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Abstract

During the past three years, 12 mid-western U.S. extension community development program leaders have established a framework for program development and documentation of collective program impacts for community leadership, participatory planning, organizational development, and community economic development in order to more effectively advocate strong support and investment at the federal and state levels for Extension research and outreach education. Key has been the respect for different curricula, different organizational structures, and different political realities in the states. With the mandate for accountability and documentation, this effort is laying the foundation for a bottom-up and top-down approach that is influencing a national process in the U.S. and highlighting research needs for evidence-based programming. The time is ripe for fostering a much-needed dialogue for the building of best practices for program development, evaluation, and documentation of impact for community development education and practice. To be discussed is the process that respected each state's programming, materials developed, implementation success and challenges. Feedback will assist in further refining and testing the implications for broader adoption.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN THE NORTH CENTRAL REGION: A MODEL FOR DEVELOPING MULTI-STATE PROGRAM LOGIC MODELS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF EVALUATION PROTOCOLS

With the increased demand for accountability, documentation of impact, and mandated multi-state collaboration among Cooperative Extension Services operated as part of Land Grant Universities in the United States, community development extension programs have found it essential to respond in order to maintain funding and staffing. In this paper, we describe a process involving the community development Cooperative Extension programs in 12 North Central U.S. states to determine a mutually beneficial program framework and impact documentation. This description will include the evolution, process of engagement of faculty and administrators, and the learning which has occurred, the results from engaging in this process, and the implications for community development programming, evaluation and documentation of impact.

Situation

Increased program accountability has become the norm among community development programs, whether funded by government, foundations, or other sources. The U.S. Government Results Performance Act (GPRA) mandates that all federal programs set goals and measure outcomes (USDA-CSREES). State and local governments have similarly required proof of return on investment and production of results from programs. Likewise foundations require documentation of results and outcomes, as evidenced by visiting any number of foundations’ web pages. For example, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (2008) has devoted considerable resources to assist in the advancement of the evaluation. All of this points to the fact that stakeholders, of all sorts, today desire to know what has resulted from programming versus simply measuring inputs (resources) and outputs (what was done).

For extension programs, this has been documented and especially highlighted by Hoffman and Grabowski (2004). They stated:

Change agents such as Extension educators achieve outcomes directly through programming outputs and indirectly through secondary interpersonal educational networks that exist in social systems (Rogers, 1998). This includes program participants sharing information with peers and clients, which has the potential to multiply the effects of Extension educational activity. For this reason, Extension programming can be expected to achieve outcomes that exceed those that directly result from programming outputs.

More recently, the Extension Council on Policy has adopted the Excellence in Extension standards. These include accountability for invested resources, continual improvement, and measurement of program outcomes, and documentation of economic impact for programs (Archer, et. al, 2007). These criteria have been combined and are being used to develop report cards that each extension service can use.
In October of 2005, the North Central Region Extension Directors convened a joint meeting of Directors and Program Leaders with the intent of establishing a framework that documents the collective impacts of multi-state Extension programs. Extension Directors placed an emphasis on the importance of identifying impact indicators for multi-state program efforts that would permit North Central Region states to collect and aggregate data across all program areas to show state, regional, and national impacts. Such information would position Extension Directors to more effectively advocate strong support and investment at the federal and state levels for Extension research and outreach education.

USDA-CSREES had already placed a stronger emphasis on the importance of multi-state program efforts in Cooperative Extension, requiring an annual report on the percentage of effort in multi-state programs. As the meeting was planned, there was an initial emphasis on the concept of existing multi-state program collaborations as a point of focus, consistent with federal reporting requirements.

Foundations for Multi-State Program Plans

In the fall of 2002, the 12 North Central CRED program leaders (North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Ohio) began discussing the core competencies for community and economic development Extension professionals, and the potential for sharing resources. The discussion on core competencies led to an understanding of the common or related program thrusts in each of the twelve North Central states. In the process, we identified resources, including published materials, professional development offerings, and professional staff that could be part of a regional resource base to support developing core competencies.

This group of competencies, ranging from content or issue competency to process and relationship skills, included:

- Group process/facilitation
- Conflict resolution/public issues education
- Planning/visioning processes
- Leadership and organizational development
- Diversity and multiculturalism
- Fund development
- Community emergency management
- Economic development strategies
- Collaboration and partnership building
- Understanding, using and developing data
- Local government education and relations

Those areas with an emphasis on issues and content are closely related to what emerged in 2005 and 2006 with North Central CRED logic models.

In 2004, a team of CRED program leaders and professionals representing the four U.S. geographic regions of the 1862 Land Grant Institutions developed the white paper titled
“Cooperative Extension’s Community Development Foundation of Practice”. Janet Ayres of Purdue, along with Mary Simon Leuci and Dick Senese, as North Central Region team members were able to convey the learning from the North Central CRED core competency identification. The emerging National Association for Community Development Extension Professionals also adopted the *Foundations of Practice* white paper (Ayres et. al, 2005). The North Central Regional Rural Development Center (NCRCRD), with input from the region’s CRED program leaders, supported the development and implementation of the Foundations of Practice training which continues today (NCRCRD, 2008).

When the North Central Directors met with program leaders in October of 2005, the stage had been well set for a dialog about shared program interests. Program leaders had practiced multiple efforts to understand their common program interests and their need to collaborate more effectively in using institutional resources to provide professional development for Extension educators working across those common program thrusts.

The Process of Developing Multi-State Logic Models

Identification of Programs and Initial Work

The North Central CRED program leaders met by conference call on monthly basis to set the stage for discussions at the Directors meeting in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in October 2005. A draft framework for the Milwaukee discussion identified seven initial topic areas or categories of program interests:

- community development
- economic development
- planning and growth management
- local government
- natural resources
- special audiences or needs
- other issues (to be identified)

The CRED program leaders began the Milwaukee discussions on the premise that it is important to aggregate impacts across community development programs to show state, regional and national impact Cudaback (1989). Most of the CRED program leaders had repeatedly encountered arguments and challenges from faculty and educators about the difficulties of measuring impact for developmental programs (Brown & Evans, 2004). Aggregation of data from existing multi-state efforts would be a subset of the larger program thrusts common to the twelve states. Program leaders first articulated the broader list of major program topics, but agreed upon four major program topics that were largely common to all of our programs: a) *community leadership development*, b) *organizational development*, c) *participatory community planning*, and d) *community economic development*.

The most important guiding principle in determining impact indicators was to keep the list as simple as possible. We recognized that many of our planning and reporting systems were burdened with a large and unwieldy number of impact indicators. Any implementation strategy
for aggregation of data from a common set of indicators across states would require an approach that would not add a complicated set of impact indicators to our existing systems.

We explored and adopted the community capitals research as a foundation for program evaluation and articulating impact indicators (Emery & Florida, 2006; North Central Regional Center for Rural Development). Figure 1 provides a depiction of the Community Capitals and that led our discussions and understanding.

![Figure 1. The Community Capital Framework](image)

Finally, we determined short, medium and long-term impact indicators that would correspond to the logic model framework. Short-term indicators were defined as learning outcomes and results. Medium-term indicators were defined as actions taken by participants or changes in behaviors as a result of the learning. Finally, long-term indicators were defined as changes in the community conditions and situation as a result of the learning and actions taken. We also identified that there are individual levels and community or group levels of learning and action. This is an area that we had not seen addressed in prior program logic models.

CRED program leaders developed a sample framework of impact indicators for each of the four program thrusts to share with the North Central directors and use as foundation for writing impact statements (Franz & McCann, 2007). These indicators were necessarily focused on economic impacts, given the political environment surrounding state and federal decision making processes that impact support for extension programs. We recognize the need to address and add social and environmental indicators in the future.
CRED program leaders developed a plan for obtaining feedback from faculty and educators (Axelrod, 2001; Littrell & Littrell, 2006) in the course of developing full logic models for each of the four program thrusts over the next year. As we grappled with these tasks, we acknowledged the importance of a research basis for supporting these programs and approaches to evaluating indicators and recognized the paucity of research that has documented community impacts of some programs such as community leadership development (Emery et. al, 2007). This has led to the advocacy for research that furthers the basis for community development educational programming within extension.

Next Steps and Implications for CRED

Following the Milwaukee meeting, CRED program leaders engaged in a process of seeking input from CRED colleagues. At the February 2006 National Association of Community Development Extension Professionals (NACDEP) conference, the initial four programs and indicators developed at the Milwaukee meeting were shared at the North Central Region meeting for feedback. The logic models and message points were then initially crafted in a face-to-face meeting in Chicago, with additional editing for each of the four logic models conducted through program leader work groups. The resulting logic models were shared with North Central directors in October of 2006, followed by a process of obtaining additional feedback from faculty and staff in each member state.

After revisions of indicators and guidelines for collection of data, we realized that a set of cross-cutting indicators was emerging for the four program areas. This was a significant development and fit with the concept of nested logic models that had guided us from the beginning. A guiding principle was that a local program had to fit within a state program which fit within a multi-state regional model and potentially within a national logic model as depicted in Figure 2.

Finally, in June of 2007, North Central CRED program leaders met in Bismarck, North Dakota and began sharing evaluation instruments being used in respective states for the purpose of analyzing and identifying questions that can be used to measure indicators. These were finalized and presented to Extension Directors in October 2007 along with requests for assistance in implementation and operationalization as well as support for additional research. Currently each state is in the process of integrating the logic models, indicators, and measures into state and local planning and reporting frameworks. Discussion during this summer and fall will focus on what has been learned and an initial attempt will be made to amalgamate results into a regional multi-state impact document. Key message points, indicators, and logic models for each of the four programs are attached as an appendix.
Additional Impact on National Program Thrusts and Evaluation

The ongoing efforts of North Central CRED program leaders to create a better understanding of program impacts at a regional level and beyond had a significant influence on articulating an opportunity and purpose for bringing together CRED program leadership from across all regions for a meeting in Washington in May of 2006. The invitation of all regions to what had been an almost annual Washington meeting for North Central CRED program leaders created the opportunity for developing a stronger national voice for CRED Extension programs across all regions. That meeting resulted in the formation of a National Council for CRED with membership from extension program leadership in all regions including 1890 and 1994 Land Grant Institutions that have historically served African Americans and Native Americans, regional rural development center directors, USDA-CSREES, and NACDEP. The Council formed four work groups to address professional development, program thrusts, partnerships, and growing support for CRED.

The Council hosted a national CRED leadership meeting following the 2007 NACDEP Conference in Philadelphia and used that opportunity for the four workgroups to reconvene with participation from program leaders, faculty and administrators with an interest in CRED. The work of North Central CRED program leaders on crafting the four program logic models with cross-cutting indicators helped to inform the “program thrusts” work group as it was formed in May of 2006 and at the NACDEP meetings in 2007. Furthermore, some of the earlier North Central CRED contributions to the development of Foundations of Practice also became part of the “professional development” work group discussion. All four work groups have active representation from the North Central region.
Further, the Council in collaboration with CSREES and NACDEP has worked the past year in developing a strategic directions document for CRED Extension. The draft is currently being vetted among state and local CRED extension faculty and educators and the final document will be officially unveiled at a national conference in September 2008. The work of the NC CRED program leaders in identifying key program thrusts has been replicated across the country in other regions and among the 1890 and 1994 institutions as groups respectively. The development of evaluation indicators among the NC states has impacted the national discussion as well.

Implementation Challenges and Considerations

As Szulanski (2003) noted, the challenges often come in the implementation phase for transfer of knowledge in organizations. Several key areas have been identified as critical for implementation and have been discussed with the extension directors. While maintaining the momentum and commitment is certainly a challenge, the motivation and demand of stakeholders is likely to drive this aspect. Other key challenges and considerations identified by the CRED program leaders, however, are discussed.

Independent Planning and Reporting Systems

Each North Central Extension state has independent planning and reporting systems. We also recognize that each of our member institutions has a different approach to programming, and that the language we use in describing our programs and collecting data may be somewhat different. The initial strategy was to identify a small number of cross-cutting indicators. From that, each institution could integrate the shared indicators into existing data reporting systems with relative ease. These indicators have been shared and discussed with faculty and staff, creating ownership and acceptance of the shared indicators.

Commitment of Deans/Directors and Program Leadership

Each institution will face some barriers, even resistance, to modifying reporting systems. Such areas as leadership development, community economic development and civic engagement are high priorities within the North Central Region. We appreciate the deans and directors’ strong and continued commitment to promote the use of common indicators in documenting impact of CRED programs.

Staff Support Needs

Each institution has a support system for the purpose of gathering impact data. There are two important considerations for those supporting the institutional reporting system: 1) how the addition of the multi-state impact indicators will affect their work loads and will be supported in the transition, and 2) how the accumulation of the data across the twelve states will be accomplished.
Approach to Measurement of Indicators

Because institutions vary in their programming and evaluation strategies, we have collected and analyzed existing evaluation instruments and processes during the past year. Existing evaluation instruments have been posted by program leaders on a web-based shared workspace hosted by the North Central Regional Center for Rural Development. Based on our analysis, we have developed a set of suggested questions to assist individual states in their measurements of the identified indicators for the four key programs. However, there is great need for continued sharing of the evaluation tools being developed, lessons learned and emergence of best practices (Patton, 2001).

Evaluation and Research Needs

Access to evaluation specialists in the course of developing the four logic models and indicators has been an important asset. North Central CRED program leaders have indicated that the availability of professional evaluation staff or specialists varies significantly across our institutions. A commitment to professional evaluation staff and expertise is an important part of the implementation process.

Program development and evaluation must have a strong research basis. CRED program leaders, with input from faculty and staff, have identified impact indicators and evaluation questions with the understanding that for some indicators there may be very limited research or data that supports the metrics chosen. Such a foundation will strengthen the credibility of any conclusions drawn or arguments made from evaluation data. One such success has been the collaborative research team in the NC region that is currently investigating the community impact of leadership programming as a basis for documenting impact. A recent article (Emery et al, 2007) in the CDS Journal also reports on research conducted by faculty at the NCRCRD that contributes to this arena. And the NCRCRD as well as Iowa State University have hosted several research convenings with program leaders to seed research. This research is being funded through competitive National Research Initiative funding from USDA-CSREES. It is imperative that we continue to build a strong research foundation that undergirds the program logic models and evaluation process.

Longer Term Institutional Approaches

As all four program areas go through the process of implementing shared impact indicators, there will be opportunities for lessons learned and shared efficiencies within each institution. As North Central CRED program leaders have engaged in a three-year dialog about common program interests and approaches to shared impact indicators, we have begun to use shared language and approaches to program evaluation. Long term, an ideal system for aggregating data across member institutions would be a movement toward shared evaluation systems.
Conclusion

This three-year initiative to identify common programming, develop nested multi-state logic models, develop common indicators of impact and means to measure has shown value for the time it has required. The effort has demonstrated the value of working together. We have engaged community development principles through meaningful involvement (Axelrod, 2001; Littrell & Littrell, 2006) of extension directors, faculty and educators, and colleagues in other parts of the country to develop that which will affect all of us. The effort has strengthened the capacity and commitment to quality program development and evaluation in each state because we as a group of program leaders have also wrestled and learned as we have progressed. We have emerged with concepts such as nested logic models, cross-cutting indicators, and regional impact statements that are leading the way in our NC region and within CRED nationally. In addition, the work within community development extension has implications for extension in general as we move toward a system more concerned about development and engagement with learners and communities (McDowell, 2001; Powers & Pettersen, 2001).

Finally, we are much farther along in documenting and sharing the value and results of our community development programming to federal, state and local government as well as an array of other funders and stakeholders, including the citizens served. As a result, CRED programming has gained valuable underpinning and voice nationally. Our learning is not complete as we move forward with implementation but we have laid the foundation for building a strong and viable place for community development extension programming.
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Community Leadership Development

Importance of Community Leadership Development
Communities consistently deal with a host of issues that demand leadership in the midst of increasing complexity. Community organizations and political subdivisions such as cities, school districts, library boards and counties continually struggle to find qualified residents to serve as council, board and commission members. Understanding external forces that affect the community and its future are critical for leaders. These include the devolution of authority for action and service delivery to the community; the double bind created by trying to maintain quality with fewer resources; expectations for sharing power and responsibility; interdependence, diversity, collaboration, and communication; and displacement of the developmental paradigm with the globalization paradigm. Research indicates that building community leadership capacity is critical to community viability and sustainability.

Results and Impact
As a result of community leadership development programs, leaders develop individual skills and collective networking skills that lead to increased collaboration across and among organizations and communities. As participants apply their learning, they increase their civic engagement and leadership in a host of local and regional initiatives that directly benefit the community. An increased density of capable leadership leads to sustainable civic engagement, broadened and more inclusive community leadership, community resiliency and ability to address the demands of change and complexity, and economically and socially viable communities.

Indicators to be Measured and Reported
1. Increased diversity and inclusion
   - Number of participants in program by ethnicity, gender, age, and income level.
   - Number of communities or groups with which we worked.

2. Leadership roles/opportunities undertaken (volunteer and paid)
   - Number participants reporting new roles and opportunities undertaken by ethnicity, gender, age, and income level.

3. Planning
   - Number of plans developed and adopted.
   - Dollar value of the plan developed.
   - Percent of plan/goals implemented, percent attained, percent legally adopted.

4. Jobs
   - Number of jobs created and/or retained and dollar value attributed to these jobs.

5. Economic value
   - Volunteer hours generated and dollar value of these hours.
   - Programs and activities initiated/completed and the dollar value attributed to these.
   - Efficiencies or dollars saved.
   - Dollar value of grants and resources leveraged/generated.
Organizational Development

Importance of Organizational Development
Public and private non-profit organizations have a significant impact on the vitality of communities.

In 2004, 368,000 non-profit organizations in the North Central Region had gross receipts (expenditures) of approximately $52 billion. Approximately two thirds of the organizations did not file a Form 990, an indicator of receipts of over $25,000 or had a religious affiliation. The assumption can be made then that approximately 231,000 of these organizations are fairly small in nature. The number of non-profits in the NC region has increased at the rate of 1.9% in North Dakota up to 26.5% in Missouri between 1996 and 2004. The average increase for all states combined was 15.5%\(^1\).

Results and Impact
As a result, organizations are able to identify goals and objectives, identify key resources, increase the diversity of membership and/or stabilize membership, and develop or strengthen effective organizational operating practices. Ultimately, these organizations are able to leverage additional resources, volunteers, and partners; attain goals established; and contribute to the social and economic vitality of communities.

Indicators to be Measured and Reported
1. Increased diversity and inclusion
   - Number of participants in program by ethnicity, gender, age, and income level.
   - Number of organizations with which we worked.

2. Leadership roles/opportunities undertaken (volunteer and paid)
   - Number participants reporting new roles and opportunities undertaken by ethnicity, gender, age, and income level.

3. Planning
   - Number of plans developed and adopted.
   - Dollar value of the plan developed.
   - Percent of plan/goals implemented, percent attained, percent legally adopted.

4. Jobs
   - Number of jobs created and/or retained and dollar value attributed to these jobs.

5. Economic value

\(^1\) Source: IRS Business Master File 12/2004 (modifications by the National Center for Charitable Statistics at the Urban Institute to exclude foreign and governmental organizations. Web site http://nccsdataweb.urban.org)
Multi-State Evaluation

- Volunteer hours generated and dollar value of these hours.
- Programs and activities initiated/completed and the dollar value attributed to these.
- Efficiencies or dollars saved.
- Dollar value of grants and resources leveraged/generated.

Participatory Community Planning

Importance of Participatory Planning
Communities need assistance to identify strategies to address the rapidly changing social and economic landscape. Participatory planning empowers citizens to take charge of their futures by analyzing and addressing their quality of life and infrastructure. Research indicates that these community planning efforts benefit from the inclusion of all sectors of the community and broad-based decision making.

Results and Impact
As a result of these sessions, communities develop and implement feasible plans that lead to increased mobilization of citizens around common goals (cultural and political capital), access to resources both technical and financial (social and financial capital), and expanded citizen understanding and skills in community development (human capital). An intermediate impact is the number of plans formally adopted by organizations and local governments. Community-based planning processes help communities increase and diversify their economy, maintain and strengthen their infrastructure, address environmental challenges, and provide educational, social, and healthcare services to community members.

Indicators to be Measured and Reported
1. Increased diversity and inclusion
   - Number of participants in program by ethnicity, gender, age, and income level.
   - Number of leadership programs.

2. Leadership roles/opportunities undertaken (volunteer and paid)
   - Number participants reporting new roles and opportunities undertaken by ethnicity, gender, age, and income level.

3. Planning
   - Number of plans developed and adopted.
   - Dollar value of the plan developed.
   - Percent of plan/goals implemented, percent attained, percent legally adopted.

4. Jobs
   - Number of jobs created and/or retained and dollar value attributed to these jobs.

5. Economic value
• Volunteer hours generated and dollar value of these hours.
• Programs and activities initiated/completed and the dollar value attributed to these.
• Efficiencies or dollars saved.
• Dollar value of grants and resources leveraged/generated.

Community Economic Development

Importance of Community Economic Development

Income in the North Central Region has declined relative to the U.S. over the past three decades. Communities are struggling to maintain competitive advantage in a rapidly changing global economic context. They must identify and implement new strategies to assure continued survival and prominence in the U.S. economy. These strategies must be consistent with their vision for their future.

Political leaders in all 12 states are calling on higher education in general, and the land grants in particular, to help lift the region out of its relative economic decline. All 12 states are working directly or indirectly on community economic development; eleven of the twelve states have formally announced programs designated under Community Economic Development or similar titles.

Results and Impact
Communities will articulate and adopt well-informed community economic development strategies. As a result, they will leverage local community and economic development funding with volunteers, grants, partner funding, and outside investment to implement strategies. Communities will also strengthen local partnerships and collaborative efforts for community economic development. These are indicators known to be linked to long-term ability of communities to experience growth in high quality jobs that complement the community’s vision for its future, raise median income levels, and reduce poverty.

Indicators to be Measured and Reported
1. Increased diversity and inclusion
   • Number of participants in program by ethnicity, gender, age, and income level.
   • Number of communities with which we worked.
2. Leadership roles/opportunities undertaken (volunteer and paid)
   - Number participants reporting new roles and opportunities undertaken by ethnicity, gender, age, and income level.

3. Planning
   - Number of plans developed and adopted.
   - Dollar value of the plan developed.
   - Percent of plan/goals implemented, percent attained, percent legally adopted.

4. Jobs
   - Number of jobs created and/or retained and dollar value attributed to these jobs.

5. Economic value
   - Volunteer hours generated and dollar value of these hours.
   - Programs and activities initiated/completed and the dollar value attributed to these.
   - Efficiencies or dollars saved.
   - Dollar value of grants and resources leveraged/generated.
COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Program Action - Logic Model

**Situation**
Communities consistently deal with a host of issues that demand leadership in a contemporary arena of increasing complexity. Community leadership is critical to community viability and sustainability.

**What we invest**
Staff
Volunteers
Time
Money
Research base
Materials
Equipment
Facilities
Technology
Partners
Leveraged resources

**What we do**
Develop a planning and advisory group
Develop and deliver curricula, workshops, retreats, field trips, etc.
Assessment tools
Coach advisory committees, presenters and participants
Evaluate the program

**What we reach**
Emerging and existing adult and/or youth leaders reflecting community demographics and sectors, and underserved residents
Leaders within new and existing community organizations

**What the short term results are**
Learning
Increased leadership knowledge, skills and confidence

**What the medium term results are**
Action
Increased degree of engagement in leadership activities
Leaders use complex networking skills to sustain organizations & communities
Increased collaboration across/among groups

**What the ultimate impact(s) is**
Conditions
Increased leadership diversity
Increased civic engagement
Sustained leadership programs
Increased viability of community/ability to deal with change
Increased community action catalyzed, creating other organizations

**Evaluation**
Focus—Collect Data—Analyze and Interpret—Report

- Increased diversity and inclusion: no. of participants & communities
- No. participants reporting new leadership roles and opportunities undertaken
- No. of plans developed and adopted & dollar value of plans
- Percent of plans/goals implemented, attained, & legally adopted
- No. of jobs created &/or retained and their attributed dollar value
- Volunteer hours generated and attributed dollar value
- Programs and activities initiated/completed and attributed dollar value
- Efficiencies or dollars saved
- Dollar value of grants and resources leveraged/generated

**Assumptions**

**External Factors**
ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Program Action - Logic Model

Inputs

Outputs
Activities Participation

Outcomes - Impact
Short Term Medium Term Long Term

Priorities
Increasing the capacity of public and private nonprofit organizations to contribute to community vitality.

What we invest
Curriculum Faculty/staff time Expertise Financial resources for travel, expenses, materials, etc. Evaluation & other organizational support Volunteers Partnerships

What we do
Workshops & training events Individual consulting Training Web-based resources Evaluation

Who we reach
Potential and existing nonprofit organizations—staff, board members, and others affiliated with the organization

What the short term results are
Learning Development of goals and objectives Learning about resource generation Learning about organizational effectiveness

What the medium term results are
Action Changes in organizational processes and procedures Effective collaboration (partnership) Leverage of resources Organizational goal attainment

What the ultimate impact(s) is
Conditions Non-profit organizations effectively support and contribute to overall viability of the community

Evaluation
Focus—Collect Data—Analyze and Interpret—Report

- Increased diversity and inclusion: no. of participants & communities
- No. of plans developed and adopted & dollar value of plans
- Percent of plans/goals implemented, attained, & legally adopted
- No. of jobs created &/or retained and their attributed dollar value
- Increased volunteer hours generated and attributed dollar value
- Programs and activities initiated/completed and attributed dollar value
- Efficiencies or dollars saved
- Dollar value of grants and resources leveraged/generated
PARTICIPATORY COMMUNITY PLANNING
Program Action - Logic Model

Priorities
- Inclusion
- Assessed-based focus
- Increased options
- Empowerment for broad-based decision making
- Development of feasible plan that can be implemented

Situation
Communities need assistance with rapidly changing social, economic, & environmental landscape. Residents need to be empowered to take charge of their futures by analyzing and addressing their quality of life and infrastructure.

What we invest
- Faculty, time, community leaders and volunteers, outside expertise, information, money, materials, meeting space

What we do
- Coordination & collaboration among partners, facilitate planning processes, asset mapping, analyze community information, develop action plans, organize implementation

Who we reach
- Community steering committee, workshop participants, project team members, community volunteers, media, youth

What the short term results are
- Learning
- Knowledge and skills for planning
- Development of plan
- Increased participation and diversity

What the medium term results are
- Action
- Increased partnerships & more effective use of resources
- Plan adoption and implementation
- Increased community mobilization of volunteers
- Formation of new social networks and/or systems

What the ultimate impact(s) is
- Conditions
- Evidence of goal attainment
- Increased capacity for future issues
- Increased dollar value of public and private investment

Evaluation
Focus—Collect Data—Analyze and Interpret—Report
- Increased diversity and inclusion: no. of participants & communities
- No. participants reporting new leadership roles and opportunities undertaken
- No. of plans developed and adopted & dollar value of plans
- Percent of plans/goals implemented, attained, & legally adopted
- No. of jobs created &/or retained and their attributed dollar value
- Volunteer hours generated and attributed dollar value
- Programs and activities initiated/completed and attributed dollar value
- Efficiencies or dollars saved
- Dollar value of grants and resources leveraged/generated
COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Program Action - Logic Model

**Situation**
Communities must find ways to thrive in the rapidly changing economic environment.

**Priorities**
Empower communities to create, expand, and retain economic opportunities consistent with their vision for their future.

**What we invest**
- Faculty and staff time and expertise
- Community leaders and volunteers
- Outside expertise and research
- Information, money, partnerships, materials, meeting space

**What we do**
- Integrated activities including research (applied and basic), teaching and extension (technical assistance, coaching, facilitating, forming coalitions)

**Who we reach**
Communities and their formal and informal leaders in the public and private sector, businesses, entrepreneurs, students, governments, other agencies, and non-profits

**What the short term results are**
- Learning
- Increased knowledge and understanding of economic trends and conditions and community strategies for achieving their desired future

**What the medium term results are**
- Action
- Increased resources leveraged
- Increased networks and partnerships
- More informed decision making
- Reduced poverty

**What the ultimate impact(s) is**
- Conditions
- Creation, retention, and expansion of sustainable economic opportunities
- Increased wealth and income

**Creation, retention, and expansion of sustainable economic opportunities**
- Increased diversity and inclusion: no. of participants & communities
- No. of plans developed and adopted & dollar value of plans
- Percent of plans/goals implemented, attained, & legally adopted
- No. of jobs created &/or retained and their attributed dollar value
- Volunteer hours generated and attributed dollar value
- Programs and activities initiated/completed and attributed dollar value
- Efficiencies or dollars saved
- Dollar value of grants and resources leveraged/generated