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Background

- History of CCB and its partnership:
  - MAPP
  - CDC violence prevention
  - Violence Prevention Task Force
  - Alameda County Public Health Department, City of Oakland and Community Groups

- Evaluation: its development from CDC research proposal
Evaluation Purpose

Process – Documentation
- Program improvements
- So others can follow a similar plan
- Determine “dose” of activities needed to achieve outcomes

Outcome
- Did the CCB activities lead to empowerment of residents and groups?
- Did CCB lead to community-level changes?
- Did these changes result in reduced health inequities?
Evaluation Approach & Plan

- Matching approach to CCB: Participatory evaluation

- Creating an evaluation plan
  - Describe the project. What are all of the activities?
  - Create a logic model: Iterative process
    - Input from many stakeholders
    - Draft – Discuss- Draft (repeat)
“Logic” Model: Theory of Change

Funding
- staffing
- Supplies and in-kind support

Community Capacity-Building Activities

Individuals Organizations Intermediate Outcomes

Neighborhoods Communities Health and Social Outcomes - Inequities Long-Term Outcomes
Resources (Key Partners)

- Alameda County Health Care Services Agency/ Public Health Department
- City of Oakland Neighborhood Services; Police; Public Works
- Residents
- Local Grassroots Organizations
- Local Community-Based Organizations
- Local Institutions (Schools, churches)
- Alameda County Board of Supervisors
CCB Activities: Grassroots Organizing and Community Development

- Community mobilization
- Resident Action Councils and neighborhood committees
- Partnership development
- Youth employment and development
- Population health services/Community Health Teams
Community Mobilization - Priorities

**Sobrante Park**
- Tyrone Carney Park Improvement
- Drug dealing/Violence
- Lack of Youth activities
  - (Added Disaster Prep in 9/05)

**West Oakland**
- Durant Park Renovation
- Blight
- Improved & Connected Youth Services
Examples of CCB

- Sobrante Park
  - Leadership Training
  - Resident Action Council
  - Health fairs, screenings and services
  - Youth Mini-Grants

- West Oakland
  - Friends of Durant Park
  - 29th Street Group; 30th and 31st St. Group
  - Youth Ambassadors leadership program and neighborhood surveys
Intermediate Outcomes

Goal 1: Residents are empowered to speak and act on their own behalf

Increased knowledge and skills to plan and implement community action

• Increased leadership

• Greater access to social capital
  • Participation in civic activities
  • Trust & willingness to intervene to stop negative activity

• Greater access to health and social services
Intermediate Outcomes

• Greater ability for youth to engage in community change
  • Increased employment skills
  • Decreased negative behaviors (e.g. truancy, loitering, fighting)

• Goal 2: Local organizations are stronger
  • Greater access to resources
  • Ability to work with and challenge institutions (including City and County)
Long-Term Outcomes

Goal 3: Residents experience concrete improvements in their lives
  • Neighborhood Action Priorities are met
  • Neighborhoods are safer
  • Violence rates are lower
  • Residents have improved health and well-being

Goal 4: Institutions have altered power relations with residents
  • More flexible and responsive to community
Theory of Change – Alameda County PHD
Community Capacity-Building

Activities
- Grassroots community organizing and neighborhood development
- Community Mobilization
- Resident Action Councils and Committees
- Partnership Development
- Youth programs
- Population Health

Intermediate Outcomes
1. Residents empowered to speak on own behalf
   - Knowledge and skills
   - Leadership
   - Social capital
   - Access to health and social services
   - Youth engagement

2. Local organizations are stronger

Long-Term Outcomes
3. Residents experience concrete improvements in their lives
   - Action priorities are met
   - Violence rates reduced
   - Health and well-being improved

4. Altered Power Relations between residents and institutions

Reduced Health and Social Inequities

Political, Economic, Social, Cultural Contexts
Evaluation Plan Challenges

- Measuring moving targets
- Superimposing a linear model on an “organic” process
- Making sure many people have input into the goals and outcomes
- Using theory like “social capital” and “empowerment” in a way that is helpful
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Evaluation Design

- Process & Outcome
- Qualitative and Quantitative
- No Comparison Group for intermediate outcomes
- Pre and Post-Tests
- Time series?
- Not exactly typical!
Evaluation Design: Multi-Method

- Surveys
- Participant Observation
- Analysis of Trends
- Other Creative Methods
- Surveillance
- Interviews
CCB Evaluation Tools

- Comprehensive Surveys in SP and WO – Baseline (‘04) and post (projected ’07)
- Pre and Post Participation Surveys for Neighborhood Committees, Resident Action Councils
- Pre and Post Surveys for Training Series
- Qualitative Methods
  - Interview and focus group protocols
Methods for Measuring Resident Empowerment

• Knowledge, skills & leadership
  ▪ Pre and Mid-participation surveys
  ▪ Interviews

• Greater access to social capital:
  ▪ Door-to-door surveys (Multiple choice questions)
  ▪ Interviews

• Access to health and social services
  ▪ Brief assessment survey in West Oakland
  ▪ Interviews
Methods for Measuring Concrete Improvements in People’s Lives

• Perceived Safety
  ▪ Door-to-door surveys

• Meeting neighborhood action priorities
  ▪ Door-to-Door Surveys (Open ended)
  ▪ More objective methods (like blight assessments)

• Rates of violence & selected health indicators
  ▪ Collecting and analyzing data from local police departments, hospitals and vital records.
Methods for Measuring Stronger Organizations and Institutional Change

- Stronger Organizations
  - Interviews
  - May adapt another ACPHD survey

- Institutional Change
  - Interviews
  - May find and use another survey instrument
Methodological Challenges

- Cross-sectional designs
- No comparison group
- Causality – what about context?
- Determining whether the “dose” of the intervention was sufficient to achieve change
- Linking intermediate to long-term outcomes
- Time horizon needed to see results?