

1. Community Strength

- **Community awareness of an issue** - Residents recognize the need for some type of initiative. A community building effort must address an issue which is severe enough to warrant attention, and which affects enough residents of a community to spark self-interest in participation.
 - Challenges
 - ✓ This has nothing to do with the coalition development or activities of the organization. This part of the pillar must already be in place to point toward sustainability. Activities of the organization may strengthen community awareness around an issue making future projects more sustainable.
 - ✓ How to determine community awareness. How to take "true" sampling of a community on a limited program evaluation budget or with a small staff.
 - Benefits
 - ✓ Just the act of measuring community awareness around an issue increases awareness of that issue and of the organization measuring it.
 - ✓ Measuring community awareness should increase coalition membership if it is an issue the community is motivated about (next component of this pillar)
 - How to measure
 - ✓ Needs Assessment
 - ✓ Community Listening Sessions
 - ✓ Focus groups
 - ✓ Process evaluation
 - LWL Ex.'s
 - ✓ Worksite - Employee Needs Assessment Aggregate Report by Krupnick
 - ✓ Schools - Food system assessment focus groups and survey (though not specific to school population). Food system assessment focus group to Student Advisory Council.
- **Motivation from within the community** - The motivation to seek solutions is self-imposed, rather than encouraged from outside "experts".
 - Challenge - how to define "within the community."
 - Benefits
 - The entire community may not be motivated, but a subset may be
 - Strength here should prevent leadership vacuum
 - How to measure

- Taskforce members, coalition members, and staff are from within the community. When resources external to the community are sought it is through the motivation of community members.
 - Is LiveWell Colorado, LWL, or Longmont communities driving coalition activities?
 - LWL Ex's
 - ✓ Development process of LWL coalition and taskforces.
 - ✓ Worksite - Motivation by upper management of collaboration members. Chamber of Commerce applying for a grant.
 - ✓ Schools - Based on the crossing guard survey administered to all Longmont schools, a Sanborn School principal indicated, *"Our parents have been begging/pleading for crossing guards for many years. They were about ready to 'take the bull by the horn' and just start acting in this role and, apparently, the city shut them down because they weren't trained properly. We would be a school VERY interested in a parent-run crossing guard program!"* Currently SRTS program requires a "champion" and that champion may be a parent, a school official, etc.
- **Small geographic area** where planning and implementing activities are more manageable.
 - Challenge - Supporting policy change while allowing for unique responses to problems.
 - Benefit - Can define communities within Longmont as opposed to having to create change in all of Longmont.
 - How to measure - output evaluation
 - Ex. - Multiple LiveWell Denver communities, instead of LiveWell Denver
 - LWL Ex's
 - ✓ Schools - Safe Routes to School Programs may happen at all communities in a city or county, but is more successful if each program is tailored to the needs of each particular school or community (e.g. not using a "cookie cutter" approach). SRTS coordinator indicates that the reason SRTS works now is because it's not a district mandate. Every school is different and has different needs. He believes a district mandate would make things too complicated.
 - ✓ Worksites - In Collaboration, each worksite implements own policies with same end goals and plans to work together. It is not the same goal across all businesses. Again, the challenge is that the end goal of the collaboration is to create a model for other businesses to follow. This model needs to provide a strategic framework while supporting individuality of business needs.
- **Preexisting social cohesion** - The strength of interrelationships among community residents
 - Measure - Look to strength of coalition development

- LWL Ex - LWL in collaboration with YMCA is trying to trace the connections between nonprofits and social enterprises in Longmont.
- **Existing identifiable leadership** - There are residents whom most community members will follow and listen to, who can motivate and act as spokespersons, and who can assume leadership roles in a community building initiative.
 - How to Measure
 - ✓ look to roster for coalition and TF members
 - ✓ When there is a leadership vacuum, how well does the organization regroup and continue?
 - LWL Ex - Id leadership was City of Longmont, St Vrain Valley School District, Longmont United Hospital, and Longmont Chamber

2. Coalition Strength

- **Widespread participation** - Participation is representative of the community (e.g. socioeconomic status, age, ethnicity, religion, culture, etc.) and coalition members continuously recruit from the community.
 - *Challenge - how to define representative*
 - ✓ Representative may be of whole community (19% of Longmont identifies as Hispanic or Latino, so 19% of Coalition members should also) or representative could be based on strategies (if 75% of the population involved with the schools are students than 75% of the school TF should be students).
 - *How evaluate*
 - ✓ Look to make up of taskforces, are the TF representative of the people being served by the intent of the TF?
 - ✓ Focus groups may bring engagement of all the varying co-cultures in a community and recruiting for the coalition from those engaged members of the community participating in focus groups.
 - *LWL Ex's*
 - ✓ Longmont food system assessment as a tool to gain more input from many different sectors of the community via focus groups and interviews with Latino, low income, senior, youth, busy adults, community engaged members, restaurant owners, small markets, big markets, agricultural producers, etc - of course all of these groups cross-over. At each focus group, LWL hands out coalition information, Melissa's contact information, and passes out a sign-in sheet asking for contact information of participants. At the end of each FG, the group asks how people would like to be communicated with regarding the outcomes of the food assessment and explains how participants can get more involved in LWL.
 - The food assessment via the city-wide survey and the focus groups were fairly representative of the Longmont community, though

participation in the food assessment did not translate into participation with LWL as a coalition, with other taskforces, or as a more sustained/engaged sub-taskforce member of the food assessment.

- ✓ Comprehensive Plan community listening session
 - ✓ Worksite ambassador program
 - ✓ School TF missing representation from teachers and students—weighted on the parent side
 - ✓ Worksite TF good representation from leadership in business to employees
- **Good system of communication** - The process includes effectively communicating within the community and to the rest of the world.
 - Challenge
 - ✓ Should communication focus on recognition of the organization or of the strategies the organization applies.
 - ✓ What is the culture change that is the goal? How to communicate that?
 - Measuring
 - ✓ Internal communication via survey of TF members and survey of attendees of coalition meetings
 - ✓ External communication via output eval
 - ✓ External communication measured by how many people are familiar with LWL (5 yr IVR) in the community. How many coalition members does LWL has?
 - LWL Ex's
 - ✓ LW CO isn't providing all tools needed. LWL just this year developing a communication plan
 - ✓ See tasks for each TF under communication plan.
 - ✓ *"The LiveWell Longmont Ambassador Program is a network of liaisons through which relevant and timely information pertaining to the mission and goals of LiveWell Longmont is both disseminated and collected."*
 - **Minimal competition in pursuit of goals of the organization**- Community organizations or businesses do not perceive other organizations or businesses as competition to fulfill goals of organization.
 - Challenge - healthy competition may be beneficial in furthering goals (e.g. worksites competing against each other to have healthiest employees). Competition is only an issue when it is to the exclusion of sharing.
 - Measure
 - ✓ Coalition evaluation - cooperation questions
 - ✓ Process evaluation for grant recipients
 - Examples

- ✓ LWL in collaboration with YMCA is trying to trace the connections between nonprofits and social enterprises in Longmont.
 - ✓ Taskforces are made up of many different organizations
 - ✓ Schools and worksite - technical assistance for grants provided by past recipients
 - ✓ Worksite - case study document in which LM businesses are sharing info about their WS wellness programs with other LM businesses
- **Strategic planning** - The process includes developing a group identity, clarifying priorities, and agreeing on how to achieve goals, along with continual follow-up to ensure that these elements don't need to shift as the community group develops.
 - ✓ Measure
 - Output eval
 - Process eval through TF member survey
 - ✓ Challenge - should do as individual taskforces and as an entire coalition
 - ✓ LWL Ex's
 - Each TF developed workplan together, forming a group identity
 - The grant application process garnering input from coalition members
 - Using coalition meeting attendance to provide input (e.g. bike map)
- **Focus on product and process concurrently** - Efforts are based on the process of community building and coalition building, as well as tangible activities and accomplishments (product focus, end-goal focus, or outcomes focus)
 - Measure - output eval
 - LWL Ex's
 - ✓ Communication strategy/ambassador program is a focus on process
 - ✓ Activities for each goal are a focus on the tangible
- **Progression from simple to complex activities** - The process moves coalition members from simple to progressively more complex activities.
 - Measure - process evaluation
 - LWL Ex's
 - ✓ Ex - Some of the problems that occurred with the food systems focus groups were because coalition members of that subcommittee were given responsibilities that were beyond their abilities at that time.
 - ✓ Ex - At the beginning of 2009, Melissa provided a very organized, detailed "expectations for commitment" form tailored to each taskforce, for each coalition member to sign in agreement to fulfill set tasks. Very few were returned. However, at taskforce meetings in October 2009, Melissa again asked for increased participation, commitment, and organization from coalition members, but this time gained a lot of support.

- ✓ Ex - Worksite collaboration in 2009 started with a big picture/big project/big goals program that was too much to ascertain and follow, which resulted in collapse and restarting from a more focused, slower, smaller goal subset to build to a widespread community-wide worksite collaboration model.
- **Training to gain community building skill** - Coalition members receive training to increase their community building capacity.
 - Measure - output evaluation (training must include capacity building component)
 - Challenge - LWL does more trainings for community than TF members, but if LWL is community driven than supporting capacity building of leadership in communities is also strengthening the coalition members
 - LWL Ex's:
 - ✓ LWL ACE training of community in May with the Comp Plan technical assistance.
 - ✓ 2009 and 2010 AHG training of school administrators and teachers
 - ✓ LWL offered facilitator training to taskforce leadership in 2009
 - ✓ 2010 plan to train Bicycle Longmont and SNAC with Intervention Mapping protocol
 - ✓ Worksite wellness conference training
- **Early involvement and support from existing, indigenous organizations** - Community organizations of long tenure and solid reputation become involved early, during planning stages.
 - Measure - output evaluation
 - LWL Ex's
 - ✓ OUR Center, YMCA
 - ✓ Worksite Wellness TF and School TF members
- **Use of technical assistance** - Experts providing consultation or hands-on training in their area of knowledge to help the group gain competence in a particular area. However, it is important to make sure that outside involvement does not overwhelm or control the process over community members. Community members know the situation of their community and what will work best, but outside experts can bring in case studies and models that have worked elsewhere and work with the community members to see if they will work in the local community also.
 - Measure - output eval
 - LWL examples
 - ✓ Worksite Wellness Conference brought in experts in that field
 - ✓ LiveWell Colorado
 - ✓ LWL is bringing in Public Health Law & Policy (PHLP) to inform development of the proposal for the City of Longmont's comprehensive plan.

- ✓ LWL food systems assessment contractor and program evaluator
- **Continual emergence/development of leaders**
 - Measure - process eval and survey coalition and TF members
 - LWL examples
 - ✓ Facilitation training conducted in 2009
 - ✓ At October 2009 taskforce meetings, Melissa had the group start from a "clean slate" and asked members to "step-up."
 - ✓ Melissa on maternity leave
 - ✓ Exit strategy of LWL
- **Community control over decision making** - Community has control over decisions (what activities are done, how funds are used)
 - Challenge - Should it be control or guide? Can the organization be viewed as the "expert" and the community provides guidance?
 - Measure - If TF are made up of community members and TF are controlling where funding for grants goes than this component of the pillar is achieved
 - LWL examples
 - ✓ Annual reports (the activities) are transparent
 - ✓ Program evaluation is transparent and results are online
- **The right mix of resources** - The process is not overwhelmed by too many resources or stifled by too few, and there is a balance between internal and external resources.
 - Challenges
 - ✓ What percentage of resources should be internal vs external?
 - ✓ How should resources shift over time (e.g. each year, external funding should decrease)?
 - Measure - output evaluation
 - ✓ What are funding sources?
 - ✓ What do coalition/taskforce members bring to the table as resources: meeting room space, matching funds, staff time, etc?
 - LWL Example
 - ✓ Eric is developing a business model for LWL on how to become sustainable

3. Activity Strength

- **Socio-ecological Model:** Providing change among all levels
 - Individual behavioral change through increasing knowledge, influencing attitudes, or challenging beliefs.
 - ✓ Ex - Coalition meetings provide educational avenue for attendees
 - Interpersonal - Targeting of groups, since groups provide social identity and support

- ✓ Ex - Minigrants to schools and worksites
 - Organizational - Changing the policies, practices, and physical environment of an organization to support behavior change.
 - ✓ LWL Ex
 - Worksites - Minigrants and worksite collaboration - create environmental and policy changes
 - Schools - Hiring of school coordinator to create environmental changes and policy changes
 - Community - Coordinating the efforts of all community members to create change.
 - ✓ Ex - coalition meetings
 - Public policy - Developing and enforcing state and local policies that support beneficial health behaviors. All strategies support goals or implementation steps of already agreed upon policies.
 - ✓ LWL Examples
 - LWL supports LW CO doing GAPP
 - LWL supporting the inclusion of health impacts in the comprehensive plan will give LWL a document to refer to when creating and implementing activities.
 - The school wellness strategy looks to enforce the District School Wellness Policy
 - Developing a comprehensive, multi-organizational worksite wellness program creates a model for others to follow
 - Creating a district-wide comprehensive SRTS policy and a crossing-guards policy eliminates conflict between the city and school district.
- **Systematic gathering of information and analysis of community issues** - Measure and analyze the needs and problems of the community.
 - ✓ Focus groups
 - LWL Ex - food system assessment
 - ✓ Community listening sessions
 - LWL Ex - food system assessment
 - ✓ Needs assessments
 - LWL Ex- worksite minigrants and school minigrants, worksite collaboration
 - ✓ Site evaluations
 - LWL Ex - school and worksite minigrants
- **Benefits to many community members** - Goals, tasks, and activities have clear, visible benefits to many people in the community.
 - Challenge - How to measure benefits. Vague.
 - Measure -

- ✓ REAIM tables measuring REACH not outcome evaluation
- ✓ Process evaluation - Goals, tasks and activities benefit the community
- ✓ Output evaluation - transparency in strategic plan

Three Pillars Held together through evaluation

- **Evaluation Used for Accountability, Management, and Learning** - Evaluation should never be conducted simply to prove that a project worked, but also to improve the way it works. Evaluation is not only an "accountability measuring stick," but also a management and learning tool.
 - Measure: process, outcome, and output evaluation - Process evaluation makes projects more replicable; whereas, outcomes evaluation informs success of the project; whereas output evaluation provides immediate data to funders.
 - LWL Examples
 - ✓ Coalition strength surveys at coalition meetings and at end of year to taskforce members utilizing revised surveys based on the "California Project LEAN Survey of Community Coalition Members" 2002 through the Florida Prevention Research Center at the University of South Florida and the "Assessing Your Collaboration: A Self Evaluation Tool" published in the Journal of Extension. April 1999, Vol 37, No 2.
 - ✓ Outcome evaluation happens at the TF level based on the evaluation plan that follows in line with the workplan of each TF.

- **Participatory evaluation:** Just as community members participate in project activities, those same participants should engage in project evaluation. Effective evaluations also prepare organizations to use evaluation as an ongoing function of management and leadership.
 - Measure - The best evaluations value multiple perspectives and involve a representation of people who care about the project.
 - Challenge
 - ✓ Gaining participation in evaluation, which is not seen as "sexy" like activities engagement.
 - LWL Examples
 - ✓ Each TF, under the guidance of the LWL Manager, devised a workplan and from the workplan, the evaluator met with leadership of each TF to devise an evaluation plan rough draft that then went back to each TF for review and revising before a final draft was complete.
 - ✓ The program evaluation plans for each TF, tools used, and the results are all published online at: <http://www.lwlprogrameval.webs.com/> ; however, they are not regularly reviewed outside of the LWL leadership and the forums for engagement are minimally used.

- **Strengthen projects:** The evaluation effort should leave an organization stronger and more able to use such an evaluation when outside support ends.
 - Measure
 - ✓ Evaluation should provide ongoing, systematic information that strengthens projects during their life cycle, and outcome data to assess the extent of change.
 - ✓ Program evaluation itself needs to be sustainable
 - Challenge - How to measure program evaluation sustainability
 - LWL Examples
 - ✓ All program evaluation is transparent: <http://www.lwlprogrameval.webs.com/> and LWL will continue to have access to the tools used in the program evaluation efforts.
 - ✓ Program evaluator is providing trainings to the Worksite Collaboration members, Worksite TF members, and Worksite Minigrant recipients on how to conduct evaluation at their worksites to further their wellness programs.
 - ✓ Program evaluator provides program evaluation technical assistance to School and Worksite minigrant recipients.
 - ✓ Use of program evaluation data is not systematized to make changes to programs mid-stream. This needs to be formalized.

- **Creating a Culture of inquiry:** Create an atmosphere of openness to findings, with a commitment to considering change and a willingness to learn. Effective evaluation is not an "event" that occurs at the end of a project, but is an ongoing process which helps decision makers better understand the project; how it is impacting participants, partner agencies and the community; and how it is being influenced and impacted by both internal and external factors.
 - Challenge - How to create the level of engagement that creates a culture of inquiry.
 - Measure
 - ✓ Data should be collected from assessing community needs prior to designing a project, to making connections between project activities and intended outcomes, to making mid-course changes in program design, to providing evidence to funders.
 - ✓ Everyone involved (particularly those in leadership positions) should regularly reflect on the values and politics embedded in program development and evaluation; honestly examining how these influence what is focused on and what is missed, who is heard and not heard, how interpretations are made, what conclusions are drawn, and how conclusions and data are presented.
 - LWL Ex
 - ✓ Integration of program evaluation plans with taskforce workplans

✓ Transparency and engagement around evaluation via <http://www.lwlprogrameval.webs.com/>. Website has not created a Culture of Inquiry yet. It is accessible but not used, the forums available but not participated in.

Appendix 1

Pillars draw from and have adaptations from:

* *Mattessich P, Monsey B. (1997) A review of factors influencing successful community building. In: Community Building: What Makes It Work. Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.*

* *W.K. Kellogg Foundation Evaluation Handbook: Philosophy and Expectations. January 1998.*

