but different examples are models for student learning outcomes – one in the UK at Birmingham City University - *http://www.ssdd.bcu.ac.uk/outcomes/;* and the second at the University of Central Tasmania - *http://www.utas.edu.au/pet/sections/frameworks.html*

12 For example, research using the *Self-Perception Profile for Children (SPCC, Harter 1985)*: *Targeted Intervention Effects on Antisocial Behaviour,* Shulruf, B – *downloadable at http://www.internetjournalofcriminology.com/ijcprimaryresearch.html*

13 *http://www.advicenow.org.uk/advicenow-guides/*

14 A discussion of the guides and evaluations, with copies of all, can be found at *http://www.advicenow.org.uk/about-us/self-management-guides-evaluation,10092,FP.html*

15 *Life and Law in Britain: a guide for young asylum seekers and refugees. Evaluation and recommendations for policy and practice. http://www.citizenshipfoundation.org.uk/lib_res_pdf/0826.pdf.*

16 *http://www.lawcentres.org.uk/uploads/Possession_Prevention_Project_2007.pdf*

17 *http://www.probonouk.net/streetlaw%20info.pdf*

18 *Save our Streets evaluation summary* at *http://www.streetlaw.org/en/Page.Evaluation.aspx*

19 Street Law Inc — *http://www.streetlaw.org/en/Page.Evaluation.aspx*

20 Combined Community Legal Centres Group NSW, *Your Guide to Community Legal Education Second Edition, 2003*

21 You can download the project report from the LCF website at: *http://www.lawcentres.org.uk/publications/category/Public%20Legal%20Education/*

22 PLEAS Report paras. 32-34

23 see: *http://www.advicenow.org.uk/advicenow-guides/problems-with-benefits/turned-down-for-dla-aa-think-youre-not-getting-enough/*

plenet
public legal education network

This report was published by Plenet, a project run by Advice Services Alliance Advicenow.

Public Legal Education Network, Advice Services Alliance, 6th Floor, 63 St Mary Axe, London EC3A 8AA.

Plenet is funded by a grant from the Ministry of Justice.

The Advice Services Alliance is a company limited by guarantee, registered in England & Wales no. 3533317.
Registered office: 6th Floor, St Mary Axe, London EC3A 8AA. Charity no. 1112627.