

METHODOLOGY

In order to understand:

- Current ADR evaluation theory and practice,
- Evaluation options and processes,
- Guiding evaluation principles.

The research arm of this project entailed:

- A literature review,
- Soliciting expert opinions and views,
- Reviewing existing evaluation instruments.

For expert opinion, 25 semi-structured interviews were conducted with ADR practitioners, academics, and participants of past Center projects. Interviews were conducted in person and over the phone, and in one case via email. Interviews were confidential and no attributions are made during the Interview Review chapter. Interviewees were made specifically aware of the scope and intent of this project and the instrument that it culminates in. The purpose of the interviews was to gain insight into what professionals, academics, and project participants view as the necessary components to evaluating the type of projects The Center engages in.

Several currently used ADR project (or process) evaluation instruments were reviewed. These include instruments come from: the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (USIECR), Oregon Consensus, and the Rand Corporation; Timothy Hedeem, PhD.; Franklin Dukes, PhD.; and several used by practitioners that were created in-house and are confidential. Note: The EPA and Oregon Consensus use adopted versions of those created by the USIECR. Some of these instruments, and some ADR evaluation theory, rely heavily on deductive frameworks or logic models in order to create evaluations. Reproducing that approach is not the goal of this paper. The purpose of looking at currently used evaluation tools is to identify what practices are currently used and if there are any universal themes among them.

The analysis portion of this project relies on program evaluation standards, principles and theory using mainly Michael Quinn Patton's Utilization Focused Evaluation, and Peter Rossi's Evaluation, A Systematic Approach.