

Facilitating Community Decision Making for Youth and Adults

Facilitating Community Decision Making for Youth and Adults

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

1. Name of the Planned Program

Facilitating Community Decision Making for Youth and Adults

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
608	Community Resource Planning and Development	25%			
609	Economic Theory and Methods	10%			
610	Domestic Policy Analysis	25%			
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities	25%			
805	Community Institutions, Health, and Social Services	10%			
806	Youth Development	5%			
	Total	100%			

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

1. Actual amount of professional FTE/SYs expended this Program

Year: 2008	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actual	9.6	0.0	0.0	0.0

2. Actual dollars expended in this Program (includes Carryover Funds from previous years)

Extension		Research	
Smith-Lever 3b & 3c	1890 Extension	Hatch	Evans-Allen
0	0	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
698044	0	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
0	0	0	0

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

1. Brief description of the Activity

Form planning committees/advisory panels, facilitate participatory visioning and planning workshops, moderate local issues forums, train moderators and conveners for forums and issue framing, hold community meetings and conduct presentations, gather data and use decision-support tools to analyze alternatives for the community with citizens and decision makers, work with communities to address a specific need or issue. Also work with media; provide analysis, training and consultation for local and state government; work with local officials to provide classroom training for middle school students; facilitate project planning and local government field trips with middle schoolers; and conduct project fairs and other events to highlight middle school learning and civic engagement projects.

2. Brief description of the target audience

Targeted audience would be all social groups in the community, including low-income and minority, youth (age 12-14), adults, community leaders, local government and policy making groups, and state and local agencies. No limitation on gender, ethnic or religious diversity, lifestyle choice, etc.

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures

Target for the number of persons (contacts) reached through direct and indirect contact methods

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
Plan	5000	36000	500	1200
2008	21335	9303	1804	645

2. Number of Patent Applications Submitted (Standard Research Output)

Patent Applications Submitted

Year	Target
Plan:	0
2008:	0

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

	Extension	Research	Total
Plan	0	0	
2008	4	5	9

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target

Output #1

Output Measure

Number of partners.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	33	225

Output #2

Output Measure

Number of volunteers who assisted.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	400	388

Output #3

Output Measure

Number of communities/organizations using deliberative processes to dialogue or frame public issues.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	10	13

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

O No.	Outcome Name
1	Increased participation and diversity; % of participants reporting they feel they have an increased voice and opportunity to participate in the community.
2	Awareness of need to develop or update plan.
3	Awareness of need for increased participation and diversity.
4	Increased knowledge, understanding, and skills.
5	Number of communities reporting plan/project implementation.
6	Local officials take actions that increase citizen participation.
7	Increased civic engagement in deliberating public issues. Number of communities/organizations using deliberative processes at least twice per year to inform decision making processes.
8	Increased capacity to deal with future issues.
9	Change in community practice.
10	Improved community fiscal and economic performance.
11	Citizens of varying cultures increase their participation and engagement in local government and in the community.
12	Sustained capacity for informed local decision making.
13	Group or organizational sustainability.
14	Development or update of plan.
15	Increased partnerships and resources.
16	Evidence of community goal attainment.
17	% of citizens reporting increased volunteering/engagement in local government, civic organizations, schools, and informal arrangements (including citizens seek public office).

Outcome #1

1. Outcome Measures

Not reporting on this Outcome for this Annual Report

2. Associated Institution Types

3a. Outcome Type:

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
------	---------------------	--------

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

What has been done

Results

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
---------	----------------

V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes

- Natural Disasters (drought, weather extremes, etc.)
- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Public Policy changes
- Government Regulations
- Competing Public priorities
- Competing Programmatic Challenges
- Populations changes (immigration, new cultural groupings, etc.)

Brief Explanation

Community decision making outcomes were limited by several external factors. Appropriations changes reduced field faculty and thus the number of communities worked with and the time available to build local partnerships and reach diverse stakeholder groups; ability to assist communities with identifying public issues and framing them for public deliberation. This also meant reduction in capacity to educate communities about the public deliberation process and train community members to moderate the forums resulting in communities not having experience with the process or choosing to budget for other programs. Competing programmatic challenges have increased as there are fewer people and those who remain take on additional work. Population changes impacted public forums because new immigrants may not have language skills or may feel intimidated by established local populations and therefore unwilling to speak publicly about their concerns. Competing public priorities force citizens to prioritize which public issues they will engage. Citizens discouraged by usual methods of public engagement on difficult issues, which result in polarizing on issues and some public discussion breaking down into shouting matches, are reluctant to engage in another process.

V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies and Data Collection)

1. Evaluation Studies Planned

- After Only (post program)
- Retrospective (post program)
- Before-After (before and after program)
- During (during program)
- Case Study

Evaluation Results

The following results were used to update poll worker training in 2008: After the general election in fall of 2006, evaluations distributed to a sample of poll workers in all counties regarding the effectiveness of the new modules for poll worker training developed for use by county elections officials in the election received the following ratings (scale of 1 to 4—highest). Providing information about the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) received a mean rating of 3.22; explaining accessible voting machines, 3.51; and dealing with difficult voters, 3.48.

The Kettering Foundation funded a recent evaluation survey conducted by Sandy Hodge and Susan Tharp to determine the impact of convener/moderator training since the program's inception in 1998. One of the impacts reported was the development of networks as a result of convening community forums around specific issues. Many respondents wrote about non-formal networks being developed. These non-formal networks connected co-workers, connected organizations, and connected communities. Those that wrote about being more connected with their co-workers appreciated knowing who had similar training. Others wrote about non-formal networks being formed with other organizations, indicating that when organizations work with the same clientele, the training laid the framework so that future programming could be developed as a joint effort. One example given was related to assisting new immigrants. People in communities gained new connections. After a forum around the issue of death and dying, doctors and nursing homes developed a new connection. Other issues have prompted the formation of study circles.

- Quotes from participants who received training in moderating forums:

quot;Immediately following both days of the workshops, we found ourselves discussing forums we would like to put on ourselves, and eventually, teaching our corps on how to facilitate and moderate productive forums."

quot;'ll retool how I conduct discussions and/or deliberations. The possibilities are endless."

quot;One thing I plan to do as a result of this session is to share what I learned with others, and set up a forum for local issues. Maybe even talk the Greene County Commission into having you do a series of forums on up coming issues. It was a good training session."

In Willard, the city administrator sees a possible use for deliberation this spring. "I'm going to suggest that the city council's work sessions be restructured to more closely resemble a forum than the traditional work session."

From a participant in the healthcare field: "One thing I plan to do as a result of this session is look for a way to incorporate the public deliberation forums into our racial and ethnic health disparities work."

Six MU faculty are using deliberative dialogue methods in their college classrooms as a result of training conducted as part of Ford Foundation funding. The results of the 11 forums held in Missouri are included in the Southern Growth Policies Board's *Report on the Future of the South--Workforce Development*.

Key Items of Evaluation

The evaluation of the eMINTS (enhancing Missouri's instructional networked teaching strategies) program was both formative and summative. Formative evaluation validated that the goals of the program were being achieved and identified areas of strengths and weaknesses and where modifications were warranted. The summative evaluation addresses key performance indicators among students, teachers, parents, and the school. Analysis of student achievement outcomes included a comparable set of non-project participants. The evaluation used a mixed methods approach using surveys, MAP (state standardized test) scores, classroom observations, and focus groups.

The First Year Teacher Survey used descriptive statistics including statewide frequency reports, institution specific frequency reports and selected statewide cross-tabulations.

This year, *Round Robin Interaction* is being used for short-term evaluation of public deliberation. Participants will detail what skills they intend to practice and how they applied the principles in their own situation. Evaluation of longer-term impact of public deliberation is under development.

Evaluation protocols and measure continue to be developed for other decision support programming and for community planning programs.