Appendix A: Approach and Methods

Early on, FORESIGHT embraced emergence as an adaptive approach to the project. Not all of the participants had consistent or multiple touchpoints with the project, and in most cases, there was just one. For that reason, reflective practice methods were used and integrated as much as possible into the interactions with participants, especially with COVID and the move to convening virtually. The chosen methods and approaches focused on being adaptable and the emergent nature of the project. Also, as equity was a vital component of the evaluation, lifting and honoring individual perspectives, especially from Residents and Community, was an approach taken by the evaluator.

Methods and Approach

A mixed-methods approach informed this evaluation. Since the broader concepts in the learning questions were not clearly defined and agreed upon by the stakeholders, **phenomenography**[3] helped determine what the stakeholders were experiencing or thinking. **Narrative inquiry**[4] informed the analysis for the interactions with the different stakeholders. **Short-term observation** provided ongoing design and implementation team sessions and various other engagements for stakeholders. Lastly, elements of **developmental evaluation** informed systems thinking and innovation while collecting real-time data. Ongoing sensemaking of the learnings also supported decision-making.

The data collection and data review incorporated a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods, including multiple-choice and open-ended survey questions, interviews, reporting, and reflections from FORESIGHT's engagements with participants and the internal team. The engagement points in Phase 1 determined the frequency of this data collection. Reflection and survey data were summarized in a rapid reporting style and shared with internal staff and participants for ongoing decision-making and course correction. Quarterly Reports and post-engagement summaries leveraged a deeper dive into the questions by adding definition, description, narrative patterns, and variances by select stakeholder group and overall. These incremental reports informed the final report that summarizes the high-level findings and lessons learned during Phase 1.

Quotations from Participants

Integrating quotes from participants was intentional to give voice and power to those who contributed their time. The quotes were transcribed from an Artificial Intelligence platform and reviewed for accuracy. Minimal editing included the removal of filler words (e.g., "um," "you know," etc.) and repetitive words that do not impact the intention. Grammar, however, was intentionally not corrected to preserve the person's individual speaking pattern and meaning.

---

[3] The qualitative methodology investigates the different ways people experience something or think about something with the idea of capturing an articulation of the stakeholder's reflection on an experience that is as complete as possible. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phenomenography
[4] https://writing.colostate.edu/guides/page.cfm?pageid=1346&guideid=63

Limitations

The reporting and design of this evaluation hold some tensions, defined as experiences and actions. The evaluation was not designed to create a baseline and follow a single individual's change over time. The developmental nature of this report focused on the larger learnings from each engagement with different stakeholders over the stages of Phase 1. The focus was to show the iteration and correction or adaptation to the project's trajectory. It is impossible to show long-term impacts or changes in behaviors as the length of this phase was limited (three years) and interactions with single participants were very infrequent or only once. However, the learnings are intended to help document and inform the project team and partners, and the design of Phase 2.