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Roundtable Overview

• Background: City-County Neighborhood Initiative
  ▪ Intervention strategies
  ▪ Partners and stakeholders
  ▪ Evaluation design and methods
  ▪ Sample Findings
• Stakeholder needs and how we met them
• Challenges and Lessons Learned in Meeting Stakeholder Needs
Intervention Strategy: Community Capacity Building/Empowerment

“Aims to strengthen characteristics of communities to plan, develop, implement & maintain effective community programs that positively affect broader community conditions that determine health and well being”

-adapted from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation
Why Build Community Capacity?

- To address root causes of health inequities
- To leverage existing city, county and community resources to solve problems
- To support organizational and systems change
- To build a power-base of residents and staff who can advocate for equitable distribution of resources
- To ensure sustainability through partnerships
History and Background

- City-County Violence Prevention Initiative
- Grant Proposals to the Centers for Disease Control for Youth Violence Prevention through Community Capacity-Building (‘04, ’05)
- Creation of the Community Capacity-Building Leadership Team
CCNI Stakeholders and Partners

- Neighborhood Residents
- Community-Based Organizations and Local Institutions
- Community organizers / “line staff” / volunteers
- Decision-Makers / funders
  - City of Oakland: Mayor and Human Services
  - Alameda County: Board of Supervisors, Health Care Services Director, Public Health Department Director
- Knowledge seekers
  - NACCHO publication; presentations, UC Berkeley, students etc.
Community Capacity Building Intervention

- Partnership Development
- Community Mobilization
  - Community surveys and forums
  - Resident action councils/committees
  - Other Interventions
    - Leadership development training
    - Time Banking program
    - Neighborhood Mini-grant program
- Population-Based Health Services
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
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?
CCNI Evaluation Model

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

Residents empowered to speak and act on their own behalf
- More Civic Engagement
- Increased knowledge, skills and leadership
- Stronger relationships within and outside of neighborhood
- Greater access to health and social services
- More youth engagement

Local organizations are stronger
- Greater resources & linkages

Residents experience concrete improvements in their lives
- Improved neighborhood conditions
- **Less Violence**
- Improved health and well-being
- Institutions are more responsive to residents
- Share power & resources
Evaluation Approach & Plan

• Matching approach to CCB: Participatory evaluation
• Creating an evaluation plan
  ▪ Describe the project. What are the activities?
  ▪ Create a logic model: Iterative process
    • Input from many stakeholders
    • Draft – Discuss – Draft (repeat)
CCNI Evaluation Methods

• Community Surveys
  - Baseline: 2004
  - Follow-Up: 2007
  - Reached 215-230 residents per administration

• 38 Interviews with staff and residents

• Measure Y data on crime and other neighborhood stressors
Sample Findings: Increased Civic Participation

- 2004 Survey
- 2007 Survey

*Attended a BBQ or block party
- 2004: 24%
- 2007: 44%

*Met with Neighbors to do something about SP issue
- 2004: 29%
- 2007: 38%

Voiced opinion about an issue
- 2004: 29%
- 2007: 35%
Sample Findings: Enhanced Skills & Relationships
(2006 Interviews)

- Residents taking on greater leadership roles
- Increased skills in organizing and advocacy
- Stronger relationships within and outside of Sobrante Park

Resident: “Now there is more unity than before between African-Americans and Latinos. Before there was a wall between the groups and more racism and stereotypes. Now we work together more and understand each other’s culture more – for example they like our food. Now we are closer.”
Sample Findings: Met Neighborhood Priority: Increased Emergency Preparedness

26% said they felt prepared for an emergency in 2004

39% in 2007
Sample Findings: Blight Reduction

• In ’04 and ’07 surveys, defined blight as: trash, dumping, abandoned cars, weeds, neglected land or buildings
• Reduced percent of residents who had called the City about blight in the past year from 41% in 2004 to 30% in 2007
• Increased satisfaction to City response to call about blight from 49% in 2004 to 56% in 2007
Sample findings: neighborhood improvements made by RACs

- New design for Tyrone Carney Park / Streetscape with community input
- $20 k from the City of Oakland
- Community clean-ups
- Earth Days
- “Mini-Park” Renovation
Sample Findings: Change in Violent Crime: ’03-'07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Sobrante Park</th>
<th>Remainder of 31Z</th>
<th>Oakland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug '03 - Jul '04</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug '04 - Jul '05</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug '05 - Jul '06</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug '06 - Jul '07</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rate of Violent Crime per 1,000 population
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Evaluation Needs</th>
<th>How met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Board of Supervisors; City Council</td>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>• Presentation with questions and answers; will return in 6 months with more info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other decision-makers</td>
<td>• Reduction in Violence</td>
<td>• Sent Executive Summary from 40+ page evaluation progress report (update annually)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concrete improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “No Fluff”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost-benefit analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and partners who work “on the ground”</td>
<td>• Who did we reach?</td>
<td>• Group discussion about evaluation findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How effective were we?</td>
<td>• Gave full report, which includes quotes &amp; stories, as well as survey data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have neighborhood priorities been met?</td>
<td>• Presentations on survey data &amp; written reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Success stories.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Challenges and lessons learned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How can we improve our work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Evaluation Needs</td>
<td>How met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Volunteers (county staff,</td>
<td>• Did their work make a difference?</td>
<td>• Volunteer Appreciation Luncheon &amp; Presentation of Survey Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residents from outside of target</td>
<td>• Was it appreciated by their colleagues / supervisors?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area, city staff)</td>
<td>• Can they apply any knowledge to their own work or projects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>• Are conditions better? Have we met neighborhood priorities?</td>
<td>• Community forums to present survey findings and discuss action planning based on findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What strategies worked and why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Has violence been reduced?</td>
<td>• Survey reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health depts. / national</td>
<td>Best practices; evidence of effectiveness; lessons learned</td>
<td>NACCHO Publication Presentations at national conferences (APHA, AEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer-reviewed journals?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges in Meeting Evaluation Needs

• How much emphasis to place on qualitative vs. quantitative data
  ▪ “Stories” speak more to residents & people in the field
  ▪ Decision-makers have asked for more facts and figures
• How do we make our presentations and reports user-friendly?
  ▪ Giving the right amount of data
  ▪ Formatting and visual presentation
  ▪ Creative ways to share info with residents
Challenges in Meeting Evaluation Needs

• Accurately explaining the limits of our evaluation design
  ▪ Attributing community change to our interventions
How we Overcame Challenges
Discussion Questions for Roundtable