

**Evaluation & Data Analysis Plan**  
**Community to Community**  
**C2C**

**Prepared by:**  
**Athena Ortega**  
**Ayana Eagans**  
**Mak McGilvrey**

**Analytical Techniques for Public Service I & II**  
**The Evergreen State College**

**March 14th, 2026**

## INTRODUCTION

### Evaluation Goal

This evaluation strives to understand how Community to Community Development’s Solidarity Economy and Participatory Democracy programs have influenced community conditions over time. Specifically, it examines changes in leadership capacity, cooperative activity, social and environmental justice awareness, and community participation, compared to conditions before the programs were implemented. The purpose of this evaluation is to provide actionable insights for C2C staff and partner organizations, helping to strengthen program design, improve participant engagement, and deepen understanding of how program activities contribute to community empowerment and collective decision-making. The evaluation prioritizes ethical, culturally grounded approaches that respect participant safety and honor community knowledge, consistent with Kovach and Kirkhart’s guidance on respectful and context-sensitive evaluation.

### Evaluation Team

- **Team Members:** Athena, Ayana, Mak – Assist with survey development, data collection, data entry, preliminary analysis, and synthesis of findings.

**Table 1. Roles and Responsibilities of the Evaluation Team Members**

<b>Individual</b>	<b>Title or Role</b>	<b>Responsibilities</b>
Athena	Team Member	Assists with survey distribution, data entry, preliminary analysis, and documentation. Responsible for overall design, coordination, and final analysis of the evaluation.
Ayana	Team Member	Assists with survey distribution, data entry, preliminary analysis, and documentation. Responsible for overall design, coordination, and final analysis of the evaluation.
Mak	Team Member	Supports qualitative data collection, organizes notes, assists in coding open-ended responses. Responsible for

		overall design, coordination, and final analysis of the evaluation.
--	--	---

**Stakeholders and Engagement**

The key stakeholders for C2C’s Solidarity Economy and Participatory Democracy programs include program participants, cooperative member-leaders, volunteers, partner organization staff, and C2C leadership. Participants and volunteers provide insights into program effectiveness, impacts on leadership and awareness, and areas for improvement. Partner staff and cooperative leaders contribute contextual knowledge, help identify priorities, and assist in survey distribution. C2C leadership supports ethical oversight, ensures alignment with organizational goals, and provides historical and operational context.

Stakeholder engagement will occur through several mechanisms. Participants and volunteers will provide feedback through surveys administered at scheduled meetings or workshops. Partner staff and cooperative leaders will help facilitate survey distribution and offer input during brief check-ins or advisory conversations. C2C leadership will review the survey instrument prior to administration and provide feedback on preliminary findings, ensuring cultural appropriateness and safety for participants. Advisory input will be ongoing, reflecting Kirkhart and Kovach’s emphasis on culturally responsive and community-centered evaluation practices.

**Need**

C2C programs were developed to address systemic inequities faced by farmworkers, immigrant communities, and low-income residents in Northwest Washington. Prior to these programs, communities experienced limited access to leadership development opportunities, political participation, cooperative economic models, and sustainable agriculture practices. Structural barriers and unsafe working conditions contributed to social, economic, and environmental vulnerability. The programs aim to reduce these inequities by fostering collective leadership, community engagement, and agroecological knowledge.

**Context**

C2C operates within a complex socio-political environment. Participants often face immigration-related risks, labor exploitation, and exposure to policies that limit participation in civic and economic systems. Environmental factors, including industrial agriculture and climate-related challenges, also shape the organization’s activities. Programs are delivered in partnership with other organizations to enhance capacity, maintain trust, and provide culturally grounded, safe, and supportive spaces for learning and organizing.

**Target Population**

The primary target population includes program participants, volunteers, cooperative member-leaders, and partner staff actively engaged in C2C’s programming. This group provides perspectives on program processes, outputs, and perceived impacts while maintaining safety and ethical considerations for higher-risk community members.

## **Objectives**

C2C programs aim to:

- Strengthen leadership and organizing capacity among farmworkers and community members
- Increase awareness of social, environmental, and economic justice issues
- Build cooperative economic initiatives and support solidarity-based local economies
- Foster civic engagement and participatory democracy
- Promote agroecological practices and food system knowledge

## **Stage of Program Development**

C2C's Solidarity Economy and Participatory Democracy programs are in a mature implementation phase, with established activities, partnerships, and community networks, while continuing to adapt based on participant feedback and emerging needs.

## **Resources/Inputs**

Resources include staff, volunteers, funding from partner organizations and donors, community partnerships, meeting and event spaces, training materials, and access to agricultural land for agroecological activities.

## **Activities**

Activities include leadership training, political education workshops, cooperative development initiatives, advocacy campaigns, public events such as the Annual People's Tribunal, and coalition-building with other environmental and labor justice organizations.

## **Outputs**

Key outputs include the number of workshops delivered, number of participants trained, cooperative initiatives formed, policy proposals advanced, and acres of land transitioned toward sustainable practices.

## **Outcomes**

- **Short-term:** Increased awareness of social and environmental justice, strengthened cross-cultural leadership, enhanced civic engagement
- **Mid-term:** Expanded cooperative economic activity, deeper coalition-building, improved local food access, reduced exposure to environmental hazards

- **Long-term:** Structural shifts toward community-led agriculture, safer working conditions, pathways to citizenship, and sustained movements for food sovereignty, climate resilience, and self-determination

Resources / Inputs	Activities	Outputs	Initial / Subsequent Outcomes	Short-/Mid-term Outcomes	Long-term Outcomes
Grassroots organizers and community leaders rooted in farmworker and immigrant communities	Leadership and movement-building trainings	Number of trainings held	Use of donations to support individuals' legal funds	Increased awareness of farmworker and immigrant justice issues	Sustained movement for food sovereignty, immigrant rights, and community self-determination
Partnerships with local and regional coalitions (e.g., Familias Unidas por la Justicia)	Facilitate campaigns and direct actions advancing farmworker and immigrant rights	Number of campaigns/actions	Empower under-represented people to have an equal voice in decision-making	Strengthened grassroots leadership and civic participation	Systems and policy changes informed by grassroots leadership
Organizational experience in movement-building and political education	Host public events and community dialogues to build solidarity (e.g., Annual People's Tribunal)	Number of public events held, participant attendance	Development of cross-cultural awareness	Broader public support for solidarity economy and participatory democracy	Safety for undocumented individuals; pathways to permanent residency/citizenship

Funding and volunteer support from community allies (e.g., Institute for Washington’s Future)	Engage in coalition organizing with environmental and labor justice groups	Partnerships and collaborative initiatives formed; media mentions	Number of farmworker-led policy proposals submitted and passed; farmers trained in sustainable agriculture; reduction in chemical fertilizer and pesticide use	Improved local food quality and community access to fresh produce	Structural shifts from extractive industrial systems toward regenerative, community-led agriculture; self-sustaining, climate-resilient communities and farmworker ownership
---	--	---	--	---	--

**Focus of the Evaluation**

**Stakeholder Needs**

The primary users of this evaluation are C2C leadership, program staff, cooperative member-leaders, and partner organizations. They will use the findings to inform program improvement, enhance participant engagement, prioritize resource allocation, and understand the perceived impacts of the Solidarity Economy and Participatory Democracy programs. Stakeholders need to learn which program components are most effective, which areas could benefit from additional support, and how participation influences leadership, civic engagement, and awareness of social and environmental justice issues.

**Evaluation Questions**

The evaluation will address both process and outcome questions:

**Process Questions:**

1. Are program activities being delivered as planned (e.g., trainings’, campaigns, public events)?
2. How accessible and safe are program activities for participants?
3. Are partnerships and collaborations effectively supporting program goals?

**Outcome Questions:**

1. How has participation in C2C influenced leadership capacity, civic engagement, and awareness of social/environmental justice issues?
2. Which aspects of the programs are perceived as most impactful by participants, volunteers, and partner staff?
3. How have program activities contributed to changes in community conditions compared to conditions before the programs existed?

### **Evaluation Design**

The evaluation will use a cross-sectional design with retrospective comparison, supplemented by historical context from leadership interviews to approximate “before and after” perspectives. Data sources will include surveys of volunteers, cooperative member-leaders, and partner staff, as well as key informant interviews for historical insight. This mixed-methods approach integrates quantitative measures (participation, outputs) and qualitative perspectives (perceived impacts and areas for improvement).

### **Resource Considerations**

Available resources include C2C staff support, access to program meetings and workshops, existing records of trainings’ and events, volunteer and partner networks, and a short academic project timeline. Survey distribution and data collection will leverage in-person and digital methods to optimize reach while respecting participant safety.

### **Evaluation Standards**

- **Utility:** The evaluation is designed to provide actionable insights for program improvement.
- **Feasibility:** Data collection is streamlined to fit within a few months, using existing meetings and trusted networks.
- **Propriety:** Participant safety and confidentiality are prioritized, following Kovach and Kirkhart’s guidance.
- **Accuracy:** Survey and interview questions are aligned with program logic and outcomes, pilot-tested, and reviewed by leadership for clarity.

## Gathering Credible Evidence: Data Collection

### Indicators

Success will be measured using both process indicators and outcome indicators tied to the logic model:

- **Process indicators:** Number of trainings’ and workshops delivered, number of participants trained, number of campaigns/actions and public events, partnerships formed.
- **Outcome indicators:** Participant-reported increases in leadership skills, civic engagement, and awareness of social/environmental justice; number of cooperative initiatives started; improvements in local food access and sustainability practices.

**Table 4. Indicators and Program Benchmarks**

Evaluation Question	Program Benchmark	Process / Outcome Indicators
Are program activities being delivered as planned?	All planned trainings, campaigns, and public events conducted	Number of trainings, workshops, events held; attendance counts
How has participation influenced leadership and civic engagement?	Participants report increased leadership skills and engagement	Survey responses on perceived impact; qualitative feedback
How have program activities contributed to community change?	Observable improvements in cooperation, advocacy, and sustainable practices	Number of cooperative initiatives, policy proposals, sustainable farming adoption; historical context from leadership interviews

### Data Collection

- **Methods:** Surveys of volunteers, cooperative member-leaders, and partner staff; key informant interviews with leadership for historical context.
- **Data Sources:** Program attendance records, event documentation, survey responses, interview notes.
- **Collection Responsibility:** Evaluation team, with support from C2C staff for distribution and facilitation.

- **Frequency:** Surveys will be administered once during the evaluation period (Dec–Feb); interviews conducted once with leadership; ongoing review of existing program documentation.
- **Data Management:** Responses will be collected digitally or on paper, anonymized where necessary, and stored securely on password-protected files accessible only to the evaluation team.

### Plan Timeline (Fall & Winter Quarters)

Evaluation Activities	Fall Quarter	Winter Quarter
Develop survey & interview questions	X	
Administer survey		X
Conduct leadership interviews		X
Analyze survey and interview data		X
Draft report of findings		X
Share results with stakeholders		X

### Justifying Conclusions: Analysis and Interpretation

#### Analysis

Data collected from surveys and key informant interviews will be analyzed using a mixed-methods approach. Quantitative survey responses will be summarized using descriptive statistics, such as frequencies and percentages, to identify patterns in participation, perceived impact, and areas for improvement. Qualitative data from open-ended survey responses and interviews will be analyzed thematically to identify recurring patterns, contextual insights, and participant perspectives on program effectiveness. This approach allows integration of numerical trends with nuanced community experiences, reflecting both Kirkhart’s context-based validity and Kovach’s respect for cultural knowledge.

**Table 7. Analysis Plan**

<b>Data Analysis Technique</b>	<b>Responsible Person</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Descriptive statistics for survey items	Evaluation team member	Identify trends in participant engagement, perceived impact, and areas for improvement
Thematic coding of open-ended survey responses	Evaluation team member	Extract patterns and themes related to leadership, civic engagement, social/environmental justice, and community change
Thematic coding of leadership interviews	Lead evaluator	Contextualize historical and community conditions, compare pre- and post-program impacts

### **Interpretation**

Interpretation of results will involve the evaluation team and selected C2C leadership or advisory members. Team members will collaborate to draw conclusions from both quantitative and qualitative data, ensuring findings accurately reflect participants' experiences and historical context. Leadership input will help verify cultural appropriateness, clarify program context, and provide insight into unexpected patterns or outcomes. This process maintains ethical oversight while supporting credible, community-informed conclusions.

### **Ensuring Use and Sharing Lessons Learned: Report & Dissemination**

#### **Dissemination**

The primary audiences for evaluation findings are C2C leadership, program staff, cooperative member-leaders, partner organizations, and trusted allies. Dissemination will prioritize participant confidentiality and safety while ensuring findings are accessible and actionable for all stakeholders. The evaluation team will work collaboratively to prepare, review, and present results, ensuring that multiple perspectives guide interpretation and reporting.

#### **Planned Dissemination Mediums:**

- A collaboratively prepared written evaluation report summarizing survey results, thematic analysis, and recommendations
- A joint presentation or discussion session with C2C staff and partner organizations to facilitate dialogue and reflection

- An executive summary highlighting key findings and recommendations for leadership and strategic planning

**Table 8. Dissemination Plan (Team-Based)**

Dissemination Medium	Responsible Team Members	Use
Written evaluation report	Entire evaluation team	Provide detailed findings and recommendations; integrate multiple perspectives for accuracy and cultural relevance
Presentation / discussion session	Entire evaluation team	Facilitate team-led dialogue with staff and partner organizations; discuss actionable recommendations collaboratively
Executive summary	Lead evaluator with team input	Highlight key insights for leadership decision-making; ensure recommendations reflect collective team interpretation

**Use of Findings**

Findings will guide program improvement, resource allocation, and participant engagement strategies. The evaluation team will collaborate with C2C leadership and staff to implement recommendations. Monitoring of implementation will be conducted through follow-up team discussions, staff feedback, and review of program adjustments, ensuring the evaluation contributes directly to meaningful program learning and improvement.