

Illinois After-school Partnership

Outcomes Work Group Meeting Summary April 19th, 2005

Attendees: Kristin Allen, Springfield Boys and Girls Club, Erica Harris, CPS, Deyon Dean, IDHS, Jennifer Becker Mouhcine, ICVP

Since attendance was small, the group held an abbreviated planning meeting to update each other on our progress, and plan for our ongoing work.

Building Tools/Supports on Evaluation

Jennifer did a quick review of our product goals, and created the following chart as a visual tool for the group to see what our process is leading to.

<u>RESOURCES</u>	<u>DELIVERY</u>	<u>SYSTEM BUILDING</u>
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Recommended resource materials in our identified areas (The “How-to” information to complement the Mott Framework and our Outcomes Chart)2. Mott Framework (separate document) with possible examples added3. Our Outcomes Chart (with info. from state agencies and other references and sources for research relating to outcome areas (separate document)	Information on existing ways to deliver the content of the materials to providers (trainings, technical assistance, etc.)	Recommendations to Partnership/State Agencies on resource expansion and enhancements needed system-wide for programs to be able learn and use information

Resource Review Reports

All members who volunteered to review resources on Logic models did complete their review, but the group decided to wait for a full report back on their findings until the larger group re-convened. A couple of members typed up their comments-these notes are attached at the end of this document.

Process for Completing Resource Review

The group discussed the next steps in completing our review of the resources in the areas we’ve identified. It had been suggested that since there are some foundational, comprehensive resources that cover several of the areas we think are important to provide information on, that perhaps we should do a second review of those major pieces against the other areas besides logic models to see what is covered and to what extent the resource is recommended in each area. In addition to the core pieces, there may be supplemental tools that are particularly useful, offer a perspective unique to afterschool, etc., or to enhance the materials covered by the comprehensive pieces. These materials can be included in our final product as recommended supplements. As the review of the core pieces is underway, where additional resources are needed and identified, we will review them as a group.

The core sets of resources identified so far are: Kellogg, United Way, University of Wisconsin-Extension, and Project Star. If group members know of other more comprehensive resources that should be included, they should bring them to the next meeting or let Jennifer know.

The group decided they would volunteer to do a review of each of the core pieces against the remaining areas, but that it would be helpful to flesh out some of the content criteria for each area, in addition to the general criteria developed before. The group asked to get input from CPRD and ERI, due to their expertise in evaluation and evaluation capacity building. The criteria will be drafted and sent out to the group, and can be used to supplement the initial descriptions below about what we'd like to see covered in each section.

Content Areas to be covered in Review:

- Readiness Assessments
 - *An organization's readiness to conduct an evaluation*
 - *A program's readiness to be evaluated*
- Evaluation Utilization
 - *Examples: communicate results, effective ways to use data, internally and externally, how to use evaluation to solve problems, how to learn from outcomes-expected and unexpected, etc.*
- Evaluation Planning and Implementation
 - *Examples: Realistic expectations about evaluation internal and external, Determining appropriate evaluation based on what questions need answers, concrete planning for evaluation/outcomes measurement*
- Evaluation Framework
 - *What is evaluation (definition of terms), why evaluate (program improvement, outcomes measurement, etc.), organizational buy in, ways to think about evaluation*

Volunteer reviewers so far are:

Deyon Dean—United Way

Kristin Allen—Kellogg

Erica Harris—UW-Extension.

Jennifer will work with other members to get additional reviewers, for Project Star and for second reviewers for the materials above.

Next Steps

- Content Criteria for each area will be drafted and sent out to group (CPRD and ERI have volunteered to help with this)
- Additional reviewers will be recruited
- Materials will be sent out to reviewers.
- Jennifer will draft a revised interview questionnaire to start to plan for getting input on needed T.A. and resource from the field

Next meeting date confirmed: June 8th10 – 11:30

WRITTEN COMMENTS FROM FIRST REVIEW FOR LOGIC MODELS

W.K. Kellogg Foundation Logic Model

Reviewed by Erica Harris, Chicago Public Schools

Full Document can be found at: <http://www.wkkf.org/Pubs/Tools/Evaluation/Pub3669.pdf>

▪ **Is the content valid and consistent with our work?**

The Kellogg Foundation's Logic Model Development Guide answers all the essential questions that would help an organization create their own model. Included are questions such as:

- What is a Logic Model?
- Why a Logic Model is necessary? How can it be used?
- What are the necessary components of a logic model?
- How to develop a logic model
- Several Examples of logic models and how they were developed

The document does not directly speak to creating logic models specifically for After School Programs, but that is likely not necessary for it to be a valid tool. The document also emphasizes the fact that there isn't "one single best approach" to doing a logic model.

▪ **Is the document or materials easy to understand for various levels of practitioners?**

Overall yes, this is a user friendly model, particularly the executive summary. Included are several examples which are explained in depth so that a user could find parallels between their program and others who have similar theories of change. They also use everyday examples like creating a logic model for an inexpensive family trip. (pg. 11 of full document) The document would be very practical, regardless of the user or practitioners level of understanding. There are some diagrams that are difficult to understand as stand alone charts, but by reading the explanations, they are easier to understand.

▪ **Is the length and format manageable?**

The actual document is very lengthy. 72 pages of in depth writing. The executive summary however is very succinct and to the point (5 pages) If a user would like to get more in depth information, the actual document is easy to navigate, has a detailed table of contents, and includes very specific headers that can lead you to the answers you are looking for.

▪ **Does it come from a reputable source?**

Yes, the Kellogg Foundation has clearly created several logic models for many of the projects they've funded. They've used several of their own examples as useful tools within the document.

▪ **Does the material give guidance on how to use the information in the programs?**

The document offers specific lists of questions to ask oneself when creating a logic model. It also has example templates which are useful for an organization beginning this process.

Notes from Angela Adan Farnham regarding the Harvard Family Research Project's Learning from Logic Models in Out of School Time.

- From a reputable source – YES
- Easy to understand / user-friendly - YES, easy to read, provides specific OST example, not too long
- Consistent with the work of the Partnership – YES, I think so
- Includes multiple levels of outcomes (e.g. immediate, intermediate, long-term) - YES, the HFRP document does this, though the language used is a bit different (measures of effect, interim indicators, ultimate indicators)
- Model shows link between program activities and outcomes - YES, the HFRP logic model guidelines provide this
- Includes community inputs / community factors in the model - NOT REALLY; the HFRP guidelines suggest including "motivating conditions & causes" in the logic model, but as described in the document, it sounds different than what our group had discussed at the last meeting. We had talked about the importance of specifying community conditions & factors which might prevent a program from achieving its desired outcomes.
- Guidance on how to use the information - YES, under the "why develop" section on p.1 of the document.

Resource review notes—JBM

UNITED WAY-Measuring Program Outcomes: A Practical Approach

Criteria

- Reputable-YES
- Valid/Consistent? –Yes, in terms of flexible, program driven, theory of change demonstrated (thought not named this) short-long term, etc.
- Easy to Understand? User friendly, made for practitioners
- Length? Full workbook 170 pages, but good
- Format? Lots of information, examples from the field, caveats, guiding questions. Workbook can be ordered.
- Guidance on how to use? Yes—designed as a “how to” step by step
- Comprehensive or unique? Comprehensive
 - Components addressed: Logic Models, Theory of change, Evaluation Utilization (perhaps not so strong here), Evaluation Planning and Implementation, Evaluation framework (in terms of Outcomes measurement by programs versus “evaluation”)

Summary

- Glossary of terms
- Intro to program outcome model
- Why measure outcomes rationale
- 8 steps
 - Get Ready (already know they are “ready”)
 - People involved, work group, etc.
 - Org. buy in
 - Benefits
 - Inherent problems
 - Guidelines for funders in using outcomes measurement (when, etc.)
 - Choose Outcomes
 - Logic model process, worksheets, examples
 - How to choose, who to talk to and how to gather outcomes
 - Varying outcome levels
 - Variety of formats for logic models
 - Guidelines for assessing appropriate outcomes, checklists, etc.
 - Specifying Indicators
 - Assessing good indicators
 - Characteristics/Factors influencing indicators
 - Information about hard to measure outcomes
 - Preparing to Collect
 - Assessing sources
 - Methods
 - Trying out the System
 - Test run of measurement process
 - Analyze and Report
 - Improve the system
 - Use the findings

KELLOGG- Logic Model Development Guide

Criteria

- Reputable-YES
- Valid/Consistent? –Yes, talks about different approaches, theory of change info. program driven, short-long term, etc.

- **Easy to Understand?** A bit more “high-level” in terms and descriptions, fewer examples or lessons from the field, more text book like. Has more in depth theory of change information.
- **Length?** 72 fairly dense pages
- **Format?** Lots of information, some built in examples, some worksheet
- **Guidance on how to use?** Some, there are exercises, but not for each step of the way.
- **Comprehensive or unique?** Fairly Comprehensive as it ties Logic Models to other areas (Note: there is a bigger evaluation handbook from Kellogg beyond this logic model piece
 - **Components addressed:** Logic Models, Theory of change, Evaluation Utilization (more along how to use your logic model process), Evaluation Planning and Implementation (in terms of how to use your logic model to plan evaluation)

Summary

- **Chapter 1**
 - a basic introduction to the logic model as an action-oriented tool for program planning and evaluation.
 - Gives examples of how to use logic models for your programs benefit.
 - Different approaches to logic modeling
 - Theory (with assumptions, etc.)
 - Outcomes-emphasis on linkages and results
 - Activities-emphasis on specific activities linked to outcomes
 - It also offers an array of sample logic models.
- **Chapter 2**
 - exercises and examples focused on the development of a simple program logic model. Exercises include practical examples “Defining Program Results, Program Resources”, checklists for reviewing content quality, and a template
- **Chapter 3**
 - instructions on how to expand a basic logic model to explore and explain the theory of-change that describes the rationale for your program. A template and checklist are provided that walks through:
 - Problem or Issue Statement
 - Community Needs/Assets
 - Desired Results (Outputs, Outcomes, and Impacts)
 - Influential Factors
 - Strategies “best practices”
 - Assumptions
- **Chapter 4**
 - introduction to how the basic logic modeling techniques can inform thinking about what should be included in an **evaluation plan**. Templates and checklists are also provided.
 - Focus, Audience, Questions, Use
 - Talks about developing indicators for all parts of evaluation plan, not just outcomes

HARVARD FAMILY RESEARCH PROJECT—Learning from Logic Models in Out-of-School-Time

Criteria

- **Reputable-YES**
- **Valid/Consistent?** Yes, though not a lot about theory of change, term indicator is confusing, and talks about community wide outcomes and outcomes programs can’t expect to reach on their own, and incorporates those into the logic model
- **Easy to Understand?** So, So.
- **Length?** 10 pages
- **Format?** General summaries with example charts and definitions
- **Guidance on how to use?** Some guiding questions, some information on how to connect Logic models to evaluation plan
- **Comprehensive or unique?** Unique to OST logic models, but does mention using them for evaluation planning

Summary

- Brief overview of what is a logic model, why develop one
- Logic model guide to terms, sample chart, etc.
 - This model has: Desired Results (broad goals, motivating conditions, program strategies, program activities, program performance measures (outcomes and outputs) and indicators (community wide effort to effect but relate to broad goals)
- Gives OST examples of each of the model components.
- Brief walk through of each element with some questions to pose
- Section on Logic Model for Learning, which shows where some evaluation pieces would fit in
- Glossary

INNOVATION NETWORK: Logic Model Workbook

Criteria

- **Reputable-YES (taken from other core sources)**
- **Valid/Consistent? Yes, has theory of change info., mention of contextual factors, short-long term**
- **Easy to Understand? Yes, for a practitioner audience**
- **Length? 20 pages**
- **Format? Walks through the basic components, with many examples from a range of programs**
- **Guidance on how to use? Provides some guiding questions and tips for each section of the model, but not in-depth in terms of who and how to walk through the process, etc.**
- **Comprehensive or unique? Unique to Logic Models**

Summary

- Theory of Change
- Developing a Logic Model
 - Goals/purpose
 - Resources
 - Activities
 - Outputs
 - Outcomes
- Contextual factors
- Logic Model review—check list to check logic model

UNIV. OF WISCONSIN EXTENSION—On-line course “Enhancing Program Performance with Logic Models”

Criteria

- **Valid/Consistent? Yes, has theory of change info., mention of contextual factors, short-long term**
- **Easy to Understand? Yes, for a practitioner audience, need to have tech familiarity**
- **Length? 7 sections in training module-unsure of how long it would take**
- **Format? On-line course with interactive exercises to test knowledge, get examples, etc.**
- **Comprehensive or unique? Unique; Covers Logic Models and Theory of Change info and touches on how Logic Models relate to Evaluation planning**

Summary

Module 1, Section 1: What is a Logic Model?

Module 1, Section 2: More about Outcomes

Module 1, Section 3: More about Your Program "Logic"

Module 1, Section 4: What Does a Logic Model Look Like?

Module 1, Section 5: How Do I Draw a Logic Model?

Module 1, Section 6: How Good is My Logic Model?

Module 1, Section 7: Using Logic Models in Evaluation: Indicators and Measures