

**Table 1 Incorporation of SPEaR good practice guidelines for Māori in an evaluation of Programme X**

|           | Applying the principles  | Guidelines incorporated in Programme X evaluation? | Summary of review  |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| Respect   | 1. Involve Māori participants (hapū, iwi, providers, communities etc) as early as possible in the design   | Partial  | Evaluation objectives were defined by the commissioning agency. The evaluation design was developed as part of the tender proposal. Prior to fieldwork starting, evaluators met face to face with providers to introduce the team, explain the evaluation design as signed off by the sponsoring agency, and negotiate access to clients. Providers were able to veto clients from the sample.   |
|           | 2. During project planning, identify protocols to be observed during engagement with Māori participants and stakeholders   | Partial  | Evaluators worked closely with regional managers in fieldwork locations. Two Māori research assistants were assigned to work with the Pākehā evaluators. The evaluators were not in a position to assess the skills of the research assistants due to time, budget constraints and lack of knowledge about what constitutes 'cultural expertise'. In the field it became evident one had extensive knowledge of tikanga while the other had no expertise in this area. |
|           | 3. Ensure the resourcing for the project enables officials to make a koha to participating groups and communities.   | Partial  | A koha (thank-you voucher) was offered to participants. Providers were reimbursed for time spent identifying potential respondents. There was no resourcing for community stakeholders to participate in the evaluation design, or analysis.   |
| Integrity | 4. Develop a consultation plan for engaging with Māori who have been identified as likely participants in the project  | No   | No consultation plan was developed by the agency or the evaluators (see 1).  |
|           | 5. Identify whether there are likely to be actions required for protecting intellectual and cultural property rights (if there are, develop mechanisms for protecting these) | No   | The evaluators / sponsoring agency did not consider intellectual and cultural property rights.   |
|           | 6. Acquire a budget for consultation   | No   | There was no budget for consultation (see 1). There was an expectation (by the sponsoring agency and evaluators) that the providers would assist with the evaluation (initial meeting and follow-up interview).  |
|           | 7. Check the validity of the analysis and/or reporting of data with Māori participants   | No   | Interview notes were not sent back to participants. The providers were not involved in the analysis.   |
|           | 8. Be ethical and honest during the evaluation   | Partial  | Evaluators considered the AES ethics guidelines, provided information about the evaluation and sought informed consent. They did not consider other practices that might be more appropriate to the values and beliefs of the participants.  |

|                | Applying the principles  | Guidelines incorporated in Programme X evaluation? | Summary of review  |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| Responsiveness | 9. Involve Māori participants in the design of the evaluation  | No   | See 1.   |
|                | 10. Develop processes that enable Māori participants to maintain contact with the project team throughout the project  | Partial  | The lead evaluator maintained informal contact with providers (key stakeholders) throughout the project .  |
|                | 11. Ensure interim project reports and other reporting documents include a summary of negotiations with Māori participants and stakeholders on issues relating to project design, and report back on any subsequent design changes                   | No   | See 1.   |
| Competency     | 12. Include officials or external advisors with an appropriate level of experience and knowledge of the tikanga and kawa (Māori customary protocol, which varies according to hapū and iwi) applicable to the Māori entities involved in the project | Partial  | A Māori evaluation advisor was sub-contracted to the project after the contract/evaluation design was approved by the commissioning agency. Advice was limited to input into the development of the interview guides, assistance with the high-level analysis and reviewing the draft report.<br><br>Both Māori research assistants were involved in interviewing and high-level analysis. One had knowledge of tikanga and te reo; the other did not. |
|                | 13. Include people with experience and knowledge of methodologies and methods applicable to Māori evaluation contexts  | Partial  | See 12. There was limited involvement by the Māori evaluation advisor due to budget constraints.   |

|                    | <b>Applying the principles</b>   | <b>Guidelines incorporated in Programme X evaluation?</b> | <b>Summary of review</b>   |
|--------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Reciprocity</b> | 14. Use the consultation process to identify any information and research requirements of participating Māori organisations, and (where possible) incorporate these into the research design | No  | See 1.   |
|                    | 15. Ensure Māori participants are given the opportunity to comment on draft analysis/findings and incorporate this into the final draft  | No  | See 7.   |
|                    | 16. Ensure potential Māori participants receive all relevant information about the evaluation (e.g. information sheets)  | Yes   | Information about the evaluation was given in writing and verbally to all participants.                            |
|                    | 17. Identify, via negotiation with Māori participants, the appropriate processes and formats for the dissemination of evaluation results   | No  | See 1.   |
|                    | 18. Release the findings (in appropriate formats) as agreed during consultation  | Partial   | There was no consultation about the dissemination of findings. A summary of findings was sent to all participants. |