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Workshop Presentation Goals
1) To demonstrate a process of generating community defined evidence that is practice based
2) To demonstrate the development of program theory in evaluating community intervention models
3) To demonstrate the development of a multi-site community based evaluation design that can help CBOs develop evidence for their promising practices

Cultural Factors & Evidenced Based Practices (Ganju, 2005)
- Evidence exists: specific programs are effective for specific populations in specific settings
- Helpful practices exist for which "evidence" has not been fully established
- Little research on EBPs has been conducted on diverse populations
- Within this limitation, existing data suggest that there are no significant differences in outcomes across different racial, ethnic, or cultural groups although not all cultural groups have been tested
- Implementation of EBPs depends on adequate infrastructure
- Emergent research suggests that adaptations can be made for specific populations

The Seattle Story: Historical Context
- Economic issues in Washington State – Changes in juvenile justice funding resources and priorities
- Difficulties in providing adequate services to juveniles and at-risk youth, particularly to youth of color (Bridges & Steen, 1998)
- Problems with interventions with youth of color; high recidivism & incarceration rates, disproportionate levels of out of home placement
- High levels of ethnic & racial disparities in sentencing/juvenile justice systems (Dean, 1997)
- Movement across the country to adopt Evidenced Based Practices as the primary approach with at risk youth (SAMHSA, 2005)

The Seattle Story: Reinvestment in Youth (RIY)
- Washington State legislature begins to explore mandating EBP for all youth serving programs
- Diverse CBOs protest lack of evaluation resources for “organic” or “homegrown” programs
- RIY develops fund for evaluation of organic or home grown programs, particularly those serving minority youth
- Simplified application and selection of six CBOs for inclusion into evaluation study
- Two large, two moderate and two small programs

Significant Barriers In CBOs
- Goals and objectives poorly defined or operationalized
- Logic models are often based on funding templates; program theories are intuitive, historical and experientially based
- Intervention approaches are often inherited from staffing and based on revolving leadership/supervisors
- Most agencies working with at risk youth are agencies attempting to "do everything" given the extensive needs of the youth
- Most agencies have minimal and reduced resources and infrastructure
Evaluation Empowerment Training

- Introduction to evaluation & evaluation team, establishing partnership using empowerment framework
- Establish foundation to understanding program outcomes, research design development and how to determine the best measures for use with program
- Develop trust and communication in bridging program and evaluation efforts
- Conduct four day-16 hour training operationalizing goals and objectives, logic models, characteristics of effective programs and theory of change model

Program Theory of Change through Logic Modeling

- What are the linkages between program activities and changes in outcomes?
- What is the sequential path that a client needs to take to get the maximum impact from program?
- Outcomes are chains of linkages or potential causal steps (logic model); if activity A occurs this should lead to outcome B which if applied consistently over time could ultimately lead to impact C (long range outcomes)
- Program outputs or activities leads to outcomes or objectives resulting in the development of a theory of change (Aspen Roundtable, 1995)

RIY Intermediate Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Social Skills</th>
<th>Pro-Authority</th>
<th>Social Competence</th>
<th>Self-Esteem/confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCRAP</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRAP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPP</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RIY Theory of Change

Program Interventions

Knowledge (+)
Pear/Family Relationships (+)

Decision Making/Problem Solving Skills (+)
Communication Skills (+)
Coping/Interpersonal Skills (+)
School Bonding (+)

Delinquent Behaviors (-)

Peer/Family Involvement

RIY Evaluation Design Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Self-Families</th>
<th>Juvenile Justice Database</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCRAP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Youth Drop-In Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASP</td>
<td>Institutional Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>Workforce Investment Act (WIA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASS</td>
<td>A-Bach Youth (AY) - East County Superior Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLS</td>
<td>Enhanced Peer Partners – Functional Family Therapy (FPF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-Site Design

- Since a “no treatment” or random assignment was unavailable, we developed a multi-site design
- A multi-site design (Straw & Herrell, 2002), involves “multiple sites with either similar or varying interventions across sites, and involves a coordinated, centrally-managed evaluation (pg. 6).”
- The strength of this design is that it allows for the simultaneous comparison of multiple program models with varying levels of intervention strength
- Furthermore it is able to compare a single program model to a continuum of program models, ranging from very tightly controlled, formalized to very informal unstructured interventions
RIY Evaluations

- Multi-method approaches
- Process Evaluations including MIs, qualitative interviews, focus groups and observations, PIG
- Outcome Evaluation involving Quasi-Experimental Multi-site Design to include an EBP
- Multiple assessments over time include baseline, 6, 12 and for some, 18 months assessments
- Sample size (min. 40-60)

Limitations of Measurement

- Often tested on college student populations
- Often have little culturally relevance
- Often developed based on Euro-American perspectives
- Methods of assessment often incompatible with different cultural groups
- Measures often only measure a portion of the variable of interest
- Subject to potential interpretation errors

Measurement

- Requires measures that are valid, culturally viable and reliable
- Valid instruments that have been previously tested and used to measure similar variables for similar populations
- Reliable in that they measure the same variable the same way with minimal differences over time
- The group selected the Washington State Juvenile Court Risk Assessment (WSJCR)
- Analysis held constant-social history: risk indicator

Results

- Total of 978 Assessments over 24 months
- Total Sample: 361 youth (186 (51.5%) males, 175 (48.5%) females)
- 80% of sample were multicultural with 20% Caucasian
- Of the original nine agencies at the onset, six remained: 5 intervention and 1 comparison site
- Loss of the "gold" EBP (FFT) was problematic
Conclusions

- CBOs have differential and varying impacts that can be cost effective
- CBOs need pre-evaluation training and preparation to include development of theories of change
- Many CBOs have effective practices but need resources for establishing evidence
- Creative designs using empowerment evaluation can produce evidence for promising practices with diverse populations