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Executive Summary

The goal of the Lincoln County Weed and Seed Project is to prevent and reduce crime in this rural Maine county. To accomplish this goal, Weed and Seed partners, including social service agency members and community citizens, focus their efforts on increasing the capacity of law enforcement to reduce crime. Lincoln County has successfully applied for official recognition as a Weed and Seed site, formed its organizational structure (including a Steering Committee), and begun formulating strategic initiatives for community policing and neighborhood restoration.

Building upon a similar strategy employed in Maine’s Weed and Seed sites in Androscoggin and Sagadahoc Counties, Lincoln County chose to implement the Enhanced Neighborhood Policing (ENP) Curriculum and process as the cornerstone of its effort to build and sustain a collaborative community policing model. ENP is a formal, structured approach and process designed to create a sustainable community-based organization, where neighborhood residents come together and solve community crime problems. Weed and Seed partners felt the ENP model was successful, but to date had not evaluated the ENP training component.

In November 2002, Lincoln County Weed and Seed, the state Weed and Seed Coordinator, Volunteers of Northern New England (VOANNE), and the Maine Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) met to form a partnership with the goal of helping Lincoln County build its capacity to evaluate the Weed and Seed intervention. The partnership applied for funding from the Justice Research Statistics Association (JRSA) and was awarded a grant to help the site build its evaluation capacity and assess the implementation of the project. Project partners also felt it would be important to learn from the implementation experience in the two other Weed and Seed projects in Maine.

The Maine SAC employed a mixed methods evaluation strategy to gather qualitative and quantitative data using training assessments, surveys, and interviews with participants from Lincoln County and the two previous Weed and Seed sites. Partners reviewed instruments designed by the Maine SAC prior to administration of each tool to ensure that the information would help to gauge the progress on the program objectives. During the course of the project, the Maine SAC:

- Interviewed law enforcement officials in the former Weed and Seed site of Androscoggin County;
- Administered training assessments to law enforcement personnel in the new Lincoln County Weed and Seed site;
- Employed a community collaboration index to measure how well Lincoln County Weed and Seed Committee work together in addressing community policing issues; and
- Delivered a logic model training for Lincoln County Weed and Seed mini-grant recipients.

The SAC reported the results of each assessment to partnership members, who used the lessons learned to refine, and in some cases develop new strategies in Lincoln County Weed and Seed. Key findings and recommendations are in three categories (Law Enforcement, Community and ENP Training) and include:

- Provide officers who implement community policing techniques with recognition;
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- Encourage law enforcement ENP proponents to promote it to their colleagues;
- Evaluate all Community Advisory Group and Steering Committee meetings using a simple evaluation tool;
- Support and publicize Community Advisory Group successes;
- Develop a process to change the training based upon officer feedback; and
- Make ENP training optional, not mandatory.

Lastly, the partnership identified several study limitations, mostly due to delays in implementation of ENP training during the time frame of this grant and the inability to gather data from community groups in the former Weed and Seed sites (a resource limitation). To address some of the limitations, Lincoln County Weed and Seed, the state Weed and Seed Coordinator, and/or VOANNE may request further work from the SAC at a later date.
Overview

The goal of the Lincoln County Weed and Seed Project is to prevent and reduce crime in this rural Maine county. To accomplish this goal, Weed and Seed partners focus their efforts on increasing the capacity of law enforcement to reduce crime, and social service agencies and community citizens to prevent crime. An important component of this strategy is to increase the effectiveness of community policing throughout towns in the county. Since its inception in 2002, Lincoln County has successfully applied for official recognition as a Weed and Seed site, formed its organizational structure (including a Steering Committee), and began formulating strategic initiatives for community policing and neighborhood restoration.

Youth Promise, located in Newcastle, ME is coordinating the project. Founded in 1994 to develop corrections options and alternatives for juvenile offenders, Youth Promise has expanded its agenda to build community capacity, including a plan to develop a continuum of programs to help children at risk of criminal conduct. Youth Promise currently collaborates with a number of regional social agencies, community groups, and recreational and educational institutions.

Youth Promise is partnering with Volunteers of America of Northern New England (VOANNE) on the project. VOANNE runs summer camp for at-risk 5th and 6th graders, oversees three pre-trial day reporting programs, oversees two intensive supervision programs for juvenile offenders, administers community policing grants, and operates a 30-bed community corrections center. VOANNE’s role in this project is an advisory one.

The Youth Promise Steering Committee developed the strategy for the Weed and Seed initiative. Building upon a similar strategy employed in Maine’s two previous Weed and Seed sites, (Androscoggin and Sagadahoc Counties), Lincoln County chose to implement the Enhanced Neighborhood Policing (ENP) Curriculum and process as the cornerstone of its effort to build and sustain a collaborative community policing model. (For an overview of ENP, please see the Appendices.)

ENP is best characterized as second generation community policing. It is a formal, structured approach designed to create a sustainable community-based organization, where neighborhood residents come together and solve community crime problems. The process involves:

1) Identifying and prioritizing the problems
2) Analyzing problems
3) Designing response strategies
4) Implementing the plan
5) Assessing its success

Law enforcement and the community work collaboratively to craft strategies to divert community-initiated calls to more appropriate venues, thereby giving law enforcement more time to respond to real police business, such as officer-initiated actions and police actions defined and regulated by existing law enforcement policy or practice. The ENP officer takes on the role of advisor, technical assistance provider, and facilitator for his or her community group. In real terms, law enforcement and the community participate in the examination of aggregated trend data that illustrates certain call patterns and associated community problems.
Purpose

In late 2002, Lincoln County Weed and Seed Project coordinators met with the Maine Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) to develop and implement a process evaluation at the new Lincoln County site. The evaluation would examine the obstacles and facilitators to integration of a community policing program, uncovering strengths and weaknesses in the model based on multiple sources of data.

On the local level, the program evaluation would benefit Lincoln County by providing feedback about what works and what does not, allowing the program to make strategic adjustments in direction based on constructive feedback. In addition, a well-designed evaluation process would help facilitate communication and discussion between law enforcement and the community, thereby contributing to community development.

On the national level, the evaluation would provide documentation regarding best practices in implementing a promising community policing model, a model that is easy to replicate in other municipalities looking for practical options. This may be replicable not only in other rural settings, but also in metropolitan areas. In 2000, ENP was introduced in Mobile, Alabama, a metropolitan area, with anecdotal reported success and measurable reductions in community-initiated calls to police.

Statement of Project Goals

To facilitate the evaluation process, Youth Promise, VOANNE and Maine SAC formed a partnership. The partnership met regularly throughout the project period to discuss the progress of the project and results and make any necessary changes. As a result of these discussions, the following goals were identified:

Goal One: To conduct a multi-method evaluation describing how community policing was implemented in Lincoln County using the ENP Curriculum.

Goal Two: To build the internal capacity of the community Weed and Seed partners to assess progress across key program indicators throughout the life of the project.

Project activities focused on the following objectives:

Objective 1: Assess the impact of the ENP curriculum on both law enforcement officials and community members.

Objective 2: Determine the effectiveness of ENP’s “Geo-beat” concept and community action groups.¹

Objective 3: Gauge the collaborativeness of Lincoln County law enforcement agencies and community group members.

Objective 4: Investigate the sustainability of the ENP curriculum and community policing model in other settings.

Objective 5: Develop local evaluation capacity to evaluate the Weed and Seed Program after the yearlong evaluation.

¹ A Geo-beat is a defined geographic area that officers are assigned to patrol. The premise is that officers who patrol a certain beat will establish relationships with people who live and/or work in the area.
Methods

The Maine SAC employed a mixed methods evaluation strategy to assess the program objectives listed above. In gauging the impact of the ENP training (objective one), the Maine SAC distributed training assessments and conducted follow-up telephone or in-person interviews three to five months after the trainings with four trainees. Since many of these departments are small, often with just one or two officers on duty at any given time, it was not possible to interview any more officers. The Maine SAC also interviewed Auburn Police Department (APD) and Lisbon Police Department (LPD) officers who had gone through the training two-three years ago. Auburn and Lisbon police departments (PD) are part of the Androscoggin County Weed and Seed site.

Reviewing the Geo-beat Model (objective two) and investigating the sustainability of the ENP curriculum and community policing model in other settings (objective four) also involved interviewing ENP trainees from the Auburn and Lisbon police departments. These officers have had ample time to implement the techniques they learned in the training. The information they gave the Maine SAC is providing valuable information to the Lincoln County law enforcement officials as they implement their own Geo-beats.2

Gauging the collaborativeness of the Lincoln County Weed and Seed Project Steering Committee (objective three) entailed administering a community collaboration index3 to all steering committee members who attended the September, 2003 meeting. Committee members used the index to measure how well they, a very diverse group, work together in addressing community policing issues. The index includes 19 key factors that have been found to be critical to successful collaboration.

In order to help develop local evaluation capacity (objective five), the Maine SAC provided evaluation skills training for Lincoln County Weed and Seed Project mini-grant recipients. This training was evaluated by participants.

Findings

1. Enhanced Neighborhood Policing (ENP) Training

To better understand the ENP curriculum, Maine SAC staff interviewed the ENP developer/trainer and studied the training materials. From the interviews and review of documents, the SAC developed a training assessment form to be used at the conclusion of ENP trainings. A copy of this form is in Appendices.

The Maine SAC employed a training evaluation methodology grounded in the framework outlined by Donald Kirkpatrick in his book, Training Programs: The Four Levels.4 Kirkpatrick’s four levels of training evaluation are:

1) Participants’ reactions to the training,
2) Knowledge, attitudes, and skills gained through training,
3) Transfer of new learning to the on-the-job performance, and
4) Outcomes.

---

2 Since the Lincoln County ENP training just occurred there is limited Geo-beat or community advisory group (CAG) information. The Lincoln County Geo-beat areas and the CAGs are still being defined and organized.
The training assessment form addresses levels 1 & 2. Typically, level 3 (learning transfer) training evaluation takes place six to nine months after training. Originally, the Maine SAC planned to conduct some level 3 training evaluation, but ENP training was postponed four months precluding level 3 evaluation.

The first ENP trainings of the fall were postponed until December 2003. In December, two trainings took place. The Waldoboro PD (four officers and the chief) and the Lincoln County Sheriff’s Office (18 officers, detectives and supervisors) were trained at two different events. In February 2004, the State Police-Lincoln County (SP-LC) detachment (three officers and one lieutenant) were trained. In late March, the Damariscotta PD (four officers) were trained.

With the exception of the Lincoln County Sheriff’s Office, all ENP training participants completed the training assessment form that the Maine SAC team had developed.5

The Maine SAC received 13 completed ENP training assessments – five from the Waldoboro PD and four each from the SP-LC and the Damariscotta PD. The assessment directed the trainees to answer scaled and open-ended questions about the trainer, training, the training materials, and overall impression.

For the scaled questions, the trainees answered as follows:

**Training Assessment Responses: Scaled Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The trainer demonstrated knowledge of content</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The trainer encouraged appropriate levels of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation &amp; questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The training had clearly stated purposes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The training were organized so I could see how</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concepts and skills were related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The training included feedback to participants on their</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The handouts were clear and helpful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The handouts were relevant to the topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the most part, the trainer, the training, and handouts received favorable marks. With just three exceptions, all the “neutral” and “disagree” ratings were made by Waldoboro PD participants at the December training.

Not all trainees completed the open-ended questions, but several respondents did take the time to complete the section. As a result, these questions did not yield a lot of information. One question that provided several responses was “What training activity was the most helpful?” The officers who answered this question indicated they enjoyed the activities that identified some of the problem areas in their own jurisdictions, especially those activities which enabled them to study and analyze data.

---

5 The person distributing the assessments at the SP-LC training misplaced them and they were never returned to the Maine SAC for analysis.
Five trainees answered the question, “What are some of the obstacles/barriers to implementing community policing techniques?” Three of these respondents cited time and resources as potential barriers. One person said ENP represented a new way of policing. Another trainee stated that he thought that the calls for service data collected for the ENP training did not give a true indication of what law enforcement was doing to address community policing issues.

In response to the question, “If you were charged with re-designing this week's curriculum what changes would you make and why?,” one officer recommended that the training handouts be distributed prior to class so officers could read them before class instead of during class. Another officer suggested that the training curriculum include examples from rural and large geographical counties in which Sheriff's offices have had success with problem solving.

Some trainees provided additional comments at the end of the assessment. One officer offered that the instructor is a real asset to the program. A conflicting opinion was put forth by another officer who stated, “[The] instructor should value input from students rather than cut off a student's comments just because it may conflict with [her] views.” One trainee indicated the training would benefit from more handouts, while another participant said he had problems understanding the handouts. Lastly, an officer mentioned it was difficult to assess the ENP because it was the first time he had seen this type of policing.

**Follow-Up Lincoln County Interviews**

In April and May 2004, the Maine SAC conducted follow-up interviews with law enforcement officials who had gone through the ENP training. Several interview questions invited the trainees to reflect back on the ENP training.

**Question #1.** At the time what did you think of the training? How has your thinking of the training changed?

One respondent was impressed by the training and content, but a little skeptical of how it would be implemented. This officer stated that it would take a lot of cooperation from both law enforcement and the community for ENP to happen. One officer mentioned being a little confused by ENP the first time around. A follow-up training helped this officer.

Another officer stated that many of the ideas/techniques mentioned in the training were already in place at the department; however, this officer indicated that the department could benefit from more emphasis on community policing techniques. Yet another officer said, “I’ve been inundated with community policing since college 9 years ago. I’ve been putting community policing into practice long before anyone told me to and I’ll be doing it long after this has gone by the wayside.”

**Question #2.** What elements of the training were the most challenging to put into practice?

Since most departments were just beginning to implement ENP, most officers responded to this question by suggesting what would be challenging. One officer thought the hardest part to implement would be obtaining the public’s cooperation in problem solving. “I think it’s going to be going to be harder for the community to trust [us]. It’s going to be difficult for the officers to trust the public too. They are used to doing things for themselves and not asking for any help.”

Another officer questioned whether community-initiated calls for services could be reduced as the trainer had suggested. This officer opined that these types of calls could be reduced in larger law enforcement agencies, but was uncertain the same was true for smaller ones. “In a larger agency you have the luxury of
going out on the “cat in a tree call.” In a small community they expect us to do the cat in the tree calls and I don’t think we’re ever going to get away from those … calls.”

**Question #3.** Since being trained, what parts of the training have you been able to use?

One person said the training enhanced the community policing techniques already employed by his/her agency. Another officer suggested that the training reminded the trainees to work on mediating factors that contribute to repeat calls from certain locations. This officer stated that they were already using this strategy; however, the training re-energized them to focus even more on these mediating factors.

A third trainee said that s/he had already used the problem-solving techniques advanced by the trainer with some level of success. This officer said that by using problem-solving techniques with a couple who used to generate a lot of calls for services (e.g., domestic disputes) the calls had been eliminated.

**Question #4.** At the time of training did you intend to use the information from the ENP training? If no, please explain.

The consensus response to this question was “Yes.” One officer said, “We do whatever we can to make our job easier.” This same officer lamented that his department does not have the resources to respond to all calls and that community problem solving offers a way to reduce the call volume.

Another officer stated that the ENP curriculum is not the only way to do community policing. This law enforcement official was taking the best from several models and integrating them into the way s/he does police work.

**Interviews with Androscoggin County Weed and Seed Trainees**

**Changes to the ENP Curriculum**

Officers were asked, “If you were charged with re-designing the curriculum, what changes would you make and why?” Three officers (both departments) stated that the curriculum is based too much on numbers and not enough on face-to-face interactions. A couple of officers said that there are external factors, over which they have no control, which can influence the numbers.

Some of the officers interviewed had several concrete suggestions on how to change the training. Among them are:

- Reduce the time between classes,
- Provide more in-depth class instruction and less time spent reading,
- Alter the mandatory community meetings to be less structured, and
- Make the trainings voluntary for officers.

**Repeating Portions of the Training**

Officers were asked, “If you were to repeat a portion of the training, what part would it be?” Most respondents said none to this question. However, three officers (both departments) indicated the problem-solving portions should be repeated.

**Reactions to the Training**

Six of the nine interviewees (in both departments) expressed negative reactions about the training. These reactions had not changed over time. They stated they do not need anyone to tell them how to interact
with the public. One officer indicated his displeasure with how the community advisory groups (CAG)\(^6\) are configured. Another officer said the training should encourage CAG members to focus on one issue instead of multiple issues. Another person suggested that the classes be more instruction-focused with less time spent on reading the workbook.

On the contrary, three officers enjoyed the training. One had originally attended to get overtime. Since then, he feels more responsible towards his community. Another person thought the problem solving and getting the community together are great ideas.

### Putting Training Elements into Practice - Challenges

Among the most commonly mentioned challenges was recruiting CAG members. This was cited by three officers (in both departments). For one officer, it was hard to find the time to recruit. For another it was trying to find the requisite number who would regularly attend meeting. The third person indicated that forming a CAG based on the curriculum guidelines was challenging.

Another challenge brought up by two officers (in both departments) was getting the public interested and involved. For one of these officers, keeping community members focused on the subject is a challenge. Citizens sometimes use these community meetings to vent. Along the same lines, two police officers (in both departments) said the biggest challenge for the CAGs is coming up with a problem and developing solutions to these problems.

### 2. Geo-Beats and Community Advisory Groups

In October 2003, the Muskie School interviewed nine officers - four at the Auburn PD and five at the Lisbon PD - to gauge their reaction to the Geo-beats concept and community advisory groups. The evaluation team interviewed both ENP/community policing advocates and detractors. The team interviewed people of varying ranks within each department.

### Reactions to the “Geo-beat” Concept

Three officers (both departments) said they liked the Geo-beat concept. One officer stated it allows officers to develop personal contacts in community. One respondent said he went along with the idea because officers should be talking with people in their community.

In contrast, two officers indicated the current Geo-beats should be re-configured. One officer suggested the beats should be based on “functional beats,” such as schools, housing communities, etc. Another officer said the departments should develop beats where the problems exist. Another officer mentioned that specific officers, who are interested in community policing, should take the lead and implement the program. Lastly, two officers reported that they often patrol an area outside their Geo-beat making it difficult to develop a connection to the area.

### Challenges in Forming a CAG

Of the CAG challenges mentioned most often by officers, recruitment was cited by five officers (both departments). Three of these interviewees had problems with CAG composition criteria. One of these officers mentioned that the people you get for the CAG are not always the best people for your group. According to two officers (both departments) attendance at CAG meetings was the biggest challenge. One

---

\(^6\) A community action group (CAG) is a group of key civic leaders and individuals who have coalesced to identify and prioritize community problems and develop solutions.
of these officers said the problem was getting enough police officers to attend them. Another officer bemoaned the lack of interest from community business leaders in joining the CAG.

On the other hand, two officers (both departments) indicated they had no problems in forming a CAG. One of these individuals said they got help from the city.

CAG’s Help in Problem Solving
Four officers (both departments) indicated that the CAGs had educated the departments about certain community problems, some of which have been resolved. The CAGs had also increased awareness in the community about the police department. According to one officer, the CAG has helped craft town ordinances in one of the two communities. Another officer stated that the CAG has helped one of the departments establish a list of contacts in the community they can turn to for help in solving community problems. In contrast, three police officers (both departments) mentioned that the CAG has not had much of an impact in helping the department with problem solving.

Most Frequent Problems Raised by the CAGs
Three officers (same department) indicated traffic issues are most commonly cited problems. Two of these officers also mentioned that parking matters are problematic as well. Juvenile problems and speeding were mentioned by one officer.

One officer stated that the number and frequency of problems have gone down, but the complaints are the same. According to one officer, his department is now more proactive in addressing problems. One officer pointed out that residents now feel more comfortable to approach officers and share community problems with them.

CAG Members’ Struggles with the ENP/Community Mobilization Process
According to two officers interviewed, getting CAG members to attend meetings, when there are no clearly identified problems has been one of the biggest struggles. Another challenge faced by one officer is educating members about what problems the police can address. According to one officer, CAG members have struggled with electing their own leaders. On another note, one officer was irked with many of his colleagues’ unwillingness to participate in the ENP process.

3. Community Collaboration
The evaluation team developed a community collaborative index to measure how well Lincoln County Weed and Seed Committee, a very diverse group, work together in addressing community policing issues. The committee is made up of local law enforcement officials, domestic violence advocates, educators, and other interested community members. This tool is based on nineteen key factors that have been found to be critical to the success of collaboration.

The instrument was administered in early September at the Lincoln County Weed and Seed Project regular monthly meeting. It was also sent to members who were unable to make the September meeting. Results were tabulated in early October. A copy of the instrument is in the Appendices.
Community Collaboration Index Results
The group scored themselves very high when it came to group membership characteristics - ability to compromise, seeing the benefit in collaborating, and sharing an understanding, trust, and a respect for each other and their respective organizations.

The group also scored itself high on factors related to process and structure. Members agreed that group members share a stake in the way the group works and has the ability to sustain itself in the midst of major changes. In addition, members generally agreed that all members have the opportunity to participate in various decision making processes and it remains open to varied ways of organizing itself.

An area that group scored itself low on was factors related to purpose. The three lowest rated questions all had to do with these factors. Many group members disagreed with the following three statements. In the case of the latter two statements, more than half of the members either disagreed or strongly disagreed.

- Our group has a unique mission and purpose.
- Concrete, attainable goals and objectives of the group are clear to all members.
- Group members have the same vision, with clearly agreed upon mission, objectives, and strategy.

These results were presented to the group at its November meeting and can be found in the Appendices.

Based on the results, the Steering Committee decided to convene a strategic planning session in early 2004 led by a skilled facilitator. Due to some scheduling conflicts this strategic planning session has yet to take place. It had been anticipated that the instrument would be re-administered; however, the Weed and Seed Project Steering Committee declined because they had not yet processed the results from the initial administration.

Lincoln County Weed and Seed Project Membership Survey
The Maine SAC also assisted the Lincoln County Weed and Seed Project with a membership survey. The survey was designed to get members to reflect upon the coalition’s accomplishments and where the coalition should be headed. Ten members completed all or parts of the survey. In response to the survey’s close-ended questions, members could choose from the following responses: strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree. The full results can be found in the Appendices.

Questions that elicited strong agreement include:

- **Question #7.** I feel that my ideas are valued and respected in coalition meetings.  
  100% of respondents either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed.

- **Question #6.** I feel well informed about the mission and goals of our coalition and I could explain them to a fellow resident.  
  100% of respondents somewhat agreed with the statement.

- **Question #2.** Being a member of the steering committee has been a rewarding experience.  
  80% of respondents either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed.
Lincoln County Weed & Seed Evaluation Partnership Project

- **Question #3.** *I feel the coalition has value and that we have made a positive impact in our county.*
  
  80% of respondents either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed.

Questions that did not elicit strong agreement include:

- **Question #9.** *I feel we should expand the membership of our coalition.*
  
  50% of respondents either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed.

- **Question #8.** *I feel our current coalition will allow us to operate even without Dept. of Justice funding.*
  
  10% of respondents somewhat agreed.

**Survey Comments**

Throughout the survey, members offered comments on a range of issues pertaining to the coalition. In regards to the coalition in general one member offered, “Weed and Seed has been [a] very positive experience for me.” On the subject of monthly meeting, one person suggested the following change, “Bi-monthly perhaps or quarterly [with] regular committee meetings each month as needed.” Shifting to the topic of mission and goals a member said, “A training for [the] Steering Committee on this topic would help and inform us on how to promote it to citizens.” Lastly, on the subject of membership, one person added, “Important for now! I would be willing to recruit. Business people, [re-enlisting] old members who represented the community well.”

4. **Sustainability**

Lincoln County Weed and Seed Project chose to implement the ENP training and process employed in Maine’s two previous Weed and Seed sites (Androscoggin and Sagadahoc Counties) as the cornerstone of its effort to build and sustain a collaborative community policing model.

The purpose of this phase of the evaluation was to get law enforcements officials to reflect back upon the changes their departments have undergone since the training, and the role of ENP in those changes. It is worth mentioning that the training curriculum has been changed since some of these officers were trained. Some of their concerns are being addressed as new departments are trained.

In October 2003, the Maine SAC interviewed nine officers - four at the Auburn PD and five at the Lisbon PD - to gauge their reaction to the ENP curriculum. The evaluation team interviewed both advocates and detractors. The team interviewed people of varying ranks within each department. A copy of the interview guide for the Auburn and Lisbon Police Departments is in the Appendices.

**Themes**

**Changes in Police Work**

While at least three officers (from both departments) thought the ENP curriculum had not changed the way the departments do police work, others felt it had. Another officer held that ENP has had a limited impact on the way the office does police work. However, this same officer acknowledged that ENP has enabled his department to focus a bit more on conflict resolution and small neighborhood problems. Yet another officer mentioned that community policing is a great tool; however, he is not an ENP proponent. He believes that community policing had been integral to his department long before the curriculum was
introduced. A couple of officers would like to see the training revised. One claims it is too basic while another would like to see the guidelines modified to enable him to use an existing community group as his CAG.

Two officers (from the same department) claim the ENP process has encouraged their colleagues to be more proactive than reactive in its policing efforts. The officers claim that community policing efforts have encouraged officers to get out of their police cars more often. According to two officers (one from each department), enhanced community policing efforts have led to a reduction in the calls for service. Two officers mentioned that the community is now more interested and involved in police department (one department) matters. With a more informed community, the department has been more successful in getting town ordinances passed that are beneficial to law enforcement.

Public Perceptions of Law Enforcement

Seven of the nine officers indicated that public perceptions of their departments have improved since they implemented ENP and other community policing efforts. The departments have a better rapport with their respective communities. One of the officers stated that the public speaks highly of the department and the officers’ willingness to do follow-ups. Another mentioned that having meetings and a presence in the community allows people to see you on a personal level.

One officer felt that the public’s perceptions have had no effect on the daily routine police work. This officer claimed that his/her department has always enjoyed good support from the community. Since the department has practiced community policing for some time, the community has positive reactions to it.

Changes in Law Enforcement/Community Perceptions

Four (both departments) of the nine law enforcement officials indicated that ENP training has not changed their feelings for the community. A couple officers indicated they were already very involved in community matters prior to the training. However, two officers (both departments) mentioned that they are now more involved in community matters. One officer stated that he has a greater appreciation and empathy for the people and children of differing economic means. Since the advent of ENP, one officer said the community is much more involved in crafting policy. Residents are more concerned about what goes on in the community.

Two officers (in both departments) were critical of the training and its focus on community policing. One officer, who professed to be “old school,” suggested that he had been doing community policing for quite some time. Further, he stated he knew more about the subject than the trainer, who he indicated had no police background. Lastly, one officer said his Geo-beat is fairly inactive with very little going on.

ENP has changed some police officers’ feelings toward the community. While some were already involved in community matters, other officers indicated they are more engaged in community matters. Finally, some officers are critical of the training because they already feel they are doing community policing.

Joint planning between Officers and their Supervisors

Five officers (both departments) indicated that they no longer do joint ENP planning with their immediate supervisor. Two of these officers said that while the training was taking place, they did some planning with their supervisor. On the other hand, monthly meetings are the norm for three of the officers interviewed for this study. One officer indicated he meets every three weeks with his supervisor to do some ENP planning.
Reductions in the Types of Disorders/Calls for Service
Officers from both departments indicated that the types of disorders reduced most since the implementation of the ENP process were domestic and public disturbances and criminal mischief. A decrease in domestic situations was cited by a couple of officers. The following issues were mentioned once: animal complaints, speeding, parking violations, juvenile problems, burglary of motor vehicles, car lockouts. Lastly, one officer indicated that there had been a drop in calls for service, but he did not think it was as a result of community policing efforts.

Problem Solving Challenges
An issue that perplexes the CAG is problem solving. Two officers (both departments) said developing solutions to problems is a challenge. One of the officers requested that the curriculum include more face-to-face time to help community members analyze the problem. Another officer thinks the training focuses on problems that have already been solved by his department. One officer mentioned that his community group finds it difficult to focus on one problem at a time. Also, one officer felt that getting the CAG to identify any problem was a challenge.

Professional and Personal Accomplishments
Four officers (both departments) stated they had not received any personal or professional accolades since taking part in the training. Two officers were skeptical of the training. One said that some his colleagues probably need the training, but that it was pretty basic to him.

Seven of the interviewees (both departments) have not been promoted since the training. Two officers have been promoted, though both of them indicated that their promotions were not attributable to ENP. Three officers (both departments) cited awards that had been bestowed upon them. They attributed these honors in part to their community policing work. Another two officers (both departments) mentioned “community” accomplishments that occurred as a result of community policing. These accomplishments included the installation of a bus ramp for elderly wheelchair users and a traffic light to slow traffic on a residential street.

Job Satisfaction since ENP
Since the ENP training, three officers (both departments) indicated their job satisfaction levels have improved. One of them said he is dealing with positive people more often. Two officers (both departments) mentioned that their job satisfaction level is high, but ENP had nothing to do with it. Two officers (both departments) noted no change in their job satisfaction levels. One interviewee said his satisfaction with his job is probably worse. He wishes the training was voluntary. Lastly, one officer claims that it is not an effective project.

Job Autonomy since ENP Training
Seven officers (both departments) indicated that their level of job autonomy has not changed since the training. According to two officers, their superiors place a lot of trust in them to do their jobs. They hold them a high ethical standard; however, they are given a lot of autonomy.

5. Local Evaluation Capacity
The Maine SAC team proposed enhancing the evaluation capacity of the Lincoln County Weed and Seed Project to evaluate their programs after this year-long evaluation. To develop such capacity, the evaluation
team designed a logic model training for all Weed and Seed mini-grant recipients. Logic models allow you to provide a snapshot view of your program and intended outcomes to funders, staff, policymakers, the media, or other colleagues. Arrows are used to link the components of the model to reflect the sequence of events necessary for the program to be effective. A copy of the logic model PowerPoint training presentation is in the Appendices. The training was held in early October on a day in which high winds and rain knocked out power to the Mid-Coast of Maine. The trainers were unable to present their PowerPoint slides and instead had to lead the presentation using handouts that were read by flashlight. Despite the inconvenience, trainees sketched out logic model diagrams for their individual programs. Participants were asked to complete their models once they returned to their offices. They were also encouraged to get feedback from their respective staffs on the model.

Results indicate that most community participants were pleased with the trainer, the workshops and the materials. (A copy of the training evaluation summary is in the Appendices.) A few people indicated they would have liked more time and one person said they would like a follow-up training on creating data collection instruments.

Instead of offering another daylong training on creating data collection instruments, the Maine SAC opted to provide individual phone or in-person consultation to all trainees. An e-mail message was sent to all trainees inviting them to take advantage of this service. Shortly thereafter, the Maine SAC also called training participants and reminded them of the Maine SAC’s availability and interest in working with them to design data collection instruments. Unfortunately, no trainees took advantage of these offers by the end of June.

Study Limitations

Training assessment data collection problems
Not all ENP trainings were assessed with the data collection forms developed by the Maine SAC. The instructor felt uncomfortable administering them and in some cases the completed assessments were not mailed to the SAC. As a result, ENP training assessment data are limited.

Uncertainty of training schedule
In a rural environment with small police departments, scheduling ENP training requires a lot of flexibility. Since most Lincoln County law enforcement agencies have relatively few staff, adjustments sometimes have to be made to account for staff absences. All trainings scheduled for the fall of 2003 had to be rescheduled because other things arose. The delays meant that the evaluation activities planned for this project had to be scaled back or eliminated. Delays in training also meant that CAG formation in certain communities was postponed. The Maine SAC intended to document the CAG formation process in at least one community, but this did not happen.

Limited number of follow-up interviews in Lincoln County
The Maine SAC intended to interview more Lincoln County law enforcement officials who took the ENP training. The Maine SAC made several attempts to contact trainees to get their perspectives and reactions to the training. Numerous phone calls were made, but few responded. Follow-up questionnaires were

---

mailed to the trainees as well, but only a couple of surveys were returned. The small size of many of these rural departments prevented the type of participation that one could expect from their urban counterparts.

**Recommendations**

The Maine SAC periodically provided a summary of evaluation data for review by the evaluation partnership. The following findings and recommendations are the result of qualitative and quantitative evaluation data from this project and reflect the key lessons learned by the partnership. Lincoln County Weed and Seed is integrating the lessons learned into project activities.

**Law Enforcement**

Nurture greater participation from senior law enforcement officials.
In developing a community policing strategy, it is important that senior level administrators are involved. While delegating some oversight of a community policing program is expected, officers need to know that their supervisors are squarely behind the program. Their active involvement would go a long way to defuse resentment from officers who resist ENP and other community policing strategies.

Provide officers who implement community policing techniques with recognition.
Several officers interviewed mentioned that their supervisors and chiefs do not talk regularly with them about ENP and/or community policing. For the program to sustain itself positive reinforcement from management is needed. Skeptical officers need to know that if they adopt ENP practices there will be some reward for them, either official recognition, job advancement possibilities, and/or pay increases. Further, these acts of recognition need to be shared with the greater community to inform them that the departments buy into community policing.

Encourage law enforcement ENP proponents to promote it to their colleagues.
The best potential salespeople for community policing are law enforcement officials who buy into the model. Officers who are on the fence about the model would be more easily swayed by a colleague than a community member. In many communities across the country, community policing has worked. It has freed up law enforcement officials to concentrate on non-community initiated calls. Community policing advocates in Lincoln County need to advocate for this type of institutional change if it is going to happen. Partnership members informed the Maine SAC that several officers highly motivated to use ENP and community policing in general have been rewarded by promotions and upgrades. Lincoln County Weed and Seed is looking at this issue of recognition and encouragement of law enforcement within police jurisdictions.

Convey community-initiated call data to officers.
Some officers do not receive the community-initiated call data from their superiors. This is especially important for those officers who may not be community policing proponents and question the ENP process. Officers need to know if their community policing tactics are working.

**Curriculum**

Develop a process to modify the ENP training based upon officer feedback.
Some of the officers interviewed had several concrete suggestions on how to change the training. Among them are: reduce the time between classes, provide more in-depth class instruction and less time spent
reading was the request of officer, alter the mandatory community meetings to be less structured, and make the trainings voluntary for officers. Given a little more time, a systematic process of training evaluation could help Lincoln County Weed and Seed and the ENP trainer identify and adjust the curriculum.

**Make ENP training optional, not mandatory.**
Several officers with the Auburn and Lisbon police departments still took exception to being made to attend ENP training some two+ years ago. Some of these officers still harbored resentment towards the ENP trainer, although the trainer did not have the authority to make ENP mandatory. Some of these officers expressed resistance to being forced to attend training by stating that they had no intention of incorporating community policing practices into their jobs. A couple of officers suggested that volunteers should be identified who are interested in community policing. Responding to officer feedback, the curriculum designer has dropped the mandatory requirement to all but the problem solving component of the curriculum.

To some extent, these comments illustrate a key issue of performance management within law enforcement jurisdictions – how law enforcement leadership promotes and integrates the philosophy of community policing within a department. Partnership members in Lincoln County feel this is a strategic issue that needs to be recognized and reinforced when possible by Weed and Seed project activities.

**Implement, collect and analyze training assessments in a timely manner.**
The ENP instructor, who also wrote the curriculum, did not want to influence the way in which the training assessments were filled out. She asked that someone else collect and mail them to the Maine SAC. In one case, the assessment forms were misplaced by the person collecting them and were never mailed. In another cases, the assessment forms were delayed in reaching the Maine SAC. The trainer is on-site and is logical choice to coordinate training assessment collection. The instructor could leave the classroom while the forms are being completed anonymously and sealed in an envelope. A systematic approach to collecting and summarizing ENP training assessments would provide data for adjustment of the training over time. In short, training assessments should be administered at the conclusion of all training sessions.

**Community Advisory Groups**

**Modify Community Advisory Group composition standards.**
Several ENP trainees in Auburn and Lisbon were critical of CAG composition standards. Some of this criticism was echoed by community policing proponents. Some officers said they could have started a CAG much easier if they been allowed to recruit people they knew were interested in serving on the CAG as opposed to selecting people from various professional categories. By altering the standards, CAG formation could probably be achieved more readily, with the greater likelihood that law enforcement would ‘own’ their CAGs and work to sustain them.

**CAG’s mission should be well articulated and understood by its members.**
The CAGs should have a clearly defined mission and its members should be able to communicate and understand it. The purpose of meetings should be to share ideas about problems and to recognize possible solutions. On an annual basis they should engage in setting realistic goal and objectives. At the end of each program year, CAG members should reflect back on their accomplishments to determine if the objectives have been met. All members should know the role of the group and how they can contribute to the workload.
**Monitor CAG and Steering Committee attendance.**
In reviewing CAG attendance among the Auburn and Lisbon groups it would appear that membership is flagging. Opening up the meetings to the public might encourage more membership and involvement. Moving the meetings to locations where community-initiated calls originate most may also encourage involvement and foster solutions to these calls.

**Encourage community participation in CAG meetings.**
In reviewing the literature on community policing, it would appear that law enforcement officials often end up running the community meeting. In order for community policing to be a true partnership, community members need to take a more active role. Whether that means running the meetings or serving as officers, community members should shoulder more responsibility. As CAGs are developed in Lincoln County, the role of community members should not only be discussed but agreed upon by law enforcement and community.

**Evaluate CAG and Weed and Steering Committee Meetings.**
All meetings should be assessed. A simple evaluation could be developed that would ask meeting participants whether the meeting was effectively run. Meetings could be rated for satisfaction as well. In addition, the assessment form could ask participants if they learned anything at the meeting and whether they had an opportunity to participate. Lastly, attendance should be assessed by gender, education, homeowner status, etc. to ensure that a cross-section of the community is represented at the meetings.

**Support and Publicize Community Advisory Group Successes.**
CAGs in Androscoggin and Sagadahoc counties have been successful for many years. Some of these groups were formed seven years ago and are still working on community policing issues. As CAGs develop and tackle community policing efforts in Lincoln County it is important that they publicize its efforts. For one, publicity can serve as a recruitment tool. More importantly, publicity serves to recognize members for their efforts.

**Structure**

**Form a Regional Weed and Seed Assessment Committee**
A number of the recommendations referenced above identify the need for a systematic way of integrating the discussion of project data and feedback into all Weed and Seed program activities. A representative group of law enforcement officials, CAG members, and other interested parties from all Weed and Seed projects in southern and central Maine could be formed to periodically review, analyze and discuss:

- ENP training evaluations;
- Steering committee and CAG meetings and action plan progress reports;
- Community-initiated call data; and
- Other information sources.

Evaluation highlights, trends and recommendations of the Assessment Committee could be included as a standing item on the Steering Committee agenda.
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What is Enhanced Neighborhood Policing?

Enhanced Neighborhood Policing, ENP for short, is an implementation process that allows a community to move from the philosophy and theory of community policing to its actual practice. ENP is a structured approach that creates a sustainable community-based organization known as a community justice project. The purpose of this community justice project is to achieve measurable reductions in crime, substance abuse, delinquency and family violence.

ENP has three levels: Level 1 (Coalescing), Level 2 (Prevention), and Level 3 (Containment). The first level, coalescing, is where law enforcement agencies, ENP officers, and community partners plan for and mobilize community residents. Larger communities usually create both a community wide advisory committee and neighborhood subcommittees. Smaller communities often create only an advisory committee. During the coalescing phase, officers and neighborhood residents work together to understand the problems of community crime, substance abuse, delinquency, and family violence. They begin to create resolutions to repeat law enforcement problems that occur repeatedly.

The second level, prevention, occurs when community groups identify strategies that will prevent the future occurrence of problems. Important during the "prevention" phase is the identification of regional problems where residents from different communities can work collaboratively for the benefit of all.

The third level, containment, involves identifying ways in which the effectiveness, efficiency, quality, and user satisfaction with the justice system can be improved. Targeting repeat offenders and reducing the rate of recidivism are activities that take place during containment.
How is ENP different from community policing?

ENP is best characterized as second generation community policing. It is not a philosophy, but rather a formal, structured approach. ENP's key difference from first generation community policing is that it results in the creation of a sustainable community-based organization, where neighborhood residents come together and solve the problems of community crime, substance abuse, delinquency, and violence. While law enforcement professionals participate, they are but one participant in a much larger collaborative. Because of the importance of community residents in achieving problem solving success, it's important that they also learn mobilization, problem solving, and management skills. To that end, the ENP officer learns these skills and then takes on the role of advisor, technical assistance provider, and facilitator for his or her community group.

What does ENP education involve?

ENP is a practicum, where 10% of the course work is covered in class. The remaining 90% involves field work conducted by the participant in his or her neighborhood. ENP education consists of twelve (12) separate modules conducted in monthly four-hour sessions. The purpose of the classroom sessions is to introduce participants to new concepts and skills. These classroom sessions also provide a forum for participants, to discuss successes and problems, as well as develop approaches to implementation obstacles.

However, the real value of ENP education is in the practical application of these skills. Thus, each module contains an ENP Project that the participant is expected to complete prior to attending the next session... Each ENP Project is an actual implementation step. As the participant completes successive ENP Projects, he or she will mobilize the neighborhood, conduct data gathering and analysis, learn and exercise problem solving skills, and become proficient at managing the ENP implementation. The ENP Projects are not "busy work." Rather, they lead participants through the ENP implementation steps in a structured, supported way.

**But every neighborhood is different. How can the implementation steps be the same?**

Each implementation step is a decision making step. Participants have tremendous flexibility and autonomy in making these decisions. ENP education will highlight the decision points and the strengths and weaknesses of some common alternatives. ENP officers and community participants have the ultimate decision making responsibility. The tasks engaged in by different neighborhoods will vary widely with the types of problems the neighborhood is facing. These tasks will also vary depending on the skills of the community members and the resources available to them.
At the end of coalescing, approximately one year, no two neighborhood groups will be identical. Their problem lists will vary, and the role of the ENP Officer will be distinctive to that group. However, at the end of coalescing, some common problems will emerge that provide an excellent basis for future collaborative efforts.

What are the implementation steps?

The coalescing implementation steps can be divided into five major groups: planning, community mobilization, data gathering and analysis, problem-solving, and project management. Each of these steps builds on the other with information from previous steps integrated into subsequent ones. In other words, the steps are hierarchical and interdependent. Skipping one can create catastrophic problems using existing resources or, in some cases, elongating their implementation time frame.

This sounds like a lot of Work.

Where am I going to find the time?

It is a lot of work. To complete the coalescing phase will take approximately 440 hours, including classroom time. Part of each class will involve how best to complete each ENP Project, including how to find the time. There are a variety of tactics that have been used by other ENP officers and community members, the vast majority of whom have completed their implementation using existing resources or, in some cases, elongating their implementation time frame.

One tactic is to complete community mobilization as soon as possible. When community members are mobilized and begin decision making, they also take on a greater share of the responsibility and accountability for their community problems. Community members can reduce the amount of work expended by officers by taking on problem resolution tasks which were previously the responsibility of the ENP officer. In the long term, success by community members in resolving low-level problems means freeing up the disproportionate amount of law enforcement resource that these problems had previously consumed.
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How will it help me?

ENP officers and community residents become leaders. They learn and practice a wide range of community mobilization, public relations, problem solving, and management skills. In the process of creating a community, based organization that becomes successful in solving problems, participants learn leadership and personnel management skills. All these skills are necessary for professional advancement.

Most important is that ENP officers consistently report increased job satisfaction. For the first time in their careers many ENP officers are spending significant time with positive, supportive, pro, social community members. They are networking and collaborating with ENP officers from other departments, expanding their collective world view. They are solving the low, level, repetitive problems, freeing them to take up more challenging, interesting work. While the transition from a traditional role to that of ENP officer is demanding the tangible and intangible personal rewards have made it an appealing choice for many law enforcement officers.

What will be accomplished in the next twelve months?

Briefly, you will have attended all the classes and completed all the ENP Projects. At the end of the year, your neighborhood or community will be mobilized. There will be a community committee that meets regularly and has solved at least three problems. You will have documented and evaluated these problems. Your group will be in the process of identifying problems which are regional as well as local. The committee will also be discussing ways of working collaboratively with other groups to solve these regional problems. The group will be ready to begin work on prevention and containment initiatives. Most important, your committee will be aware of and operating within
the context of the newly formed community justice project.
# Enhanced Neighborhood Policing (ENP) Training

*Spring 2004*

- Please completely fill in the circle for your response. (Sample: ●) Thank you.
- Include as many written comments as you can. If more space is needed, use additional paper.
- All information on this form is confidential.

## TRAINING ASSESSMENT

**Date:** ________________

(please fill in)

Fill in the circle that best describes how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

### 1. The trainer(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>● demonstrated knowledge of content</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>● showed respect for the experiences and knowledge of participants</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>● encouraged appropriate levels of participation and questions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>● was flexible (adjusted session “on the fly” to accommodate changes)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___________________________________________________________________________________

### 2. The workshop:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>● had clearly stated purposes</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>● was organized so I could see how concepts and skills were related</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>● included feedback to participants on their progress</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___________________________________________________________________________________

### 3. The materials used and/or handouts were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>● clear and understandable</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>● relevant to the topic</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___________________________________________________________________________________

### 4. Overall Impression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11A</td>
<td>● The knowledge and skills from this workshop are applicable to my job</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11B</td>
<td>● This workshop provided me with skills and tools I can use</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(over)
5. The training activity was most helpful?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

6. What subjects did you struggle with today? Please be specific

_____________________________________________________________________________________

7. Do you intend to use the information from today's training? If no, please explain.

_____________________________________________________________________________________

8. What are some of the obstacles/barriers to implementing community policing techniques?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

9. If you were charged with re-designing the curriculum what changes would you make and why? Would you add/subtract anything?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

10. What are your reactions to the workbook materials and exercises? What, if any, improvements would you make to these materials?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

11. (For ENP Community Mobilization trainees only) Were you able to complete the work activities from the previous module for today's session? What, if any, problems did you encounter?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

12. Any other comments?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
ENP Training Follow-up Questions

Introduction
1. How has ENP changed the way your office does police work? What has changed the most? What do you do more of? Less of?

2. Since having started ENP, how have your feelings about the community changed?

3. Since implementation, how would you characterize the public perceptions of the department? How is this different than before the training?

4. What professional and/or personal accomplishments have you had since taking part in the training?

Training - General
5. At the time, what did you think of the training? How has your thinking of training changed?

6. What elements of training were the most challenging to put into practice?

7. If you were charged with re-designing the curriculum, what changes would you make and why?

8. If you were to repeat a portion of the training, what part would it be?

Problem Solving
9. What is your reaction to the “Geo-beat” concept? How has having a specific geographic area changed the way you do police work?
ENP Training Follow-up Questions

10. How often do you get together and do joint planning with your immediate supervisor and the officers that are under his/her supervision?

11. What types of disorders/calls for services have been reduced most?

12. What aspect of Problem Solving do you find the most challenging?

Community Mobilization
13. In what ways has the CAG helped you and the department with problem solving?

14. What were some of the challenges in forming the CAG? How could the training be changed, if at all, to assist you and CAG members with this process?

15. What were the most frequent problems raised by your CAG? Have these changed from year to year?

16. What parts of the ENP/community mobilization process did CAG members struggle with most?

Closing
17. Now that you have done ENP, how would you rate your job satisfaction level?
18. Have job advancement possibilities changed since you were trained?

19. How has your level of job autonomy changed since you were trained?
**Collaboration Assessment Checklist**

*PLEASE NOTE: For each of the statements below, please fill in the circle under your chosen response. Try to choose a response that most closely reflects your perception, belief and/or opinion.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Factors Related to the Environment</th>
<th>Strongly Agree 1</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree 2</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree 3</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree 4</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. There is a history of collaboration among service agencies in our community/county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Our group (and the agencies we represent) is perceived within the community/county providing leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Leaders and policy makers at the local level support (or at least do not oppose) the mission of our group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Factors Related to Group Membership Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Members of our group share an understanding, trust, and a respect for each other and their respective organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Our group includes representatives from the appropriate cross-section of the community/county who will be affected by its activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Members of our group believe the benefits of collaboration are in their self-interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Our group members are able to compromise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Factors Related to Process/Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. All group members share a stake in the way the group works and the results or products of its work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. All group members participate in various decision-making processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Our group remains open to varied ways of organizing itself and accomplishing its work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Group members clearly understand their roles, rights and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The group has the ability to sustain itself in the midst of major changes, even if it needs to change goals, members, etc., in order to deal with changing conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Factors Related to Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Our group uses open and frequent communication to convey all necessary information with one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Channels of information exist on paper and e-mail, so that information flow occurs among group members. In addition, members establish personal connections – producing a better, more informed, and cohesive group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Factors Related to Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Concrete, attainable goals and objectives of the group are clear to all members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Group members have the same vision, with clearly agreed upon mission, objectives, and strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Our group has a unique mission and purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Factors Related to Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Our group has an adequate, consistent financial base to support its operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The person(s) who convenes our group is a skilled collaboration facilitator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions are based on nineteen key factors that have been found to be critical to the success of collaboration. [Mattesich, Paul W. and Monsey, Barbara R. “Collaboration: What Makes it Work.” Amherst H. Wilder Foundation: St. Paul, MN. 1992.] The goal of this assessment is to gauge collaboration and see if it changes over time. Information from this assessment will be compiled and reported back to the group at a future meeting. All information on this form is confidential.
Weed & Seed Steering Committee Collaboration Assessment Checklist - Results

**PLEASE NOTE:** For each of the statements below, please fill in the circle under your chosen response. Try to choose a response that most closely reflects your perception, belief and/or opinion. Fifteen Steering Committee members completed this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Factors Related to the Environment</th>
<th>Strongly Agree 1</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree 2</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree 3</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree 4</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. There is a history of collaboration among service agencies in our community/county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=14)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Our group (and the agencies we represent) is perceived within the community/county providing leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=14)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Leaders and policy makers at the local level support (or at least do not oppose) the mission of our group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=15)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Factors Related to Group Membership Characteristics</th>
<th>Strongly Agree 1</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree 2</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree 3</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree 4</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Members of our group share an understanding, trust, and a respect for each other and their respective organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=15)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Our group includes representatives from the appropriate cross-section of the community/county who will be affected by its activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=14)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Members of our group believe the benefits of collaboration are in their self-interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=15)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Our group members are able to compromise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=15)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Factors Related to Process/Structure</th>
<th>Strongly Agree 1</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree 2</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree 3</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree 4</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. All group members share a stake in the way the group works and the results or products of its work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=14)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. All group members participate in various decision-making processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=14)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Our group remains open to varied ways of organizing itself and accomplishing its work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=14)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Group members clearly understand their roles, rights and responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=14)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The group has the ability to sustain itself in the midst of major changes, even if it needs to change goals, members, etc., in order to deal with changing conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=15)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Weed & Seed Steering Committee Collaboration Assessment Checklist - Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Factors Related to Communication</th>
<th>Strongly Agree 1</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree 2</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree 3</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree 4</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Our group uses open and frequent communication to convey all necessary information with one another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=14)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Channels of information exist on paper and e-mail, so that information flow occurs among group members. In addition, members establish personal connections – producing a better, more informed, and cohesive group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=14)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Factors Related to Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Concrete, attainable goals and objectives of the group are clear to all members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Group members have the same vision, with clearly agreed upon mission, objectives, and strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Our group has a unique mission and purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Factors Related to Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Our group has an adequate, consistent financial base to support its operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The person(s) who convenes our group is a skilled collaboration facilitator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d. Our group members are able to compromise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Members of our group believe the benefits of collaboration are in their self-interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. All group members share a stake in the way the group works and the results or products of its work. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. Our group has an adequate, consistent financial base to support its operations. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Leaders and policy makers at the local level support (or at least do not oppose) the mission of our group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Members of our group share an understanding, trust, and a respect for each other and their respective organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e. The group has the ability to sustain itself in the midst of major changes, even if it needs to change goals, members, etc. in order to deal with changing conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. All group members participate in various decision-making processes. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Our group includes representatives from the appropriate cross-section of the community/county who will be affected by its activities. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Our group remains open to varied ways of organizing itself and accomplishing its work. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Channels of information exist on paper and e-mail, so that information flow occurs among group members. In addition, members establish personal connections – producing a better, more informed, and cohesive group. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. There is a history of collaboration among service agencies in our community/county. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Our group uses open and frequent communication to convey all necessary information with one another. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. The person(s) who convenes our group is a skilled collaboration facilitator. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Our group (and the agencies we represent) is perceived within the community/county providing leadership. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. Group members clearly understand their roles, rights, and responsibilities. (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Our group has a unique mission and purpose. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Concrete, attainable goals and objectives of the group are clear to all members. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Group members have the same vision, with clearly agreed upon mission, objectives, and strategy. (N=14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percents pertain to those respondents who either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed.
Ten people completed all or part of this survey.

1. When we joined the Steering Committee, we all had expectations of what we would accomplish. Membership on the steering committee is meeting my expectations.

   3 (responses) - Strongly Agree  
   3 - Somewhat Agree  
   2 - Neither Agree or Disagree  
   2 - Somewhat Disagree  
   0 - Strongly Disagree  

   60% of respondents either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with the statement - “Membership on the steering committee is meeting my expectations.”

   Comments:
   
   a. Excellent group, focused on goal.  
   b. Presence at meetings has been sporadic.  
   c. Weed n seed has been very positive experience for me.  
   d. Would like to see more focus on DV.

2. Being a member of the steering committee has been a rewarding experience.

   4 (responses) - Strongly Agree  
   4 - Somewhat Agree  
   2 - Neither Agree or Disagree  
   0 - Somewhat Disagree  
   0 - Strongly Disagree  

   80% of respondents either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with the statement - “Being a member of the steering committee has been a rewarding experience.”

3. I feel the coalition has value and that we have made a positive impact in our county.

   2 (responses) - Strongly Agree  
   6 - Somewhat Agree  
   2 - Neither Agree or Disagree  
   0 - Somewhat Disagree  
   0 - Strongly Disagree  

   80% of respondents either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with the statement - “I feel the coalition has value and that we have made a positive impact in our county.”
4. Meeting monthly is an appropriate meeting schedule.

5 (responses) - Strongly Agree
1 - Somewhat Agree
1 - Neither Agree or Disagree
3 - Somewhat Disagree
0 - Strongly Disagree

70% of respondents either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with the statement - “Meeting monthly is an appropriate meeting schedule.”

If you disagree, please suggest another meeting schedule.

Comments:

a. Attendance has been poor; quarterly may be better.
b. Bi-monthly perhaps or quarterly w/ regular committee meetings each month as needed.
c. I wonder if we should meet every other month?
d. Monthly is though. I would recommend a monthly Executive Committee and Quarterly Steering Committee.
e. Sometimes difficult to make each meeting, but it appropriate.

5. The meeting time is appropriate for our coalition.

4 (responses) - Strongly Agree
3 - Somewhat Agree
2 - Neither Agree or Disagree
1 - Somewhat Disagree
0 - Strongly Disagree

70% of respondents either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with the statement - “The meeting time is appropriate for our coalition.”

Comments:

a. The day schedule is probably best for most.
b. Possibly 1 hr earlier?
c. Ok for me, but I think another time maybe better for others.

6. I feel well informed about the mission and goals of our coalition and I could explain them to a fellow resident. Only nine responses to this question

0 (responses) - Strongly Agree
9 - Somewhat Agree
0 - Neither Agree or Disagree
0 - Somewhat Disagree
0 - Strongly Disagree

100% of respondents somewhat agreed with the statement - “I feel well informed about the mission and goals of our coalition and I could explain them to a fellow resident.”

Comments:

a. A training for Steering Committee on this topic would help and inform us on how to promote it to citizens.
b. I feel I understand what we are trying to accomplish.
c. I think we could do a little better on keeping updated on objectives (meeting them) and statistical data.

7. I feel that my ideas are and respected in coalition meetings.

5 (responses) - Strongly Agree
5 - Somewhat Agree
0 - Neither Agree or Disagree
0 - Somewhat Disagree
0 - Strongly Disagree

100% of respondents either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with the statement - “I feel that my ideas are and respected in coalition meetings.”

If you disagree, please explain.

Comments:

a. na

8. I feel our current coalition will allow us to operate even without Dept. of Justice funding.

0 (responses) - Strongly Agree
1 - Somewhat Agree
6 - Neither Agree or Disagree
2 - Somewhat Disagree
0 - Strongly Disagree

10% of respondents somewhat agreed with the statement - “I feel our current coalition will allow us to operate even without Dept. of Justice funding.”

If you disagree what would you suggest we do differently?

Comments:
a. I believe we are working in that direction but still needs work.
b. I worry because our membership keeps dropping.
c. I think the commitment is strong, but I question whether the funding would continue without some help from WS.
d. Not sure if I can answer that.

9. I feel we should expand the membership of our coalition.

4 (responses) - Strongly Agree
1 - Somewhat Agree
4 - Neither Agree or Disagree
1 - Somewhat Disagree
0 - Strongly Disagree

50% of respondents either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with the statement - “I feel we should expand the membership of our coalition.”

If you agree, whom would you suggest we recruit, and would you be willing to be a part of the recruiting team?

Comments:

a. Important for now!! I would be willing to recruit. Business people, Rejoining old members who represented the community well.
b. We should look at current membership list.
c. I am not sure, but I would like us to discuss this at meetings and I would assist in recruiting.
d. I think we should check that the original members are still committee, and if necessary, reach out to replacement community members to take their place.
e. Mental health community, clergy, social workers, hospital community.
Why Are We Here?

Program evaluation is the systematic collection, analysis and reporting of information about a program to assist in decision-making.

Steps in the Evaluation Process

1. Engage Stakeholders
2. Describe Program
3. Determine Evaluation Design
4. Collect Data
5. Analyze and Interpret Data
6. Ensure Use and Share Lessons Learned

Stakeholders are:
People who care about what will be learned from the evaluation and about what will be done with the knowledge gained.

Stakeholders may be….
• Those involved in implementing the program
• Those served or affected by the program
• Primary users of the evaluation

Who are your stakeholders?
Why include them?

- To promote equity
- To boost credibility of evaluation findings
- To ensure a broad perspective
- To promote collaboration/partnerships

Steps in the Evaluation Process

1. Engage Stakeholders
2. Describe Program
3. Determine Evaluation Design
4. Collect Data
5. Analyze and Interpret Data
6. Ensure Use and Share Lessons Learned

Describe the Program

- In writing
- Create a LOGIC model

Written Description

- Mission, goals and objectives
- Expected effects
- Activities
- Need
- Resources
- Stage of development
- Context

Advantages of Logic Models

1. Presents overview
2. Explains the relevance of a program
3. Helps programs to plan, set goals
4. Develops common vision
5. Creation process fosters understanding
6. Describes important contextual issues
7. May reveal unforeseen factors/variables
8. Strengthens causal claims (program theory)
9. Can focus on multiple levels of intervention
10. Creation may involve literature/best practice review

Program Overview Logic Model
What Are *Program Components*?

- Population served
- *Major* intervention type
- *Major* strategy or type of activity
- Health issue or disease

Choosing Interventions

- Perform an issue analysis (multiple levels)
- Review risk factors (think about demographics, geography and trends)
- Review the literature
- Review theory
- Address multiple, and appropriate *levels* (political, community, social, family or individual) *use experience*
- Ask yourselves whether the strategies fit with the state measures (in RFP) and federal measures.

Choosing Outcomes

- Address *initial*
  - Knowledge,
  - Attitudes,
  - Norms,
  - Skills
- Address *intermediate*
  - Behavior
- Address *long-term*
  - HEALTH

Exercise #1: School-based Health Centers
### School-Based Health Center Logic Model (overview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Components</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Initial Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve Health Care</td>
<td>Adolescents reduce risky behaviors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Adolescents increase healthy behaviors</td>
<td>Better Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KANS=Knowledge, Attitudes, Norms, Skills;  B=Behaviors**

### HIV Program Logic Model Worksheet: Forward

**PRIORITY POPULATION:** Partners of the opposite sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Initial Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-Term Outcome (Health)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buy Condoms</td>
<td>Place Condom for use</td>
<td>Use Condoms</td>
<td>Decreased HIV transmission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KANS=Knowledge, Attitudes, Norms, Skills;  B=Behavior**

### Maine Immunization Program Logic Model (overview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Components</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Initial Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-Term Outcome (Health)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase state-wide child immunization rates for 4-3-1 Series to 90%.</td>
<td>Persons attending the groups will use the learned risk reduction skills including correct condom use, and condom negotiation with sex partners to prevent acquiring HIV and other STIs.</td>
<td>Persons attending the groups will report an increase in the intent of using risk reduction skills including correct condom use, and condom negotiation with sex partners to prevent acquiring HIV and other STIs.</td>
<td>90% of the population will have 2 or more doses of vaccine recorded in the registry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KANS=Knowledge, Attitudes, Norms, Skills;  B=Behavior**

### Steps in the Evaluation Process

1. Engage Stakeholders
2. Describe Program
3. Determine Evaluation Design
4. Collect Data
5. Analyze Data
6. Ensure Use and Share Lessons Learned
Determine Evaluation Design/Method

1. Have logic model/Description
2. Develop evaluation questions
3. Create performance indicators and measures
4. Choose data sources and time lines

Evaluation Questions

- narrow the focus of the evaluation (makes it more specific)
- reveal the questions stakeholders believe should be answered
- Determine evaluation timeframe
- will guide data gathering, data source selection, and data analysis

Develop Evaluation Questions:

Outcomes: Increase condom use skills among clients

Question: Have our clients increased their condom use skills?
(Within the desired timeframe)

Evaluation Questions Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-Term Outcome</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcome</th>
<th>Initial Outcome</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased HIV transmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Consistent Condom Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Condom Use Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual-Level Counseling*

- Are our clients satisfied with the counseling?
- What was actually covered in the sessions?
First, create performance indicators

- What
- For Whom
- How Much
- By When

Example of a performance indicator

Increase by 30% over baseline (how much) the number of men who have sex with men participating in peer-led safer sex house parties (who) who report an increase in safer sex practices (what) at 3 months post-intervention (by when).

Performance indicator exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-Term Outcome</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcome</th>
<th>Initial Outcome</th>
<th>Evaluate Questions</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of Measures:

- % of clients able to demonstrate correct condom use (initial)
- % of a population practicing safer sex behaviors (intermediate)
- Rate of needle sharing within a population (intermediate)
- HIV incidence rates (long-term)
- # served by intervention type (process: intervention/activity)

Then, choose a measure

Measures translate performance indicators into specific, measurable parts
### Performance indicator exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Exercise</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Initial Outcome</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcome</th>
<th>Long-Term Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% reporting satisfaction with interventions</td>
<td>% of content geared towards skill building</td>
<td>Of our clients who report wanting to use condoms, there will be a 10% increase among those reporting consistent condom use by 6 months after enrollment</td>
<td>Of our clients who report wanting to use condoms, 90% will be able to demonstrate correct condom use by 6 months after enrollment</td>
<td>Have our clients increased their condom use skills?</td>
<td>Data: Things to Think About</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of content geared towards skill building</td>
<td>% clients reporting consistent condom use</td>
<td>Increased Consistent Condom Use</td>
<td>Increased Condom Use Skills</td>
<td>Is the incidence of HIV infection down?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% clients who can demonstrate correct use</td>
<td>% clients reporting consistent condom use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased HIV transmission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% reporting satisfaction with interventions</td>
<td>% clients reporting consistent condom use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Determine Evaluation Design/Method

1. Have logic model
2. Develop evaluation questions
3. Create relevant performance indicators and measures
4. Choose data sources and time lines

### Data: Things to Think About

- Multiple sources and types (qualitative and quantitative)
- Quality (reliability and validity), quantity and logistics
- Collecting data (cost, skills, confidentiality, cultural competence, etc)

### Timing:

When the data is gathered/collected

- How often?
- At regular or specific intervals?
- Time of year
- When, relative to the intervention
Data Sources Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design Conclusions

- Be practical
  (keep it as simple as possible, use a logic model, get help, contact evaluation resources)
- Combine quantitative and qualitative
- Use secondary (existing) data sources whenever possible

Steps in the Evaluation Process

1. Engage Stakeholders
2. Describe Program
3. Determine Evaluation Design
4. Collect Data
5. Analyze and Interpret Data
6. Ensure Use and Share Lessons Learned
### Weed and Seed Logic Model Training - Feedback

1. **The presenter(s):**
   - **demonstrated knowledge of content:** Strongly Agree 8, Agree 8, Neutral 8, Disagree 8, Strongly Disagree 8, No Answer 8
   - **showed respect for the experience and knowledge of participants:** Strongly Agree 8, Agree 8, Neutral 8, Disagree 8, Strongly Disagree 8, No Answer 8
   - **encouraged appropriate levels of participation and questions:** Strongly Agree 5, Agree 2, Neutral 1, Disagree 8, Strongly Disagree 8, No Answer 8
   - **were flexible (adjusted session "on the fly" to accommodate changes):** Strongly Agree 8, Agree 8, Neutral 8, Disagree 8, Strongly Disagree 8, No Answer 8

2. **The presenter(s) would be even better if:**
   - The electricity had been on, of course!
   - Projected--Power was out do not your issue.

3. **The workshop:**
   - **had a clearly stated purpose and objectives:** Strongly Agree 6, Agree 2, Neutral 8, Disagree 8, Strongly Disagree 8, No Answer 8
   - **was organized so I could see how concepts and skills enable me to apply knowledge and skills:** Strongly Agree 7, Agree 1, Neutral 8, Disagree 8, Strongly Disagree 8, No Answer 8
   - **enable me to apply knowledge and skills:** Strongly Agree 7, Agree 1, Neutral 8, Disagree 8, Strongly Disagree 8, No Answer 8

4. **The materials used and/or handouts were:**
   - **clear and understandable:** Strongly Agree 3, Agree 4, Neutral 1, Disagree 8, Strongly Disagree 8, No Answer 8
   - **relevant to the topic:** Strongly Agree 8, Agree 8, Neutral 8, Disagree 8, Strongly Disagree 8, No Answer 8

5. **The workshop would have been better if:**
   - A lot of information for a short time.
   - We had electricity.

6. **Overall Impression**
   - **The knowledge and skills from this session are applicable to my job:** Strongly Agree 6, Agree 1, Neutral 8, Disagree 8, Strongly Disagree 8, No Answer 8
   - **This workshop provided me with skills and tools I can use:** Strongly Agree 5, Agree 2, Neutral 8, Disagree 8, Strongly Disagree 8, No Answer 8
   - **Overall, how satisfied are you with this workshop?** Strongly Agree 6, Agree 1, Neutral 8, Disagree 8, Strongly Disagree 8, No Answer 8

7. **The most beneficial parts of the workshop were:**
   - Handouts
   - Exercises
   - Model practice; model sheets/blanks

8. **Are there any other evaluation related topics you would like to see offered in the future?**
   - Creating the data sources.