

For Better or Worse: Collaborative Statewide Evaluation Efforts

Wendy K. Todd
National Grid
February 8, 2012

Does the collaborative approach improve the evaluation process?



HERDING CATS.

Research Overview

Attempt to examine the success of the collaborative evaluation approach using two research activities:

1. Case study of a refrigerator recycling program
2. Survey of industry professionals

Measures of Success

1. Statistical
2. Societal
3. Economic
4. Regulatory
5. Political
6. Professional

Measures of Success

1. Statistical
2. Societal
- 3. Economic**
4. Regulatory
- 5. Political**
- 6. Professional**

Refrigerator Recycling Program Case Study

Program is present in three states –
New York, Rhode Island &
Massachusetts.

Impact and process evaluations were
conducted in 2010-2011.

Evaluation methods and results were
similar across all three states' studies.

Refrigerator Recycling Program Case Study

Ability to compare costs per study
sponsor shows economies of scale:

NY: \$67,000

RI: \$84,000

MA: \$5,000 - \$100,000

Survey of Evaluation Professionals

◆◆◆◆YOU◆◆◆◆



Survey of Evaluation Professionals

PA/Utility Evaluation Staff	48%
PA/Utility Implementation Staff	23%
Evaluation Contractor	16%
Regulatory Contractor	10%
Regulatory Staff	3%

Economic Success

75.0% of industry professionals responded that MA collaborative efforts are economically successful

Political Success

97.0% of industry professionals responded that MA collaborative efforts are politically successful

Professional Success

83.3% of industry professionals responded that *historical* MA evaluation efforts are professionally successful

69.4% of industry professionals responded that MA collaborative efforts are professionally successful

Time Commitment

66.7% of evaluation professionals reported that the time commitment involved with collaborative efforts was greater than non-collaborative efforts.

Efficient Use of Resources

Evaluation professionals are split on whether or not evaluation resources are being used efficiently under collaborative efforts versus non-collaborative efforts:

- 33% More Efficient
- 27% Same
- 12% Less Efficient
- 27% Other

Time & Efficiency

“In general, I think we are doing bigger studies with broader and more extensive application, and they take more time to conduct, administer and oversee. Overall though, I think the efficiency with which available resources are deployed has improved.”

“Less time in the planning stages since that is typically managed by one group, but then more time in the review and reporting because often times the planning group oversaw the needs of some companies.”

Measures of Success

1. Economic Success

75% of professionals responded that collaborative efforts are economically successful

2. Political Success

97% of professionals responded that collaborative efforts are politically successful

3. Professional Success

Slightly more professionals responded that historical efforts were professionally successful

Recommendations

1. Continue to monitor and assess the success of the collaborative evaluation framework both in Massachusetts and industry-wide.
2. Investigate and confirm the drivers of the added costs of collaborative efforts.
3. Conduct additional research on the underlying reasons for potentially lower success ratings of the current efforts on the professional measure of success.
4. Examine the current evaluation practices and develop industry-wide best practices on the efficient use of evaluation resources.



Save the Date

May 15-17, 2012

**AESP's Spring Conference
Baltimore, MD**

Oct. 15-17, 2012

**AESP's Fall Conference
Long Beach, CA**

Jan. 28-31, 2013

**AESP's 23rd National Conference
Orlando, FL**

www.aesp.org

