Developing a Data and Evaluation Framework for Urban Promise Zones - Session 1

Janet Pershing: This is Janet Pershing speaking. I'm going to be helping facilitate the session today. And I'd like to welcome you all to this webinar. We're glad you're all here, and we are looking forward to a series of four of these sessions over the course of the next eight weeks or so.

First thing I'd like to do here is to get you a little bit oriented to the electronic platform we're using and let you understand some of the ways that we plan to interact. So you can see here we have a number of different mechanisms for involving you in what we're doing here in the session. As the host mentioned, if you have technical difficulties, you're going to use the chat function to speak with her. But the other functions here we will be introducing to you as we go.

We'll be doing some polls and quizzes. We will have a white board function where you'll be able to write in some short answers. We've got some exercises. We'll be having some sharing from one of your fellow Promise Zones. The San Diego Promise Zone is going to be sharing some of their experiences. We'll have some open question-and-answer sessions and we'll have some discussion.

Now, in order to do a number of those exercises, we are going to need to have you able to speak on the line. We have all been part of webinars where there's been the dog barking in the background, the doorbell ringing, the hold music. We are really interested in not having any of those things disrupt us today. So I'm going to ask you all right now if you would please use your own mute function on your phone or computers to mute yourself.

In just a moment, I'm going to ask the host, Chantel, to unmute all of the lines. And what that will do is let everyone unmute themselves at will and break into the conversation. If, by any chance, you accidentally come off mute and there is background noise, Chantel will mute you manually. At that point, you will not be able to unmute yourself. So if you would like to be unmuted, if Chantel has had to mute you manually – you should use that chat feature to let her know your name and that you want to be unmuted so that she can take care of that for you.

So with that, please make sure you have muted yourselves. And Chantel, go ahead and unmute the group so we can speak to each other when the time comes. All right.

So with that, I'd like to move on to a little bit of an overview of what you're going to behaving in the webinar. And the first thing we're going to do is have a poll to figure out a little bit about who is on the call. So we'd like to do a quick poll if you can bring that up for us, Chantel. What you can do is look in the lower right-hand corner of your screen. You will see that there is a poll question there. It's asking you what your role is in the Promise Zones initiative. We'd like to get a little sense of who's on the call.

So choose your Promise Zone role. And do make sure that you hit the submit button that's in the lower right-hand corner. If you just hit the radio button, your selection will not be registered. So go ahead and let us know who's on the call. Great. Looks like the responses are rolling in here. All right. I think that gets us pretty close.

Chantel, why don't you share those results so folks can see who's here. It looks like we have quite the predominance of Vista volunteers – 29 percent of you – a couple of researchers and evaluators, one program administrator, and some HUD staff. We do have quite a few more folks who are registered for the webinar than who have actually joined. So we are hoping that we will have additional people joining us over the course of the introductory material here. And we will include them as they come on.

So I'm glad to see we have a number of different perspectives represented. I think that'll be really important when we get to some of the conversation. So let's go, if we can, to the next slide. We're going to talk about learning outcomes. Essentially, what we are hoping is going to happen over the course of these four webinars is that you are going to end up with a data and evaluation framework, that each of the Promise Zones is going to have their framework and be ready to go.

I know that a number of you do, in fact, have either full or partial frameworks at this time. And so for those of you who already have some work done on those, this'll be an opportunity to reflect and refine those. And for others of you who haven't really gotten a good start, this'll be your chance to make that happen.

And we do hope that those of you who are further along in the process will be able to share some of experiences and learning with those who are just beginning. So what I'd like to do now is another poll. In this case, we want to get a sense of where you are in your capacity to develop a data and evaluation framework.

So again, looking at lower right-hand corner, and please select the option that fits you best. Are you in really great shape? Are you doing pretty well on your framework? Are you not too confident about it? Or are you struggling a little bit with it? And we may have people at all different levels and that's fine.

So go ahead and choose your favorite whether you're not started, whether you're rock stars who are in great shape. All right. We're looking pretty good. Why don't we go ahead and close that poll.

So it looks like we've got quite a mix. We've got nobody who's really struggling. But we've got quite a few who are not too confident and only one who feels like they're in really great shape. So a little bit of a range and definitely folks who have some work to do on their frameworks, which means you're in the right place. This'll be our chance to help you really get to the end of that process by the end of June.

So our next slide here shows you what the four-part series is going to consist of. This session we're really going to be taking a look at working with your partners because that's such a crucial part of how you as a Promise Zone will be forming your data and evaluation framework. And we're going to talk a lot today about the theory of change and logic models, which really are the foundation of what you're going to be doing with your framework.

Session 2 we're going to actually dig into that concept of data and evaluation framework. Exactly what is this thing? What does it look like? What are the pieces? How are we going to get there? And we will really look at the different kinds of evaluation that you may want to plug into your framework. Session 3 is going to look at data. We're going to look at the data sources, kinds of data you may be getting, and really talk about some systems for collecting and maintaining the data that you need to collect.

And finally, in session 4, we're going to talk about some best practices for analyzing data. We're going to look at data visualization. And we're going to think about how you can use that to drive decision-making and to really engage new partners and inform people about what you're doing with your Promise Zone. So that's the lay of the land for the four sessions. It is certainly the case that many of these topics are interrelated and we may get to a topic where you have a question that we're going to be covering in a later session. If that's the case, feel free to ask the question. If we know we're going to be tackling it later, we may ask you to hold the question and we'll put it in a parking lot until we get to that later session.

In addition to the four webinars that you know about, we are going to be making sure that you get the kind of support that you need. There are a couple other supports that HUD is making sure of being provided you to. The first is office hours: There's going to be one-on-one help available to each Promise Zone as you complete your homework. So as you complete each session's homework, it's going to be building toward that framework, and there will be evaluation experts available to you to tailor your questions and to help you finish your pieces of work toward getting your framework together.

In addition, there are going to be four peer-to-peer learning sessions. Those four sessions are going to be designed to connect Promise Zone staff so that you can learn from each other and hopefully create a network that will be able to support you as you go forward beyond the timing of these webinars and these peer learning sessions.

So you can get a look here at your TA provider team. I'm Janet Pershing, as I noted at the beginning. I'm here with Xiaodong and Kasia. All three of us are with ICF and we are going to be your webinar trainers. We will then have office hours and the peer-to-peer sessions, then those will be provided by Trish, Jennifer, and Manolya. They are all with AIR and they will manage both of those pieces – the office hours and the peer-to-peer sessions.

We work for two different firms, but we are partnering here to make sure that you get the support you need in all dimensions. So for webinar information, you're going to be getting that from the three trainers you see at the top. And you will meet Trish, Jennifer, and Manolya as you get into the office hours and the peer-to-peer sessions.

So let me just give you a couple of thoughts about the role we are hoping that you will play. First and foremost, as everyone knows who's participated in a webinar, you get more out of it if you stay engaged and you don't multitask. So if you can convince yourself to turn off your e-mail and put your phone down and really focus on the content, you'll get more out of it, as you well know.

We also really hope that those of you on the call will actively share your experience and ask questions. Really a lot of the value of this – while we have some great material to share with you – will come from you sharing your thoughts with others about your questions, the strategies you've tried, the things that work for you, and the things you're still struggling with.

We also really want to make sure that you are focused on doing the homework. The homework is very much tailored to getting you through this process of developing a framework. If you do the homework in the chunks that we've broken it out into, none of the weeks will have a huge load of work. You'll be able to get it done. And at the end of the process, you can pull it all together into a framework. And absolutely take advantage of those office hours to help you get through the homework and get input at whatever stage of development you're in from an outside person who can give you their expertise.

So with that, let me give you a minute if you'd like to unmute yourself, if you have any questions that you want to ask at this point about what we're doing and how we're going. You may not have any questions, but please feel free to unmute now if you do.

Charlene Walla: Hi. This is Charlene Walla [ph] and I'm from USC, the research evaluation partner for the Los Angeles Promise Zones.

Janet Pershing: Hi.

Charlene Walla: Hi. I just wanted you all to know I can't see what you're doing but I'm listening so I can't [inaudible] picture –

Janet Pershing: Is that because you're not at a computer and cannot see the slides? Or is that because your slide's not working for you?

Xiaodong Zhang: She might be under session info instead of PZ webinar.

Jess Yuen: Yeah. Hi, Janet. This is Jess Yuen down in San Diego. Kayleigh is also having trouble logging in from San Diego, as am I. Kayleigh has a blank screen – a blank window.

[talking over each other]

Speaker 4: And Atlanta's having the same issue also. We can't see anything after you launch it.

Janet Pershing: All right.

Speaker 5: I'm experiencing the same thing.

Janet Pershing: Why don't we hang on for just a minute, let me consult with our technical team here and see what we can do.

Xiaodong Zhang: FYI, other people are having problems, the same issues. You can tell. Okay. Just tell them that.

Speaker 6: It opens in a different program, so if people are still looking in the spot where they clicked on the link, you won't be able to see anything. You have to look on the bottom to see if there's another program open.

Jess Yuen: I just get a blank white box opening. It's a separate – but it just says, fail on the top in part of the bar. I tried it on two different browsers and two different computers so –

Speaker 4: I've done the same thing and just getting the same result.

Xiaodong Zhang: I'm one of the presenters. We're starting from slide number 13. You all received a glossary in advance and we asked you to look it over to see if you have any questions, especially the terms with asterisks. We want to take a minute to check on how well you did in absorbing the information. Chantel, if you can bring up the quiz. And we have two true-and-false quiz questions.

The first one is data visualization is a term referring for very specific sets of display that can be used to analyze data that require a specialized software to generate – true or false? The answer is coming in. People are still working on it. Draw a picture of the data. Yeah. Let's close the poll. It looks like a lot of people are still undecided. This is a little bit tricky. The correct answer is false because data visualization, it doesn't really have a finite number of display. And more importantly, although it is true that some would require specialized software, it is not always the case.

Second one. Chantel, if you can bring up the poll, the quiz. It reads: The important distinction between primary and secondary data is timing. Primary data are data collected prior to the start of an evaluation while secondary data are data collected after the evaluation – true or false?

Speaker 5: False. [Inaudible] data are data collected directly from whatever study.

Janet Pershing: This is Janet. While you're thinking, I will just jump in to say we've had several people kind of muttering under their breath in the background clearly not on mute. Chantel is muting you, so if you have a little trouble being heard later, make sure to use the chat function to ask her to unmute you. In the meantime, please everybody, make sure you are muted.

Xiaodong Zhang: Okay. Let's close the poll. This time a lot more people ventured out. They gave their results. And of all the ones that we've received, they all answered correctly. It's false. The important distinction between primary and secondary data is not when – it is the data source, specifically, who's collecting data. The primary data are usually collected from the evaluator or the program people where the secondary data are data collected from somebody else and provided to the evaluator and to the team.

Let's move on to the next exercise. We're going to talk about the glossary terms for a few minutes. And Chantel, if you could bring up the white board function, and for those people who can access the WebEx, I would encourage you to try it. Please type in any confusing terms that you wanted to be sure to clarify by writing them down on the white board. And do that by selecting – if you can see on the upper left corner there's a T on the toolbar. If you click on that T and then click on the white board, you can type in your response.

Janet Pershing: And I will just add for those of you who don't have access to WebEx at this time, if you would like to just say out loud any terms that you'd like to have explored, please feel free to do that and we can jot them down here.

Xiaodong Zhang: Yeah. And if people are writing down their answers, I just want to clarify how this glossary can be used. You can notice that the one that is marked with asterisks are for the most part representative of terms that we either define or they are directly related to the webinar. The other terms are related to evaluation and they have specific meaning that you might come across while you are looking at the references or start digging more into the world of evaluation. So the key point here is that we would expect you to understand those terms with asterisks at the end of the webinar four sessions. And the rest of them will be used for your future references.

Janet Pershing: Looks like we had a couple of people experimenting with the white board but nobody having any questions about any of the definitions. One last chance for any verbal statements about those if anybody wants to chime in. Great, if they're all really clear.

Okay. We have someone who doesn't have a glossary. So two ways that you can access the glossary for those who registered prior to yesterday I believe. It should have been attached to your – there should have been an e-mail explaining that you should review it in advance, and it should be attached there. If not, we will give you a URL at the end of this webinar that will take you to a link where you can actually access the glossary.

I think rather than trying to spell out a URL here when not everybody has got access to be able to see things on the screen, I'm not going to do that right now. We will get that to you afterwards and you can take a quick look after the session is over. You can definitely let us know of any terms you'd like to have explained further after the session and we can tackle them next week.

Xiaodong Zhang: Now we have some results. Thanks for those responses. And we won't be able to review them right now, but we will clarify them as we are going through the session. For example, we're going to talk about logic model today and we're going to talk about Group C indicators in more detail in session 3 and descriptive statistic in more detail is session 4. So we will keep those in mind as we go through those related content.

Chantel, if we can move to the next slide. This painting was specifically designed for the PZ in the placed-based environment. Here is a list of place-based initiatives that you might be familiar with. And as you can see, many of them are from HUD, but there are agencies involved like the Department of Education, Department of Justice, and SAMHSA.

To help prepare for the webinar, we also conducted a quick application review just to learn about what the PZs are doing. The main finding is they're quite diverse. I just want to highlight a few findings. So for example, most PZs address crime, education, economic development, housing; and some tackled health, transportation, and infrastructure issues.

The lead agency tends to be mayor's office or city office or city department, but it could also include some of the nonprofits. Other partners may include implementation partners, support partners. But for some other PZs, they are more organized by subzones or action teams. At the time of the applications, very few PZs have data and evaluation framework developed. Although some have provided samples of their data sharing, data usage agreements and some have hired third-party evaluators. Next slide.

The cornerstone of the place-based initiative is this idea of collective impact. Now, here's a quick review of the collective impact theory with key elements of faces in a collaborative chain. I'm not going to read them all, but I just want to piece them out for your reference. Next slide.

Because PZ is such a complex endeavor involving so many partner organizations, it is paramount to engage these partners effectively. Here are some principles to help engage your partners. We will be coming back to this over and over in the webinar, because you can't really do it alone. You really need your partners. For today we're going to focus only on the first bullet. And we'll circle back to the others in later webinars. Back to Janet.

Janet Pershing: Great. Thanks. So next up, is doing a little bit of sharing about engaging partners and stakeholders. If you're going to be doing collective action, one of the things you really have to be doing is engaging the other folks who have to be involved for you to succeed and to do that well. And what we'd like to do is to invite Kayleigh to help share some of her experiences around this in San Diego. Kayleigh, I know you were having some difficulty accessing the visual. I hope that you are able to unmute yourself now and speak.

Kayleigh Creswell: Hi. Yeah. I'm here. Can you hear me?

Janet Pershing: Absolutely. Thank you so much and go right ahead.

Kayleigh Creswell: No problem. Hi. I'm Kayleigh Creswell. I'm the data associate AmeriCorps Vista for the San Diego Promise Zone. So San Diego is a third-round Promise Zone, but I'm sure as many of you can attest to, Vista and Promise Zone is a steep learning curve. So I'm happy to share with you the challenges that we've faced so far in San Diego.

So just to clarify some of our language that we use in San Diego, we have six goal areas. Those goal areas meet every month in working groups. And those working groups are usually chaired by two co-chairs. And we also have two research consultants that help us with our work. So one of the first lessons that we learned around engaging our stakeholders is that we really had to show value.

So we had to have a clear value add – or we tried to have a clear value add at every meeting that we're inviting our partners and stakeholders to. We also try not to play favorites, which is easy to do if you have a large partner that seems like they can do everything very quickly. I think it's important not to overlook smaller partners that might have that big expertise or actual resources that you need. So San Diego does best personally by, of course, our preference points our huge value add.

We also do grant alignment meetings, so the Vistas look up grants that we think our partners might be competitive to and invite them around the table to see how they might work together to apply for that grant. We also do activity alignment in our monthly meetings, of course, data and knowledge sharing, which is what these classes are all about. That's a huge value add especially to our smaller partners that might not have that capacity at their organization. And also reminding our partners that Promise Zone is a network, we also hold all-partner meetings, which are open to the public and, of course, all of our partners and that's once every four months.

So that's more doable for all our smaller partners who maybe can attend a long monthly meeting every month. And it's an opportunity to get everyone connecting and back together. In the future, we're looking to meet around funding opportunities more often to have that as a value add with a caution that we don't have any mission drift. So we're not going after funding just because it's there but because our partners are able to and it aligns with our mission.

Another lesson that we've learned around engaging stakeholders has been to clarify their roles. So we've learned that unclear roles can lead to apathy at best and messy misunderstandings at worse. So you'll have those that are afraid to step on toes so they won't get involved. And then you'll have those all too willing to step on toes. So it's important that we remind our partners and our stakeholders that the Promise Zone team is really the backbone and that they're the drivers of the work.

So in San Diego, we've done that through an MOU, which is a memorandum of understanding and that's signed by all of our organizations and our partners. And that really clarifies our roles both on the side of partners and the Promise Zone, makes everything clear. We also have written roles and responsibilities for the co-chairs that just says, the consultants, etc. we don't have those signed but they are very clear and laid out and written down.

And finally, as far as clarifying roles, as we've moved from planning to implementation, our consultants used to have a lot of support. But our co-chairs have recently taken over agenda writing, meeting facilitation with the best of the support. And this support often looks like reminder e-mails, sending past documents to use as templates, reminding co-chairs of [??] activities and note taking.

There's a few things that might be overlooked or silly, but we found them very useful as far as engaging stakeholders and that is appreciation and patience. So it's people who engage with positivity. So that might be personal e-mails thanking them for data or input during meeting. The personal invitation meetings are always talking about who's the best to bring around the table. And in the future, we're really looking to spotlight their work in newsletters or blogs as we increase our capacity as a team.

Circling back to that patience I mentioned, I think it's really easy to get frustrated as partners or stakeholders don't get back to you right away. But you have to remember that especially talking as a Vista perspective, we spend 40 hours a week or maybe more working on this. And our partners and stakeholders really vary in the amount of time that they can dedicate. And no one wants to contribute to something that makes them feel guilty. So we try to be encouraging, honoring our stakeholder's time by being on time to meetings, earning that trust by not rescheduling the meetings, and making their job easier by offering drafts, bringing printouts, and then bringing info to those who couldn't attend in the first place.

I think one of our most important challenges that we've actually faced recently is balancing consistency with novelty. So personally, we have six meetings a month every month. Our meetings are at the same time of the month every month in the same room. If any changes are made, it's across the board on all of our forms of communication. We've had challenges with that before where partners say, oh, I showed up to this meeting. I didn't know you changed it. I'm not happy with this. And we have to apologize.

That's not an ideal situation. So we've learned that lesson. At the same time, that can get dull doing the same thing over and over again. It's been great because people show up every time.

They know what's expected of them. It's easy for them to plan in their schedule. But as we move into implementation, we're trying to create some more variety in our meetings, so doing break-out groups. We are planning up some of our first joint meetings across our working groups. And doing worksheets and activities within those meetings really gets the energy level up.

And then one of the most important things has only happened once in the San Diego Promise Zone as far as the events that we have planned, but nonbusiness events – so getting to know your stakeholders and partners as people and not just seeing them when you're trying to get down to business. So in the month of last December, we canceled all of our meetings – so all of our six meetings, or co-chair meetings – and had a holiday party instead.

And that was a real paradigm shift for everyone. These partners that had seemed stern at first were actually really friendly in this kind of more relaxed venue. Actually, one of our co-chairs offered for one of our Vistas to spend Christmas with them because she had no Christmas plans and no family in town. And since then, it's really served to deepen trust between the partners and the Vista team, the Promise Zone team, between the partners. And I feel like it's really served to accelerate that work.

We also work to get out to our partners' events, like their galas and fundraisers, their graduations if they're in the education sector. In the future, we're looking to build that one-on-one relationship between the Vista and the co-chair to increase that bond further. So those are some of the lessons that we've learned so far. So I will open it back up to the group. And I'm interested in who's had similar challenges and maybe how you guys have faced them or challenges that I haven't mentioned or any questions about what I mentioned. Thank you.

Janet Pershing: Please feel free to unmute yourselves and respond. If you're not able to get yourself off mute, make sure that you chat with Chantel. She may have muted you if you had some background noise. Anybody have thoughts or reactions for Kayleigh? I'm curious about whether others have done some of the kinds of interesting and unique things that San Diego did – the holiday party as an example. Any other Promise Zones have some interesting techniques that you've tried or that you're thinking of trying to engage your stakeholders?

Katherine: Hello?

Janet Pershing: Yeah. Please go ahead.

Katherine: Hi. This is Katherine from the North Promise Zone [ph]. My question was in regard to the co-chairs if Kayleigh could answer. What was the strategy to best identify two co-chairs that had time and availability to be the co-chairs for the working group?

Kayleigh Creswell: Hi. Yeah. That's a great question. As far as I understand, they were involved before I arrived. But it was mostly on a volunteer basis. So a lot of it was getting the region's nonprofits and other stakeholders excited about what the Promise Zone had to offer. And then the people who are excited by collective impact really came to the forefront and became the drivers and then our co-chairs.

Jess Yuen: Yeah, Kayleigh. This is Jess Yuen. I am the HUD community liaison for the San Diego Promise Zone. Kayleigh is exactly correct here. As the working groups were being stood up, there was sort of a really intense look at who were the partners who had been involved especially through the two application processes that the City of San Diego had led? Who were our implementing partners?

And then in most cases, going to leadership at those organizations and saying, we still want you guys to participate. We want you to help lead this work. Will you participate in this? And either having them participate or them designate somebody from their organizations to participate, it was very much on a – looking at the people who were doing the work and who aligns with the work of that particular working group and having them lead.

We are going through some transitions. We asked in the beginning for co-chairs to commit to a year. And with that commitment, they were to work with our consultants and the businesses who were being on-boarded at the time in order to do a strategic plan. We have now recently gone back to those co-chairs and said, as we're moving into implementation we want to make sure that this is the work that you still want to lead.

We may have some shifts in co-chairs coming up. We had, for example, one co-chair who was working on both access to health care and healthy foods and also our safety working groups. And she has come and said, safety and informed work is really where my heart is and my organization is, so I will stay on safety and I will help you identify somebody to take my spot on the health working group.

So we are seeing some shifting of the co-chairs, but I think that's normal and expected. But those co-chairs really have been the drivers of the work. They are the ones especially the co-chairs of our education working group and economic development and creating jobs working groups. Those co-chairs are engaged to the point where they are the ones reaching out to their colleagues at other organizations and inviting them and asking them to attend.

Dan Queue: Hi. This is Dan Queue [ph] from the Philadelphia Promise Zone. I have a follow-up question to that. I know in our logic model in our application we identify a public and private partner and I'm wondering if that held true for the San Diego Promise Zone as well.

Kayleigh Creswell: Yeah. So now especially that we're going into implementation, we are really looking at especially industry partners. So a lot of our first steps into implementation are focusing on disconnected youth, so those youth that aren't in school or in a job. So it really brought our jobs and education group together. But we recognize the importance of hiring sectors at the table telling us what they need and what they want as far as training these young individuals.

So we've actually found that we've really formed an organic network. We already have a few community colleges around the table and those community colleges already have those strong connections with industry partners that we're looking to reach out to. So I'm not sure if they were listed specifically. We definitely had educational institutions and health institutions as well as nonprofit partners. And along the way as we logic modeled, we did come up with large industries. But now that we're getting down to the nitty-gritty, it's definitely as inviting specific names around the table. It's really become an organic process of inviting through people who are already around the table.

Janet Pershing: I'm going to jump in real quick. We're at the end of our time for this segment but it's been really informative. So I'm going to get one more question on the table before we wrap this up. Kayleigh, we know that some of the Promise Zones had some trouble reaching out to educational partners especially in high schools because of personally identifiable information issues. So the question is: How has relationship building improved your access or do you still have trouble communicating with those partners – those education partners in particular?

Kayleigh Creswell: Yeah. Of course. I think it goes back to using the network that you already have. So for us personally, our school district was very involved, maybe not the schools themselves. So it was about asking those partners for a warm hand-off to who else we would like to get data from. So for example, we were having a person from administration come from the school district and he was very involved.

And when it came time to gathering the data about after-school programs that the school district was connected with, it was about going to him and asking him for that warm connection, because I have tried to reach out specifically for data, just cold reaching out. And you are faced with that, what do you want? Are you trying to sell us something? Are you writing a story for a paper that's going to make us look bad? So it's much easier if you can find someone who's first- or second- and even third- or fourth-degree connected to who you want to reach out to.

Janet Pershing: Great. Thanks.

Ms. Shanike: I'm – I have a statement on this. So I'm Shanike [ph] from the Philadelphia Promise Zone and I support the education committee. And here we actually have someone from the school district sit on as a co-chair for the education committee and to engage principals who actually hold meetings at their schools. And we invite principals to speak about their school in the meetings when our education meeting is hosted at their school. And we've actually been recently seeing an increase in engagement by principals hosting meets at their school, having connections within their staffs.

Janet Pershing: Great. Fantastic. Thanks for sharing that. Sounds like that there may be a longer conversation that could benefit the group if you all get together after some of your peer-to-peer sharing to talk about education in particular. I'm going to need to stop our conversation there, I'm afraid, to get through the rest of the material. But thank you very much, Kayleigh. And we'll be back to you later in the session. Let me at this point turn it over to Kasia, if I may.

Kasia Razynska: Thanks, Janet. For those of you following along with our Power Point, we are now around slide 20. And in this section of our presentation we will be exploring what a theory of change and what a logic model is. I will start the conversation by talking through a theory of change and then I will pass it over to Xiaodong, who will explore the logic model.

Before we get into this whole section, however, we would like to take another quick poll to get a sense of how comfortable you are with your understanding of theory of change and logic models. You are amongst friends, so we please ask you to be honest. And let us know the poll is now open. It seems like we have a range of responses with some folks saying that they only have a vague understanding all the way to folks who feel extremely comfortable with theories of change and logic models. However, just because you know what a theory of change is doesn't mean that you necessarily like them. So we will hopefully by the end of this session convince you they are very useful tools that can really help you engage your partners.

So what exactly am I talking about when I say a theory of change? In plain language, a theory of change or a TOC is a way to check your logic and see why you think what you're proposing will work. You identify a problem and then you develop a hypothesis to solve this problem. A theory of change keeps you focused on strategies that deal with the problem you want to address. It is a good way to start – and a good way of starting a logic model is to ask yourself – in a theory of change is to ask yourself who, what, how, and why.

You start by identifying your target population or who you need to help. You then identify the outcomes that you are trying to reach for this population – the what you are trying to do. And finally, you use a process called backwards mapping. Once you have identified those outcomes, you start thinking about the strategies that you can implement to try to reach the outcomes that you've proposed. The benefit of doing it this way is that you ensure that these strategies that you're proposing will ultimately lead you to the outcomes that you proposed.

A lot of times when you're developing a theory of action you might think, here's my population and here are some strategies that I think will help me. And at the end you realize, wait. Those weren't the outcomes that I wanted. So by doing this process of backwards mapping and thinking first about the outcomes that you want for this population, it helps you focus those strategies to specifically hit the outcomes that you want to focus.

And the last thing in our framework is the why. If you look at that picture on the slide, the why are the greens arrows around the outcome strategies and population. The why is the reason for how you'll get to the what. It's the process through which you will move from your strategies to your eventual outcomes.

Now that we have a good foundation on what a theory of change is, why are we proposing that you start your process of building an evaluation framework with a theory of change? Sometimes practitioners find the idea of a theory of change a little academic. However, I want to convince you that it really does have a lot of value. A theory of change helps you articulate explicitly what you are thinking about and what you are assuming. It also helps to bring you and your partners all to the table and to articulate and share those assumptions that you might have.

Some of those might be different for different groups. And so by developing a theory of change, you can make sure that everybody is on the same page as to what their assumptions are about the problem that you're trying to solve. And the final benefit of having a good theory of change is that once it's agreed upon, it makes it clear to everybody exactly what you want to measure in your evaluation framework and allows you to do so both effectively and efficiently.

So now that we have discussed what a theory of change is why it's beneficial to use a theory of change, let's start thinking about how we would actually create this theory of change. And it can be extremely overwhelming to just to start with nowhere. So what we want to propose to you is a technique of writing a theory of change that will contain all the needed pieces. And we are calling this technique Pit-B. That's easy to remember if you think of a pit bull. So what is this Pit-B technique that I would like to [inaudible] for you?

Well, you start by identifying your problem. Not only do you identify the problem, but you also list all the assumptions that you are making that go along with that problem. Once you've identified the problem and all the assumptions, you then go through developing an if/then statement. And when you create this if/then statement, this is where you create your workable hypothesis about the strategies – which are the if's – and then the outcomes – the then's – of what will happen as a result of the strategies that you're implementing.

The final step of this process is creating a very good because-statement. This is the causal link that explains the logic to you why you think that the hypothesis will eventually lead you to the outcomes that you're expecting to reach. Let's look at an example.

Suppose that we have a problem and our problem is that students do not read at grade level. We believe that one of our assumptions is that the reason students don't read at grade level is that they are not receiving enough individual attention in the classroom. There might be other assumptions, but this is the assumption that we are – there might be other reasons why they're not reading at grade level, but this is the assumption we are going to for simplicity [?] try to deal with in this problem.

So an example of an if/then statement might be: If we provide 30 minutes of one-on-one tutoring and then after school, then the reading level of the students with improve. In order to check that hypothesis, we then develop that because-statement – why do we believe this hypothesis is true? This is our final check of logic.

So by providing individualized one-on-one tutoring to the students, we are able to give them one-on-one attention that they're not receiving in the classroom. More individualized attention helps them improve their reading because the tutors are able to tailor their teaching to the specific individual student needs. This logic makes sense. And therefore, ultimately we can say that as a result of our strategies, we can reach our outcomes and students' reading level will improve.

So now that I've walked you through this example, we want to put you to work again. We will have a short exercise in which we want you to be able to identify these critical components of the Pit-B model. You will see for those of you who can see our screen – you'll see a potential scenario come up. I'll give you a minute to familiarize yourself with this text. As you're reading this, I would like to bring your attention to statements that are bolded. The statements that are bolded are the beginnings of either a problem – an if-, a then-, or a because-statement.

As you read them, keep this model in mind and you'll see a poll come up eventually in which we will ask you to identify both the problem-statement and the because-statement. I'll give you a couple of minutes to look at it and read the scenario. And for those of you who are following along with the Power Point, we are now on slide 25. So I'm going to give you one more minute. And you will now see a poll come up. What we want you to do is we want you to identify which of the words – the bolded words identify the problem-statement first.

We're still having some folks write in. Okay. We're going to close the poll now. It looks like everybody who responded identified the correct statement, which is great news. And I think it was a very easy, because usually the first thing you do is you identify the problem. So obviously those of you who got it right, the first sentence is the right answer. Now we're going to ask you to identify the because-statement or the logic. Again, what we want you to do is we want you to hit the statement that starts the because-statement.

So it looks like this question was a little bit more difficult. For those of you who answered at D, congratulations. You got the right answer. But because there were several votes for different statements, let's walk through this problem piece-by-piece. So what you see before you is sections of the problem if/then and because-statements highlighted in the color corresponding to the model. So what you see in red, starting with adolescents in our city, that is the problem we're identifying. Not only are we identifying the problem, we are also identifying those assumptions about our problem.

And here you see we believe adolescents did not know how to make good food choices and so on. That is where we're identifying our assumptions. Following this we have our if/then statement. The if represents the strategies that we are going to be using and the then represents the outcome we're hoping to reach. So if adolescents learn about healthy shopping and cooking, then those students will become healthier. The outcome we're trying to reach is students are healthier. The strategy we're going to use is we're going to help them learn about shopping and cooking.

And that final piece, the piece that folks have a little bit of a hard time identifying – the give-away here is that it starts with the word, because. And this is where we're testing our logic. Why do we believe that introducing a strategy is going to help us reach our ultimate outcomes? We believe this because – we believe that once students learn about how to choose better food options and develop positive – they will develop positive attitudes towards eating.

I just wanted to draw your attention to the very last statement that ultimately this will – the statement that starts with, ultimately this will reduce adolescent obesity and related ailments, that statement is a final step in which we check – if our logic is correct, do we really solve the problem? And here I believe that we do just through the theory of change.

It's easy to develop the theory of change. It doesn't necessarily 100 percent mean that the program will work. However, one thing that I also wanted to highlight is that a theory of change is just hypothesis. Even if your particular program is grounded in evidence-based practices that were implemented somewhere else does not necessarily mean that the same program will be successful in your particular setting.

This is why it is very important at the very beginning list all the assumptions that are particular to your specific case, which will be slightly different. And a part of the – or the purpose of the data evaluation framework is to test whether your hypotheses will hold up in your particular setting. The last thing I wanted to mention before I pass it on is I wanted to talk about some common pitfalls that we have seen in theories of change that we have seen in our experience.

One common pitfall is creating a circular logic and basically stating, "My hypothesis will work because my hypothesis will work" – basically restating the hypothesis in different words. For example, let's say we're trying to implement a drop-out prevention program saying simply, we will introduce a drop-out prevention program and as a result of the drop-out prevention program, we will help the problem of drop-outs. That introduces a lot of circular logic and doesn't really explain in clarity what the because is in this situation.

Another common pitfall is having your theory of change be too focused on the process. Rather than really thinking about the link between strategies and outcomes, these theories of change tend to focus way more on exactly the details between the strategies that you're trying to propose. Another pitfall is including too much history of the program in your theory of change. Remember, what you're trying to produce is a statement that explains your logic, not give a history lesson of why this is the program that you chose.

And finally – and this goes back to a point I made previously – a lot of folks try to in the because-statements provide too much information that reads like a literature review to show that the program that your implementing is evidence-based, that it's been successful in previous iterations, and just providing too much of that literature review context. This is supposed to be a short statement that explains why this particular program is going to work in your context rather than providing an overview of all literature available in this program. And with that said, I'm now going to pass it over to Janet.

Janet Pershing: For those of you who are following along in the slide there, go ahead and move to slide 30. We hope to have a little bit of discussion right here, but I think we're going to skip that for the time being and do some Q&A and discussion about this at the end if we have a little time. I just want to make sure we don't cut ourselves short on some of the other content.

So when you look at slide 30, one of the key takeaways that I hope we will have some time to discuss later is making sure that you figure out how you're actually going to use your theory of change. It's as you know, good to articulate a beautiful theory if you don't actually use it to guide your work. And so in the webinars that are coming up, we are going to be talking about a variety of ways to apply that theory of change in your work and to the various elements of your framework. And in fact, I think we'll hear a little bit more about that from Kayleigh when we start thinking about her logic model in a little while.

So with that, let me ask Xiaodong if he can go ahead and talk to us about the logic model and we can maybe discuss theory of change and logic model together when you're done.

Xiaodong Zhang: Sounds good, Janet. A related topic to theory of change is this idea of logic model. Some people see these as two different tools with the theory of change focusing on the why-question and the logic model focusing on the how-question. But I really see them as the same thing in that the logic model is simply a visual representation of theory of change.

The why logic model: The key value of having a logic model is really to help us unpack the complexity and to clearly articulate a program theory. The process of developing a logic model is also a process to establish common understanding among partners. It also provides an opportunity to uncover holes in the program theory. Let me give you an example using a healthy food program as an example. And we will use the same example throughout the discussion of logic model.

Let's say the program goal is to improve children's health. In conceptualizing what needs to be done, different folks came up with a long list of activity. One of them was to provide training for teacher well-being. Upon closer examination, partners concluded that this activity won't directly contribute to the goal and, hence, they decided to drop this particular activity.

Conversely, if a program outcome is to improve children's knowledge about healthy food and yet the program does not have any specific activity that is explicitly helping children to attain the knowledge, then there's a problem there. So these are two examples of how theory of change can help us uncover the holes in the program.

We are on slide 33. Here's an example of a template for a logic model. In the next few slides, we're going to give a step-by-step illustration of what each component of each element means. I just want to emphasis that this is our template and our ways of doing logic model. Others may have had their own template or slightly different ways of defining and labeling things, which is totally fine. What is important is that we have to go through a systematic way, a systematic thought process in developing our program theory, a logic model.

So here's a quick overview of the key component of the logic model. If you take a look at the slide, on the left-hand side we start with inputs. And this is kind of a tabulation of the resources. The next element is called activity. The third column is labeled as output. And the final sections are outcomes defined by short-term, medium-term, and long-term. Let's not forget about the arrows that show the connection of all these different components and different elements.

I'm going to talk about each one of them in more detail in the next few slides. And the first element is called input. The input may include financial, human, organizational, and community resources. This is especially important to tabulate these resources here because the PZs have lots of pieces that have to be coordinated. Next slide.

The second element of a logic model is called activities. Sometimes it's also known as strategies. They are the tools and actions that we hypothesize that will bring about intended change. In this example, we provide a few sub-bullet and sample activity for our healthy food example. And these activities may include: providing workshops, providing counseling, and providing referrals to food programs and resources.

The third element is known as output. Outputs are direct tabulation of activities. People often compare output to widgets or bean counting. In our healthy food example, the output may include number of trainings provided. But they don't really tell us whether the kids are learning or not. So going back to the point, output what we are doing and not what happens because of it.

The fourth element is called outcomes. So the name refers to the expected change resulting from the program. These are our ultimate goals. If you don't see the outcomes materialize after the program is completed, either or both of these two things are happening: First, the theory might be flawed and/or second, the program is not implemented as designed. Since the PZs are 10-year initiatives, we offer some guidance on how to define short-, medium-, and long-term.

So for example, we arbitrarily say anything happens within the first three years are short-term, between three years and five years are medium, and after five years are long-term. But PZs may have their own criteria, which again, is totally fine. The bottom line is for long-term investment strategy like Promise Zones. You don't have to wait for 10 years to see what happened. You really want to be on top of evaluating the activity or whether the short-term outcomes are materializing so you can make mid-course correction. Next slide.

And now we're on slide 38. In doing the logic model, we often find that people are confused about the difference between output and outcomes, especially since both elements can be expressed numerically or can be quantified. Here's a recap of the key differences, both in terms of definition or in terms of examples. I'm not going to read them, but the key takeaway is that just listing the output is not enough. For example, we cannot just give out 40 books without trying to determine if this activity improves student learning or not. Next slide.

Now that we have defined different elements of a generic logic model, let's try to put it together by going through our healthy food example and clarify what they mean as it related to the healthy food. So for example, in terms of input, the input could include grants, money, staff capability, and the curriculum that they use to educate children about healthy food. The activity may include delivering the curriculum or delivering the training program. The output could include the number of workshops provided, number of people or children that have been trained.

The short-term outcome may include the improved knowledge, skills, and attitudes as a result of participating in the training. The medium-outcome could be reflected in improved healthy food choice and healthy behavior. And the long-term in this case would be the improved health in the community. So this is just a very quick example of how we put it together. Next slide.

In the previous slide, the logic model that we have shown were developed from left to right starting with the input and thinking through the activity, resulting output, and ultimate outcomes. Another way to do it – which Kasia illustrated and she was a strong proponent of that approach – is called backward mapping that's displayed in this graph. In this case, we start from point B to point A, which is the long-term outcome and try to back into what needs to be done to get there from point A.

As Kasia mentioned, there are several benefits of doing this backward mapping exercise. So for example, we can dream big by envisioning an end point. Secondly, it also helps you focus on what input that will get you what you want and not necessarily be constrained with what you have right now. But again, both ways will work fine.

For Promise Zones – now we are at slide 41 – this might not be as tidy. So for example, you may find yourself in a situation where the partner has already several certain activities being implemented when everything gets started. In that case, so they are at point A – so in that case, you really need to think about what outcomes those activities are likely to lead to and how that would support your desired long-term outcome in point B. And then you really need to think about what may be missing according to your theory of change, your logic model, and go back and think about what supplementary input and activity might be needed to help you get there. So we go from point B back to point C.

You may also find that some of these outcomes would require collaboration of activity between different partners and between different sector to achieve. So for example, in the case of reducing poverty, it's not just a mission of, let's say, Department of Economic Development. It would really require a different partner from, let's say, education, human services, to bring about the intended change. Next slide and we're on slide 42.

So this is an example of a logic model from a choice neighborhood program, which is also a place-based initiative from HUD. It's actually a logic model, but in order to fit the logic model in one slide, we kind of simplified the logic model by focusing on only two sectors. The first sector, the first row is about housing and the second one is about community development. I really want you to take a closer look and see how different activities leads to outcome and how they drive different output and how the different output would drive different outcomes eventually leading us to the long-term outcome, which is to transform our neighborhood.

In the next slide I'm going to show how this logic model is connected to the theory of change using our Pit-B model. So we kind of have it nicely color-labeled. Essentially, all the activities here are all if-statements – the activities including demolishing, rehabilitating, or constructing housing, or a different kind of a community improvement activity – these are our if-. If these activities are taking place, then we will see our long-term outcome, which is the fact that the whole neighborhood has been transformed. And everything happening in between from the output, the short-term, the medium-outcome – these are our because-statements. These are what it takes from the if- to our ultimate long-term outcome.

I just want to mention that the input section is not in here even though they are kind of equally important. The next slide 44, I just want to point out in the resource section – which Janet is going to talk about at the end of the webinar – you will find a link to another choice neighborhood logic model. We kind of present – I have a screenshot on this slide. And you can see this logic model is formatted very differently. But it essentially includes the same information that we've been discussing.

So for example, if you'll take a look and try to find where is the problem? Where's the problem section? The problem is really the need section in this logic model. And the ifs are labeled as strategy. Then is our goal. And because is our outcome/metric section. I want to show you then here not only because it is a concrete logic model used by a place-based initiative, but just to illustrate the fact that the logic model can be done differently as long as we go through the same thought process.

I want to wrap up by – I want to conclude by giving you some tips to creating a logic model. So for example, the first one is, it's absolutely okay to borrow and adapt from a similar program that you're implementing. And if you are creating a logic model, make sure that you focus on the Pit-B way of thinking.

And the third one is, when we create logic model especially for a place-based initiative with so many different partners, it's probably advisable to start small. And that different partner may create their own logic model and then you can all sit together and see to what extent collectively those logic models lead to a logic model at the PZ level and to what extent some of the activity needs to be connected so that we don't work in silo. Finally, and the most important point is that the logic model is a living document. And don't be afraid to adjust it as you learn through the implementation. Back to Janet.

Janet Pershing: Thank you. So we want to do some question and answer here. But I think what we're going to do – because I don't want to short change Kayleigh's time – is go to her first and then we will circle back to questions you may have. And I know we've gotten some actually through the system. We'll circle back to those after we've heard from Kayleigh. So Kayleigh, if we could, I would love to go ahead and turn this over to you. Talk a little bit about some of the challenges you've faced in dealing with theory of change and logic models and making sure that they stay active and not duck be on the shelf.

Kayleigh Creswell: Yeah. Absolutely. So I think one of the first things we tried to do while we were planning logic modeling and getting partners around the table is making sure there was early investment, so making sure everyone was contributing and doing so early on, really ensuring that they felt ownership of what they were contributing to. So we spent about 10 months logic modeling and gaining partners through that whole process. And that's going to vary deeply. But that was a very cognitive decision on the Promise Zone team then to be strategic and careful so we could have this document that we could refer back to again and again and really be our anchor.

We also spent two entire meetings picking our indicators and/or sources of data. And again, that was driven by our partners. We wanted to make sure that they felt like they were in charge and they had ownership of this process. So you really see how we tried to weave data and indicators into our planning and logic modeling. So those happened within that 10 months. Another way we promoted early investment was, as we mentioned, those inputs. While they can be funding or curriculum, most of all of our inputs are partners. And those partners directly correlate to activities that they've themselves volunteered to contribute to or that their organizations are well known for.

Also, we mentioned the importance of being flexible – so it's important to us that our logic model is not written in stone. If I had a dollar for every time we called it a living document, my stipend would probably be triple what it is. So it's a jumping off point for new initiatives. If it was written in stone, I feel like it would be a big turn off for more partners to join us and strengthen our initiatives, so it's very flexible.

So for example, both our jobs in education have a focus on disconnected youth. So what we ended up doing with our logic model is we took one subgoal from each working group, a subgoal from jobs and a subgoal from education. We took their logic models and then we combined and reordered a subgoal from their logic model. And now we have four steps and activities under that. And we plan to use that as a guide as we go forward working on a specific population. And that meeting took a half an hour and a couple follow-up meetings. But it was very easy because we had already had all of our thoughts written down and who was going to contribute to this in the logic model that we had spent time previously on.

Third, it's very important to have well-recorded baby steps, we've found. Logic models for Promise Zones can be huge and overwhelming. The San Diego Promise Zone has six goal areas, so our logic and each one has a logic model. So that's pages and pages and pages. So as we moved into implementation, we were very careful to prioritize what we were wanting to tackle first and then time line the rest.

We also were careful to keep track of the changes we made so that there were no groundhog's day meetings, that we weren't coming into a meeting saying, what did we change in the logic model last time? Who's going to contribute to this? It was very clear, like, meeting before last what had changed and what we were going to work on in this meeting to keep us from being overwhelmed and keep the work on track.

Fourth, to keep the logic model from sitting on the shelf is – we find it helpful that it has a voice, that someone be the official manager or kind of advocate for the logic model. So that needs to be our consultants, our research consultants. And in implementation that responsibility has shifted to the co-chairs in the Vistas. It also needs to be someone that believes it's a good tool. You don't want someone that's perhaps more action-oriented in their work and doesn't believe in a lot of planning. You want someone that likes to strategize and believes this is a really good method of implementation and planning.

And finally, just presence, just having it at the meeting – so printouts of our logic models are present at every single meeting and they are used. We use them as reference as we're talking about what work we're trying to get done. And in the agenda, the logic model and the things that's in the logic model are explicitly mentioned. So as we're going through our agenda for that day, it will say, we're looking at subgoal B in the logic model today and C's activities. So it's very specifically called out.

So those are the things that we found. We rely heavily on our logic model. And I think all for the better. It keeps us centered. It keeps us from getting distracted. So that's the end of how we've looked at logic modeling. So my question to the group would be: If you have a logic model, do you find it helpful, divisive or neutral? And if you don't have a logic model, what are the guiding values or the document that you're using instead of that?

Janet Pershing: Anybody game to respond to Kayleigh's question?

Jeremy Stroud: This is Jeremy Stroud from the Spokane Tribal Promise Zone. I use something that's kind of similar to what you're referring to, or at least I've tried to start. The only difference I think between mine is that this is showing a one segment model that's a progression through a one specific challenge. What I'm trying to do is understand all of the challenges and more importantly, how each one of those challenges relate to one another.

Tribal governments are trying to balance or judge where they're going to spend valuable resources and assets. So I'm trying to model that in a reasonable way given 50, 60, 100 different challenges, goals, and direction. Any advice there?

Kayleigh Creswell: Yeah. Absolutely. I can speak to that a little bit. So this is a very what was shown as kind of your foundation for first filling out a logic model. So what we've done is – again, that sounds very overwhelming and I know that's the challenge that all Promise Zone faces. We're trying to tackle everything at once within 10 years, granted – so what we've done is split things into goals and subgoals and then fill out the previous template that you've seen in those subgoals. So it helps break things up, keep it organized. And then as far as seeing how things are related in relationship, that's also something we face as a challenge.

I mentioned how we're having a joint meeting coming up between our jobs and our education working groups and how they've taken two subgoals and combined them and reordered them. So in this meeting coming up, we'd really like to see those relationships as well. So what we plan on doing is calling all of our relevant partners together that served those disconnected youth – either in jobs or education or industry – and having them – doing an activity with them where they typically place themselves, maybe be a sticky note and we can compile that later into something more professional so it's an interactive experience.

But having them somehow place themselves along that continuum as far as what's coming down the pipeline as far as, for example, I'm having 24 graduates on my certification program. And perhaps an industry can go, well, I plan on hiring 5 new employees with these skills and then so we can see kind of what's coming up and make those connections while we still have time to plan, so there's a warm hand off, that there's no gap that these disconnected youth are falling into. So I think that might be a good example of how you can see where those connections are in those relationships while still using a logic model.

Jess Yuen: I'm also going to drop in here. This is Jess Yuen again, the community liaison for San Diego. Throughout that whole planning process that Kayleigh referred to earlier – the strategic planning process – we were doing very similar types of relationship building throughout the entire thing. So every time we were looking at the logic model, figuring out the activities, it was always an open question of: Who is not around the table that needs to be around the table? Who was around the table but are not participating for whatever reason? How do we engage them? Who is the appropriate person of the room who already has that relationship? Can they reach out? Can they do a warm hand-off, things like that?

And then when we got to the conversation about data indicators and how we weave them into the logic model, it was a very concerted effort to make sure that all of the partners were engaged in the brainstorming process and in the prioritization process of figuring out what indicators we were going to track, how do we layer them together? It was a very robust effort in order to use that as a tool for maintaining and building relationships.

Janet Pershing: I think we've got a couple of questions that have come in that kind of have a similar theme. So I'm going to try to put these together. And Kayleigh, we'll let you have the first crack at it but others may want to chime in.

There's a bit of a question about as you're putting together a theory of change and logic model, you're doing this around programs that are being implemented in many cases by your partners. So what do you do if you have a partner who doesn't want to engage because they're afraid they may not accomplish it and they're going to be held accountable for it? What do you do if you want to put together a logic model or a theory of change, but you're not the entity that is running the program? Do you do that in isolation? How do you bring those folks in? How do you partner with them on that? Do you mandate that they do it?

So that whole process of working with your partners around the theory of change and the logic model, have any thoughts that you might share on that front?

Kayleigh Creswell: Yeah. I'm sorry. In this example, what's the reason for them not wanting to contribute?

Janet Pershing: In one case, they're afraid that they may not succeed and that they might be held accountable for the results that they've not been able to achieve if they put it into a logic model.

Kayleigh Creswell: Yeah. That's a really interesting challenge. I can't think of a specific time where we've faced that super clearly. My first thoughts would be that that's more of a one-on-one conversation and that has a lot to do with trust building and that we've mentioned as far as engaging our partners. I would say we absolutely don't mandate anything. We want people to be contributing because they want to contribute. We think that that's the best way to get work done. That's where the best work comes from and people are actually engaged in participating on their own behalf.

But I would think that that would be – in our case, it would probably be in a meeting with our director, our liaison, maybe the appropriate Vista and it would be talking through those concerns and asking them what kind of support they would need to feel comfortable contributing.

Janet Pershing: And I think that the basic process that you just described there very likely would address the other question, which was a more general one about essentially how do you involve a Promise Zone, an entity that got a preference based on Promise Zones and do you engage with them and how? I'm hoping that kind of got at that question as well.

Got time for just a couple more here so who's got thoughts either questions specifically for Kayleigh and the San Diego Promise Zone or anything you wanted to reflect back on? There was one other that came in that I think I'll mention about theory of change and logic model more generally. And the question was: It looked like we demonstrated the theory of change and logic model have pretty different purposes. And so if you start trying to think about them as a single thing – as some people do – that seems kind of confusing.

So I guess my clarification would be, I think if you think about the theory of change as what you think is going to be happening and why, and the logic model is really how are you going to implement that? What are the actions you're going to take and the output you're going to create to get where you're going in the long-term to achieve the vision in your theory of change? I think that's how they fit together as a cohesive unit. So I hope that answers that question.

See if anybody else has got a question that you'd like to do verbally. I'm not hearing anything. I will go ahead and just read another question that came in here on the screen. We mentioned that having partners can be input considering that PZs have limited funding, if any. Can we expand a bit more about using quantifying your human resources? And Kayleigh, I think you spoke specifically to that about the importance of thinking about the partners and their time contributions. Would you like to expand a little on how you had to quantify that piece?

Kayleigh Creswell: Yeah. Sure. Personally, we don't have any quantifier next to the partners and the inputs, but human capital is huge. They're the cogs that run the whole Promise Zone. As far as taking full advantage of that, we've been talking a lot about asset that mapping. So we've been using some different tool for that and reaching out to our partners. If you have a local 211, that's a great source. They have an organized database that's accessed online that says all of the local nonprofits at least and the services and the populations that they're serving. So that's a good way to clearly see in one place where your partner's strengths lie, but nothing beats directly reaching out to those partners.

And also, I would recommend all of our Vistas sign up for several different newsletters from our partners. So it's a great way to keep up on what's going on in our partner organizations, especially because as people are coming to our meetings, they only represent one person in sometimes what are huge organizations. So no one can know everything that's going on. It might not fall under their purview. So that's a great way to get a big-picture look on some of the things coming down the pipeline and recent successes and resources that your partners could possibly offer that maybe the representative that they're sending isn't quite aware of yet.

Janet Pershing: Great. Thanks, Kayleigh. I did have another one come in here, a bit of an observation in some sense basically pointing out that we need to make sure that if we think about this, we're framing it with the emphasis on the fact that the PZs don't do or implement these programs. We're putting together a theory of change and a logic model that is really for programs that our partner organizations are implementing and then in some cases are already underway. And that's a really important observation as we talk about how you involve your partners in thinking through your theory of change and developing your logic model.

Obviously, they are the ones who are out there on the ground doing this work and you need to make sure that they are in sync with you about what you're putting in your model. At the same time, as we notice, there are going to be multiple different segments of activities that you hope are going to come together for an overall goal, that collective action output. And so as the PZ, you really need to be able to bring it together and synthesize that material that's coming in from all of your partners. So I think it's an important observation that this is not all within your direct control. So thank you very much for sharing that thought.

I think we've got time for maybe two more questions if anybody has one or an observation. If you don't have a question, that's fine. You can just share a thought. Just one of my questions and this is one depending on how many of you have actually gotten yourself to the point of having a theory of change and a logic model: Have any of you found that you have had an opportunity to use it? We heard Kayleigh describe that it is on the table every time they have a meeting. They use it very regularly in her community. Anybody else find themselves using it actively in that kind of a way or in another way?

Angela: Hi. This is Angela from Place B, the HUD community liaison. And I think I have more of a not necessarily an answer to that because our Promise Zone is still developing our logic models. But my question is more to San Diego. Were your partners the one developing the logic models and actually putting the graphics together? Or was it your backbone team, because what we've found is that we're finding ourselves and our Vista team putting the logic models and the theory of change together and not necessarily our partners.

Kayleigh Creswell: Yeah. Absolutely I can speak to that. So at each of our meetings, it's all of our partners, the backbone team, as well as our consultants. I have to give a lot of credit to our consultants. They're the experts on a lot of strict modeling. But I don't think consultants are necessarily a necessity. What the consultants serve to do is a lot of reflection. So they'll say things like, so what I'm hearing is this, kind of summarizing the group discussion.

So a lot of reflection and then they'll be editing the logic model on site. When those reflections are approved by the group, when the group says, the partners say, yes. That is what we're saying or not quite. We need a work method that – and then the consultant will write down those changes in real time.

[talking over each other]

Jess Yuen: I was saying the consultants for the San Diego Promise Zone did a really great job of working with the backbone in order to guide the Promise Zone partners through the logic modeling process, and as Kayleigh mentioned, doing a lot of that. I hear this in making sure that everybody's on the same page getting consensus and then turning that into what you see in front of you. And over time – because consultants aren't forever – that work really has transitioned to the backbone team in partnership with the co-chairs. And that's how I think moving forward it's going to be.

Angela: So just as a follow-up to that, are there any kits or advise or Promise Zones that don't have a consultant where it's like our backbone team I know this is great that we're doing this data TA in this webinar to learn more about these logic models and the theory of change. But for Promise Zones who don't have consultants, then we're really just relying on the liaisons or director and our Vista team to put these pieces together. Are there any tips on how we should be putting these together or involving our co-chairs?

[talking over each other]

Kayleigh Creswell: Yeah. I will mention first, I think the most important thing is to make sure the logic model isn't sacred somehow, that your partners can't touch it or you need to do everything perfectly. It's a tool. And it doesn't require a certificate or a degree to be able to mess with it. You do have to think carefully about what's an output, what's an input, what's an activity? Are these things supporting one another? But it's very assessable to anyone who wants to use the tool.

So as we did have professional help, but I don't think it's necessary. After we went through our logic modeling, the Vistas kind of sat down and made our own logic model. And we found it a really helpful exercise personally. So it's very attainable for anyone who wants to approach it. And I think it's important.

I know there were some challenges that got brought up as we were logic modeling because as Jess mentioned just recently that we've transitioned to the co-chairs having more autonomy over the logic model itself where the co-chairs would be like, we need the consultant and we're not sure we're doing this correctly. So I think just encouraging everyone to really get their hands dirty in the logic model and ensuring that there's no special intense training needed in logic modeling.

Janet Pershing: Jess, did you want to get in a word?

Jess Yuen: Yeah. I just wanted to say really the consultant's the most useful add for them in terms of our process was for them to really just guide people and keep them moving along and to clarify. I mean, the questions that most of the time they would basically ask is: We're looking at inputs right now. What are some of the inputs that the group, you subject matter experts have? People would say things. They would write it down.

And then they would say, well, when you said this, did you mean that? Does everybody agree? Those were the types of questions that the consultants were asking. And it was really just to guide people through the logic model and then standardizing it across these different work groups. I think it's eminently like Kayleigh said – eminently possible for you to do that without outside help.

Janet Pershing: And I'm going to need to cut us off there on the questions just because of time. Some great discussion. And Kayleigh, thank you so much and you too, Jess, for jumping in with all those thoughts to share. I'd like to move on to slide 48, if I could, and talk a little bit about the homework. I mentioned at the beginning that we're going to be working through a homework assignment after each of the four webinars. And by the end of the process, it would give you all the pieces that you need for your framework. We did have a question asking if you could have a preview of what the homework is.

So I'll just give you the high level here. We can maybe get one written out for our next session. But basically, we're going to be starting by thinking about the logic modeling and theory of change that we tackled this week between now and the next session. In the next session, we're really going to be thinking about evaluation design and evaluation strategies, so you'll do some thinking about that. The following one you'll be thinking about data and what kind of data you will be collecting and your strategies for collecting and managing it. And then after the final session, you'll really be thinking about analysis and data visualization and how you're going to communicate your results.

So at a high level, that's what the homework is going to look like. You're really going to be developing those building blocks of the data and evaluation framework. I'm going to repeat something that Xiaodong said because I'm really afraid people will walk away and be worried about this. We in the homework are giving you a format so that if you don't already have what you need to develop – if you haven't already begun, you don't face a blank sheet of paper. You've got a form that you can fill out. It'll guide you through step-by-step.

That said, if you already have a fully fleshed-out document or a partially developed document or you just like another style better, you are under no obligation to use our template. It's simply a tool to support you if you want it.

The other thing I'd mention is that with regard to some of the questions about if you don't have a consultant how do you go about doing this, while you don't have a long-term consultant at your disposal, you do have office hours at your disposal. So you want to make sure as I talked about at the beginning those office hours, folks are there who have evaluation expertise who are available to support you as you are doing this homework. So I really want to emphasize that you should make good use of them. And we'll talk in a minute about how to access that assistance.

So slide 49 gives you the first of two pieces of the homework for this week. What we're asking you to do is very much implement what you heard today to describe your theory of change and then to build or refine your logic model. You will find in the homework that there's a blank space for you to write that theory of change. Obviously, we're going to recommend that you think about that Pit-B model that Kasia talked through. And there's going to be a Power Point that's got the little boxes and arrows just like you see them here.

Now, surely, your program is not going to have exactly this number of boxes with the arrows going in this direction. Obviously, you will need to adapt it. But the fact that it's already laid out in a Power Point template means you can just drag and drop things and copy the pieces should make your life a lot easier if you want to go ahead and use this as your model.

As somebody mentioned earlier, doing a single logic model for all of the pieces of what you're doing maybe overwhelming. You may need to do a separate chunk by goal or by subgoal. And that's fine. You can definitely do a separate page. And ultimately in your thinking down the road you're going to want to think about how does that all come together to meet your broader goals. But it's fine as a starting point certainly to think about doing a logic model that's fit by goal or by subgoal for your organization.

I'll also just say that we're asking you to do this particular exercise, come up with your theory of change, and draft that logic model in a couple of weeks. Obviously, Kayleigh talked about spending 10 months refining [inaudible] it's an ongoing process. You're not going to do that in two weeks. What you will be able to do we hope is to really think about what you already know about your theory of change and the pieces that you know about your logic model and get those captured into a framework that can then be refined as you work with your partners over time. So that's your first task is to think about those two big chunks.

The second task is on slide 50 and that's just to think a little bit about the barriers that may make it difficult to implement your logic model. And to kind of brainstorm about those we've definitely heard that there are some Promise Zones that have gotten to the point of coming up with their theory change logic model and then feel kind of stuck about the implementation. And that's the last thing we want to see is people stopping after you've put your work into the development. So we'd like you to think about the barriers that you're seeing and then really think about some possible solutions.

I think we've heard a lot of great creative ideas from Kayleigh during her discussion today. Other people chimed in with a couple of other alternatives. Think about those. Talk to some of your colleagues. And if you can't think of a possible solution, again, use those office hours. Talk to the folks who are going to be there to support your thinking about evaluation, about their thoughts about how you might be able to overcome whatever barriers you are seeing.

On slide 51, you will see that there is a link to the HUD Exchange. If you go to the HUD Exchange, you will find that you can go to programs and find Promise Zones. And on the Promise Zone's page, you will find on the right-hand side that there is a link to the data and evaluation framework process. That's where you are going to find the glossary. Some of you were not able to identify that at the beginning of the session today. The glossary is there. You will also find the instructions written for the homework. I just talked you through the two main tasks, but it's written there. The logic model template is there and a little template for the barriers analysis is also there.

One tip that I'd like to give you is that when you open those documents, depending on your browser and the temperament of your computer, it may not want to open. Therefore, instead of opening the document, if you run into any problem, choose "save as." You choose the save-as document and you should be able to get to it without any difficulty.

So that's the homework. I do want to just point out the resources that we've been alluding to on slide 52. Again, it's that HUD Exchange Promise Zone webinar page – you find all of the materials for these webinars. The office hours, if you scroll down on the HUD Exchange Promise Zone page, you get to a place where there's a link on that page where you can sign up for office hours. The AIR folks have got hours on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of the week following each of these webinars. So you can go on there and find yourself a block of time and get signed up.

You'll also want to be watching out for the peer-to-peer learning. May 9th will be the first of those sessions that AIR is going to be sponsoring. They'll be bringing folks together for some peer-to-peer sharing. You want to make sure that you catch that. And then we will be back here for the second of the four content webinars on May the 16th.

Slide 53 gives you some references that we used as we put together the materials today. If you have interest in seeing anything in more depth, they give you some links that you can try there. That would include the last item, which is the screenshot that Xiaodong showed you about the logic model that looked rather different but had many of the same pieces of content, just to give you an idea of different ways that you may want to think about and format your work to communicate with your communities over time.

And that's all we have for you today. We are right at the top of the hour so I'm going to wrap it up. Thank you all very much for your attention. And we hope that we will see you back here next week. If you have questions about the homework, you can go ahead and reach out about those. And we're going to make sure that we take a look at the technology and see if we can figure out what folks are running into so that we don't have that barrier again next time around.

So with that, I'll thank you all very much for your participation and we will see you in two weeks.

(END)