TRANSFORMATIVE CLIMATE COMMUNITIES

Draft Evaluation Plan

August 2018

Presented to: Strategic Growth Council

By: UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation and
UC Berkeley Center for Resource Efficient Communities

1. Introduction

The bold aim of the Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) program is apparent in its name. The program aims to leverage Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund dollars to transform communities that have historically experienced underinvestment. These communities face high levels of poverty and environmental burden, but low levels of key services such as reliable transportation, affordable housing and access to fresh food. The first round of the TCC program will bring a variety of new programs and services to three communities in Fresno, Ontario and the Watts neighborhood of Los Angeles. No such program has ever been initiated.

Sound program evaluation will help SGC understand the results and limitations of the program. This information can be used to communicate the program benefits to key stakeholders and to improve future program rounds. Without rigorous evaluation, it is impossible to discern the ultimate value of the TCC program on the communities it seeks to transform.

This document describes an approach and timeline for evaluation of the TCC program. The indicators contained in this evaluation plan are the result of a six-month long planning process that took into account the goals proposed by the grantees; the logical chain of inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts that will occur from funded activities; budgetary constraints for primary data collection; and availability of secondary data sources at appropriate geographic and temporal scales. The framework that was used to develop the initial list of indicators, including a definition of terms, is summarized in **Appendix 1.**

Project-level evaluation plans are provided in **Appendix 2**, which lists each relevant indicator by project-type and then organizes each indicator by evaluation phase. The evaluation phases are: 1) baseline data collection, 2) process evaluation, 3) outcome evaluation, and 4) impact evaluation. These phases are defined n the following section.

The evaluator will employ both quantitative and qualitative analysis to assess progress and results. The methods described in this document leverage secondary data and utilize targeted primary data collection. In addition and in collaboration with the grantees, the evaluation team will utilize ARB's co-benefit methodologies in an effort to ensure consistency across project areas and to build organizational capacity among the grantees.

This evaluation plan includes the following sections:

1. Overview of Evaluation Phases
2. Methods and Data Types
3. Description of Narratives that Complement Evaluation
4. Next Steps
5. Appendices

2. Overview of Evaluation Phases

The sites selected for TCC investments are disadvantaged communities and therefore have disproportionate levels of pollution, chronic disease, and poverty. The goal of evaluation is to measure those conditions before and after the implementation of a treatment protocol, and to see if that treatment had a meaningful impact on improving baseline conditions. In the case of this evaluation, the treatment of interest is a suite of TCC investments that reduce greenhouse gases while providing a number of environmental, health, and economic co-benefits. Since transformation happens over time, these co-benefits should be measured at at multiple points in time. The four phases below describe each of the evaluation phases included in this plan: baseline, process, outcome and impact. See **Appendix 2** for project-level lists of indicators organized by evaluation phase.

2.1. Baseline Evaluation (Year 1)

The first step in evaluation is to establish baseline data for prioritized indicators at each of the three TCC sites and their respective control sites. This will happen in year one of TCC project implementation using secondary data. After collecting baseline data, we will assess the same set of indicators annually (for those for which secondary data is updated annually), and again at or near contract closeout. Long-term impacts will likely not manifest in the data until many years after project completion, but we will still collect baseline data for indicators that can be easily assessed through secondary sources (e.g., poverty, unemployment, median income, etc.).

2.2. Process Evaluation (Estimated Years 1-5)

Process evaluation has two primary objectives. The first is to collect early data on implementation milestones which can be used to understand program progress, as well as to communicate these initial results to external stakeholders, as appropriate. Many of the data points and indicators that will be examined for this component of the process evaluation will be derived from grantee tracking and reporting efforts, as the associated data should generally be available at their disposal from program documentation (e.g., number of trees planted). The evaluator will develop streamlined reporting templates to assist the grantees in collecting and reporting on their inputs and outputs in a consistent manner across the three TCC sites. The evaluator will also provide assistance, when necessary, to meet reporting requirements.

In addition to the output data that grantees will self-report, the evaluator will track a number of key outputs using secondary sources. This will allow the evaluator to document the spillover effects (i.e., indirect effects) that occur from the TCC investments within the TCC sites (i.e. treatment sites). Using control sites to exclude the effects of external forces, the evaluator will be able to infer how TCC investments affected outputs such as the number of trees planted, solar systems installed and housing units built, above and beyond those that TCC investments directly financed. Outputs are likely to be the most measurable changes that occur pre and post

project implementation, and are critical for communicating how TCC investments have transformed community strengths and assets.

The second component of process evaluation is collecting more qualitative data about implementation processes through ongoing communication with grantees (and/or co-applicants, as necessary), as well as SGC staff. These communications will allow the evaluator to understand which components of the program implementation is going well and where improvements can be made. This information -- to be shared internally and not publicly -- can be used to prompt course corrections throughout Round 1 of the TCC program, if necessary, and to inform future rounds of the program.

Because the TCC program is new and undergoing its first round of implementation, this form of stocktaking, reflection, and documentation of implementation processes is important to help ensure optimal program delivery in this and future rounds. This form of process evaluation will be conducted through a variety of means, including interviews with grantees about hurdles they are facing in implementing their projects. Evaluators will develop a schedule (in consultation with the grantees) to have phone conversations with project leads at regular intervals. Focus groups will also be a key means of gathering information on the implementation process, particularly related to the transformative plans.

2.3. Outcome Evaluation (Estimated Years 2 or 3 through 5)

Intermediate outcomes are defined as changes in stakeholders' behaviors, practices or decisions. During outcome evaluation, we will track and measure intermediate outcomes using secondary and, as feasible, primary data (e.g., user surveys or from existing grantee program records). In addition to the quantitative metrics listed in the appendices of this report and discussed in detail in the Indicators Report, we will gather qualitative information through focus groups. The focus groups and the user surveys are discussed in further detail in **Section 3 - Methods and Data Types**.

2.4 Impact Evaluation (Year 5 but Best Done Later as Well)

Impacts are the changes in environment or human condition that result from TCC activities, and represent the set of indicators that most closely align with the objectives the TCC Program. Impacts, however, will likely not be realized for several years after program implementation. In some cases it could take a generation for the effects to show up in data. Thus, while we will assess impact indicators at project closeout, we should be clear that we may not see measurable change during the project period. We recommend that the same indicators are also cost effectively assessed several years later.

Even if impacts do not show up in the data during the evaluation period, the evaluator can frame the outputs and outcomes that will be measured during the five-year evaluation phase in terms of their influence on the the transformative TCC objectives and specific program goals defined by the grantees (outlined in **Table 1**). In doing so we will reference the literature documenting links between the intermediate outcomes and long-term impacts reflect to the TCC program. For

instance, the outputs and outcomes measured during the evaluation can also be connected to a number of other pressing policy aims, such as building community-level resilience to climate change and other stressors. Resilience to climate change, for example, is achieved through the same pathways that achieve greenhouse gas reductions (e.g., tree planting, energy efficiency etc, distributed energy generation, etc.).

Table 1. Goals Defined by Round 1 TCC Grantees

Fresno's Defined Goals:	
Reduce Emissions from Local Sources of Air Pollution	Improved Access to Training Opportunities and Career Pathways for Low-Income Residents
Improve Public Health and Other Environmental Benefits	Creation of High Quality Jobs for Low-Income Residents
Addressing the Improvement of Public Health Outcomes through Improving Access to Care	Business Development
Watts' Defined Goals:	
Reduce local sources of air pollution	Access to Training
Improve public health outcomes and address health disparities	High quality jobs and careers
Prevent displacement and its impact on physical and mental health	Support and expand local businesses and organizations
Address and mitigate non GHG sources and exposure to pollution	Help youth identify and prepare for careers in GHG reduction fields
Create safe and secure public space	Empower and educate residents to advocate for greater equity and provision of municipal services
Ontario's Defined Goals:	
Breathe healthy air, eat healthy food, and be free from chronic disease	Improve access to training opportunities and career pathways for low-income residents
Feel safe and comfortable walking and biking to transit and other neighborhood destinations	Create high quality jobs for low-income residents
Live in a home that is safe and affordable	Increase educational attainment that leads to sustainable employment and job growth within the TCC project area.

3. Methods and Data Types

This section provides an overview of the methods and types of data that will be used to evaluate the TCC Program.

3.1. Methods

Before and After Comparison

The sites selected for TCC investments are disadvantaged communities and therefore have disproportionate levels of pollution, chronic disease, and poverty. The goal of evaluation is to measure those conditions before and after the implementation of a treatment protocol, and to see if that treatment had a meaningful impact on improving baseline conditions. In the case of this evaluation, the treatment of interest is a suite of public investments that reduce greenhouse gases while providing a number of environment, health, and economic co-benefits. Since transformation happens over time, these co-benefits should be measured at at multiple points in time, as summarized in **Section 2 - Overview of Evaluation Phases**.

The Importance of With and Without Comparisons / Control Sites

Attributing any improvements in baseline conditions to the TCC Program requires conducting a with or without comparison. This comparison communicates whether improvements at the three awarded sites were uniquely associated with the suite of TCC investments, or whether these sites would have realized these same benefits without any intervention. For example, an increase in housing affordability across the three sites may be the result of market conditions or other statewide policies and programs that incentivize affordable housing development. Moreover, it is important to recognize that climate change itself -- the primary impetus behind this program and other California Climate Investments -- could confound many of the things that should be tracked for this evaluation. For example, a hypothetical decline in trees could be due to tree mortality from heat stress and prolonged drought, rather than unsuccessful tree planting efforts. Without controlling for external factors, the evaluator could widely over- or under-estimate the effect of the TCC Program.

To conduct a with or without comparison, we recommend selecting a set of comparable control sites that did not receive TCC investment. These control sites should be similar to the three awarded sites along a number of dimensions, including socioeconomic demographics, density, existing transit infrastructure, employment opportunities, and climate. Given the diversity of the three awarded sites across these dimensions, we recommend one control site per TCC site. All of the indicators that are measured for the awarded sites should also be measured for the control sites. Collecting before and after data for the control sites will help control for external

forces such as broader economic trends that could also explain the changes in environmental, health, and economic conditions observed in the three awarded sites. Final selection of the control sites will occur during Phase 1.5.

Without a community survey, however, a number of indicators do not lend themselves to measurement in a control site. For, example, there is no regularly updated secondary data source on VMT reduction at the census tract scale. Thus, there is no way to accurately identify how much VMT has declined in control sites. Without such data, the evaluator will be unable to draw any conclusion as to whether TCC investments reduced VMT beyond what could have been expected in the absence of the TCC program. **Appendix 3** provides a list of all of the indicators that can be measured in a control site and all of the indicators that can not. Those that can be measured in a control site will communicate the *net* benefit of TCC investments on the three awarded sites.

3.2. Secondary Data

Utilizing publicly available secondary data can reduce evaluation costs compared to collecting primary data. In addition, secondary datasets are usually collected for the entire state of California, which allows the evaluator to compare data points from secondary data sources in both the treatment sites and the control sites. Another benefit of using secondary data is that it allows the evaluator to assess any local spillover effects (i.e., indirect effects) that occur from the TCC investments within the treatment sites. Because secondary data captures what occurs in actuality, it allows evaluators to measure both the direct and indirect effects of TCC investments. Measuring spillover effects, however, requires comparison to a control site, so that evaluators can discern between indirect effects from the TCC investments and broader trends that are occurring regardless of those investments. For example, if there is an increase in solar PV panels within a TCC site (above and beyond the LIWP projects), then there is evidence to suggest that TCC investments induced additional solar PV installations (a homeowner is more likely to install solar if they see their neighbor doing so). Alternatively, if the same increase in solar panels is observed at a control site, then this increase is likely part of a larger trend.

The number of usable data sources at the appropriate geographic scale is somewhat limited because of the neighborhood scale of the TCC projects. **Table 2** below details the secondary data sources and/or databases that are proposed for the evaluation. Additional information on these data sources -- including the frequency at which databases are updated, the geographic scale to which the data corresponds, and any limitations of the data -- will be provided in the final draft evaluation plan. The list below may be modified prior to the finalization of the evaluation plan.

Table 2. Secondary Data Sources

Data Source/ Database	Relevant Indicator(s)	Relevant Project Type(s)
Alternative Fuels Data Center/ Plugshare (as available)	- Number of EV charging outlets installed by level of service, if applicable - Number and location of charging stations installed, if applicable	LCT
California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) data	- Affordable housing units (by size of unit)	AHSC
Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Registrations	- Estimated EV miles traveled - Estimated vanpool miles travelled - Other vanpool miles travelled	LCT
Google Earth aerial imagery	- Trees planted	UG UCF LIWP AHSC
Google Project Sunroof Data	- Number of solar PV systems installed by building type	LCTOP LIWP
IHS Markit	- New private EV purchases	LCT
Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS)	- Reduced pedestrian injuries and fatalities - Reduced bicycle injuries and fatalities	ATP UG
Tax assessor's parcel data	- New housing units (by size of unit) - Net density (dwelling units per acre)	AHSC
US Census - American Community Survey (ACS)	- Housing stability - Housing crowding - Housing costs - Housing unit occupancy rate - Median income - Poverty rate - Employment rate	DAP AHSC WDP

3.3. Primary Data: Outline of Survey Collection

The evaluation plan includes two types of primary data collection instruments 1) User Surveys and 2) Focus Groups. This section of the evaluation plan outlines the following for each of the survey types:

1. Purpose: why the surveys will be used and how they benefit evaluation
2. Scope: which instruments will be used for which project types
3. Limitations and questions: key limitation on survey impact and any questions to be addressed during survey design

Surveys will only be used in the TCC program sites. The evaluation team will not collect survey data in the control sites. At the end of this section are a set of tables that outline the potential indicators to be collected through the user survey and/or focus group.

User Surveys

Purpose

The evaluator will gather information from participants in the TCC funded projects and programs through a set of user surveys. These surveys will ask questions related to how the program offerings have changed participant behavior. For example, if ride-sharing participants make more trips to critical services since the program began and thereby reduce their total vehicle miles traveled. Thus, the user surveys will speak to important goals that are difficult to asses through secondary data, such as increased mobility and access to amenities critical to one's well-being and public health.

Scope

User surveys will be distributed based on the implementation timeline for each project. For example, the workforce development surveys will be distributed to training program participants at the end of the training program, whereas the AHSC survey will be distributed approximately two months after residents move in.

During the Phase 1.5, the evaluation team will develop a set of qualitative metrics and questions to be included in user surveys, as appropriate. These qualitative metrics will aim to add additional depth and perspective to quantitative indicators.

The evaluator will develop user surveys for the project types detailed in Table **3** below. The evaluator will rely upon the grantee to distribute the surveys to the appropriate user group. See **Appendix 4** for draft surveys examples for the Workforce Development Plan and the Community Engagement Plan, which are the only surveys that could be administered during baseline data collection. The remaining surveys will be developed during Phase 1.5.

Table 3. User Surveys by Project/Plan Type[1,2,3,4]

Project/Plan Type	Timing of Survey Data Collection	Survey Population
Workforce Development Plan	- During final WDP training	WDP training program participants
Community Engagement Plan	- First community engagement meeting during implementation - Final community engagement meeting _(as applicable)	Participants of community engagement process
Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities	- Two months after AHSC residents move-in	AHSC building residents
Food Waste Prevention and Rescue Program	- Six months after program begins - Contract closeout	Food recipients (food will be provided at farmers market and other distribution sites in Watts and through a grocery and community orchard for Fresno)
Low Carbon Transportation	- Upon participants' registration - Contract closeout	Participants of LCT project activities (e.g., car-share, vanpool)

Limitations

These user surveys will seek to survey all users/recipients of a given TCC project type in each of the three communities, rather than a representative sample of the entire project area population. As such, they will not provide the basis for drawing conclusions about the impact of the TCC investments on the TCC communities at large. Instead, they will provide documentation of the impact of TCC project investments on individuals that were *directly* served by the program. As mentioned earlier in this document, these impacts, however, will not be statistically reliable without a control group. A change in travel behavior following enrollment in a car sharing program, for example, may not be unique to TCC communities if gas prices are also motivating individuals across the state to retire their vehicles and enroll in car sharing programs. To control for these confounding variables, a community survey would need to conducted at control sites, which is outside the scope of the current evaluation budget. However, the user surveys will nevertheless provide important information that can complement the qualitative narratives about how community members perceive community changes associated with the TCC investments.

[1] This table is based on current project types, should any of the grantees discontinue a particular project, a user survey will not be distributed to the proposed users of that project.
[2] The distribution of these surveys is contingent on the completion of project activities within the evaluator's contract period.
[3] **Appendix 4.3** provides tables with all of the indicators that will be addressed through user surveys.
[4] Distribution of surveys may vary based on site-specific project-level details.

Focus Groups

Purpose

Like user surveys, focus groups are a valuable and cost-effective way to collect data. The evaluator will implement at least one focus group during baseline data collection (Phase 2). The focus group is a strong alternative option to the community survey that was originally recommended in the indicators report. While focus groups will not allow us to extrapolate statistically significant findings from the information gathered, they will enable us to gain valuable qualitative information to complement secondary data, which is particularly important for interpreting findings from secondary data. For example, focus groups will provide an opportunity to gather information from community members about what motivated behavioral changes (e.g., a move to a new housing unit). These motivating factors are often lost in secondary data. Thus, focus groups will allow the research team to gather information that would have been part of the community survey, including sentiments around housing affordability, displacement, accessibility and mobility, and other neighborhood changes, but from a much smaller sample of individuals.

In addition, the focus groups will be an important way to gather data beyond the boundaries of the indicators that were developed during the logic modeling process. Focus groups offer the opportunity for more open-ended responses and follow-up questions than surveys, allowing the research team to discover and investigate issues of importance to the community that might not otherwise have been captured. This will include questions related to process evaluation, such as “Is implementation moving forward as expected? Are all of the right stakeholders involved in the process?” These questions will be particularly valuable in evaluating the transformative plan implementation.

Further, focus groups will allow the evaluator to collect information about transformative change when it may not be visible from secondary sources. Most of the changes associated with the TCC Program over the first five years will likely be too small to show up in most standard secondary data sources (e.g., American Community Survey data, California Household Travel Survey data, California Household Interview Survey data etc.), many of which collect data in geographic and temporal increments that are too large or infrequent to be sensitive to the neighborhood-scale effects of the TCC project investments. Given the limitations of secondary data, focus groups may provide some of the most useful data collected during the entire evaluation process.

Scope

The first focus group will take place during baseline data collection and will be composed of members of the grantee team and representatives from key community groups. Following this, a series of focus groups based on specific project types will gather information again from program participants. For each of the transformative community plans, the evaluator will form a focus group made up of representatives from relevant community groups.

The evaluator will conduct focus groups for the project types detailed in **Table 4** below.

Table 4. Focus Groups by Project/Plan Type[5,6]

Project/Plan Type	**Timing/Frequency of Focus Group[7]**	**Survey Population[8]**
Workforce Development Plan	- Start of the training program - Annually through project close out	WDP training program participants and community stakeholders
Displacement Avoidance Plan	- Project kick-off - Annually through project close out	Representatives of community organizations, particularly housing organizations
Community Engagement Plan	- Project kick-off - Annually through project close out	Participants in the community engagement process and representatives from key community organizations
Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Projects	- Two to six months after AHSC residents move-in	AHSC building residents

Limitations

As with the user groups, the focus groups will not provide data that can be compared to a control nor used to make statistical inferences about the entire population of the TCC project areas. However, the insights gained through face-to-face conversations hold a different, but just as important significance. There are aspects of community transformation that cannot be isolated and quantified, but only understood through stories and discussion. Gathering these stories and insights will be a key goal of the focus groups.

[5] The implementation of these focus groups is contingent on the completion of project activities within the evaluator's contract period.
[6] **Appendix 4.3** provides tables with all of the indicators that will be addressed through focus groups.
[7] The final number and timing of focus groups will be determined during survey design in Phase 1.5 and may differ somewhat from what is described below.
[8] Final list of participants to be developed in collaboration with TCC grantees.

3.4. Estimated Data

When collecting primary or secondary data is not feasible for an indicator, the evaluator will estimate the TCC program's effect on that indicator. For many of these indicators, CARB has developed tools or methodologies for estimating the net benefits of TCC program activities. For indicators that lack a tool or methodology developed by CARB, the evaluator will rely upon a tool or methodology commonly used by public agencies (e.g., iTree, COBRA, etc.). Some indicators, however, lack an established tool or methodology altogether. For the those that are relatively straightforward to estimate (e.g., water cost savings), the evaluator will develop an original methodology. For indicators that require more robust methodologies (e.g., expected reductions in obesity), the evaluator has eliminated them from the evaluation plan. **Table 5** lists the tools and methodologies that the evaluator will use to estimate the benefits of TCC activities.

It is important to note that many of these tools can only be used to estimated a change for a particular indicator, and cannot provide before and after data. Additionally, many of these tools have built-in assumptions that may not be accurate at a local TCC site level and do not automatically adjust as external factors change in the real world (e.g., extreme weather events, economic shocks, population shifts, etc.). Thus, estimates from these tools and methodologies should be understood as the benefits that one would expect from TCC activities after holding all else equal, rather than the actual benefits that will likely be observed in the community.

Table 5. Tools and Methodologies for Estimating the Benefits of TCC Activities

Estimator Tool / Methodologies	Relevant Indicator(s)	Relevant Project Type(s)
CARB's Draft Asthma / Respiratory Disease Incidence Co-benefit Assessment Methodology	-Asthma / respiratory disease incidence**	AHSC ATP FWPRP LCT LCTOP UCF UG
CARB's Energy and Fuel Cost Savings Co-benefit Assessment Methodology	-Reduced energy costs	AHSC LIWP
Relevant CARB GHG Quantification Methodologies	-GHG Emission Reductions (MTCO2E)* -Diesel PM Reductions (lbs)* -NOx Reductions (lbs)* -PM 2.5 Reductions (lbs)* -Reactive Organic Gases Reductions (lbs)* -Passenger VMT reductions -Fossil fuel based energy use (kWh and therms)	AHSC ATP FWPRP LCT LCTOP LIWP UCF UG

	-Fossil fuel based transportation fuel use reductions (gallons)* -Renewable energy generation (kWh) -Estimated passenger VMT reduction	WE
CARB's Travel Cost Savings Co-benefit Assessment Methodology	-Reduced transportation costs	AHSC UG
CARB's Water-Energy Efficiency Grant Program calculator	-Water use reduction -Fossil fuel based energy use reduction (kWh)* -Fossil fuel based energy use reduction (therms)*	LIWP WE
Co-benefits Risk Assessment (COBRA) Health Impacts Screening and Mapping Tool	-Reductions in cardiovascular disease	AHSC LCT LCTOP
Database for Energy Efficient Resources (DEER) and CSI Solar Thermal Calculator	-Fossil fuel based energy use reduction (therms)	LIWP
iTree Canopy	-Square feet of permeable surfaces added	UCF UG
iTree Planting	-Stormwater managed	UCF UG
iTree Streets	-Reduced energy consumption	UCF UG
The National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) PV Watts calculator	-Estimated renewable energy generation (Kwh)	AHSC LCTOP LIWP
ArcGIS network analysis	-Access to grocery stores that sell, healthy, fresh food -Access to educational services -Access to preventative or critical health care services -Access to recreational facilities -Access to workforce development related services -Access to walking / biking pathways	MAE
UCLA / UCB Methodology (TBD)	-Fossil fuel based transportation fuel use reductions (gallons) for AHSC, ATP, LCTOP, UG -Fossil fuel based energy use (kWh) for LCT -Reduced energy costs for WE, UCF, UG -Reduced water costs for LIWP, WE	AHSC ATP FWPRP LCT LCTOP LIWP UCF UG WE

4. Narratives to Complement Evaluation

The impacts of a program as broad and innovative as TCC cannot be fully understood through a list of quantitative measures, no matter how comprehensive. Further, the multifaceted TCC investments will create impacts that the evaluators cannot predict. Some of these impacts will be personal--how people feel about where they live, how it changes their behaviors and knowledge. Other impacts will occur at the community level--new investment and businesses drawn to the area because of the TCC program.

The evaluation team understands that the impacts from the TCC program will be more than the sum of its parts. There will be interactions between projects, such as how increasing both affordable housing and active transportation in the same location can create a virtuous feedback loop that further increases active transportation. The innovative nature of the program requires a flexible approach to evaluation.

We will thus develop a series of narratives and case studies that aim to describe transformational impacts that cannot be quantified. The narratives will complement quantitative data collected from the process evaluation with stories on how local households and employees are involved with and benefiting from the TCC Program. Documentation will include photographs at the TCC sites as well as interviews with households and workers/trainees that are benefiting from the TCC Program at the local level. This information will be packaged into profile pages. The evaluator will work with SGC staff, grantees and community groups to identify and select stories for inclusion.

5. Next Steps

This draft evaluation plan is the final deliverable for Phase 1. In Phase 1.5, we will refine and operationalize the evaluation plan. This will includes the following tasks:

1. Reviewing the draft evaluation plan with experts from a variety of disciplines to gather feedback to inform final evaluation plans;
2. Designing the user surveys and focus groups;
3. Identifying key stakeholders to participate in the focus groups;
4. Conducting additional research on the reliability of identified data sources.

Phase 1.5 is expected to end on October 31, 2018. Phase 2 is anticipated to begin on November 1, 2018.

Appendices

Appendix 1. Evaluation Framework and Definitions

Appendix 2. Indicators by Project Type and Evaluation Phase

Appendix 3. Indicators by Controllability

Appendix 4. Example User Survey Outlines

Appendix 5. Draft Job Reporting Form