

Building Inclusive Communities

Building Inclusive Communities

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

1. Name of the Planned Program

Building Inclusive Communities

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
610	Domestic Policy Analysis	5%			
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities	40%			
805	Community Institutions, Health, and Social Services	45%			
806	Youth Development	10%			
	Total	100%			

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

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

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actual	4.3	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 38040	1890 Extension	Hatch	Evans-Allen
	0	0	0
1862 Matching 251074	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
	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

Provide facilitation, training, workshops. Conduct intensive courses and conferences to share state of the art knowledge and research and to integrate research with community needs. Assist with organizational development, fund development, and tailoring content to local community need, and gaining non-profit status. Work with media and facilitate partnerships to assist in working to meet needs of Spanish-Speaking and other minority populations.

2. Brief description of the target audience

Targeted audience is all social groups in the community, including low-income and minority, youth and adults. No limitation on gender, ethnic or religious diversity, lifestyle choice, etc. Also targeted are those who are currently serving in a leadership role in an agency, organization, neighborhood, club, community, business or aspire to serve; local and state government officials and professionals working in community development.

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	3000	10000	300	1000
2007	15157	69136	705	13632

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

Patent Applications Submitted

Year	Target
Plan:	0
2007:	0

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

	Extension	Research	Total
Plan			
2007	0	1	1

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target

Output #1

Output Measure

Number of partners engaged.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	40	194

Output #2

Output Measure

Number of conferences, courses or workshops held.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	7	19

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

O No.	Outcome Name
1	Individuals have an understanding of the diverse relationships that exist within communities and organizations.
2	Increased utilization and development of networks that bridge between diverse cultural groups.
3	Individuals, organizations, and communities value and celebrate their cultural, ethnic, and racial diversity.
4	% of participants in the Community Development Academy that report changes in communities' capacities and collaboration as a result of their application of skills and knowledge after 3 years.
5	% participants will gain knowledge and skills in building inclusive communities.
6	% participants that indicate application of skills and knowledge gained after one year.
7	People understand and appreciate the cultural attributes of a diverse society.
8	More people from different cultural and racial groups participate in University programs.
9	Individuals develop skills in leadership, facilitation, group process, public deliberation planning and evaluation that make it possible to create, develop, and work with diverse groups.
10	Communities understand the opportunities presented by change.
11	Diverse elements of the community are engaged in civic affairs.
12	Educational resources are accessible and relevant to the needs of all members of the community.
13	Intercultural competence is demonstrated.
14	Individuals are engaged in activities that broaden their view of the world.
15	Public leaders reflect the diversity of the communities they serve.
16	Communities are integrated in that the public policies reflect the diverse interests of the people who live and work in areas affected.
17	Collaborative relationships among different interest groups are the norm for addressing complex community issues.
18	Communities have developed and use an inclusive planning and decision-making process that helps them effectively address societal changes.

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

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

Brief Explanation

Several external factors affected the Building Inclusive Communities Program. The public discourse on issues of immigration has created a climate of anger and fear in a number of communities experiencing a large influx of Latino immigrants. The State of Missouri saw legislation introduced that would have affected Extension's ability to reach immigrant groups had it been passed. The federal government's inability to effectively address immigration reform has added to local tensions.

Programs designed to strengthen nonprofits tend to focus on small community-based organization that have fewer other options for educational resources. Changes to the rules governing charitable organizations may affect how community-based organizations operate. A statewide conference of nonprofits in Missouri was held in 2007 that may lead to the formation of a state association, potentially increasing the voice of nonprofits in public policy.

Population changes continue to affect these programs. Few organizational resources deal directly with immigrants moving into small communities. Organizations that emerge to serve as bridging institutions are often under-funded, have limited prospects for growing their resource base, and have to compete with other groups and organizations that have longer histories, more capacity, and an existing resource base to strengthen their position. The lack of bridging institutions in many communities is negatively affecting their ability to effectively integrate the new populations into the community.

A projected slowdown of economic growth in 2008 and a possible recession has placed additional demands on existing service providers while simultaneously reducing the money in the system for their work. This has increased workload of organizations, the demand for the programs that support the work of nonprofit organizations, and the premium placed on effective planning and board development. Economic changes have exacerbated community tensions between newcomer and receiving communities.

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

1. Evaluation Studies Planned

- After Only (post program)
- Retrospective (post program)
- During (during program)
- Case Study

Evaluation Results

The Community Development Academy was the only program that engaged a systemic programmatic evaluation in 2007. Strengthening Community Nonprofit Organizations and Alianzas are in the process of developing programmatic evaluation processes. Both programs developed frameworks for evaluating their program and are currently in the process of developing effective measures.

The Community Development Academy regularly collects post program evaluation at the close of the course. In 2007, an online evaluation was implemented to measure the extent to which participation in the CDA prepared participants to practice community development. In the spring of 2007 the survey was sent to 154 people who had completed at least 1 of the 3 CDA courses between 2003 and 2006. Sixty-six of the 154 responded. Of the 154 email accounts, 25 were returned as undeliverable leaving us with a response rate of 51%. Respondents were mostly women (70%), white (77%), and worked for the University (56.5%), or another academic institution (21%). Participant responses indicated their involvement in CDA led to changes in community development practices, increased resources, increased volunteerism and new projects. of Missouri Development Academy

Community Development Practices—Seventy-five percent of participants reported their knowledge of community development process increased quite a bit or extensively; 72% reported their understanding of CD principles increased quite a bit or extensively; 70% reported their knowledge of CD tools increased quite a bit or extensively; 63% increased their understanding of the diverse relationships that exist within communities and 47% increased their interaction with diverse groups.

Increased Resources—For 47% of the participants the value of the Community translated into increased resources for their organizations or communities. Some of the participants (16) estimated a dollar value of \$955,250 in increased resources. Development Academy

Increased Volunteerism—The use of learning in CDA has mobilized 489 volunteers serving more than 900 hours. New volunteers were attracted and seasoned volunteers were energized.

New Projects—Nearly half (49%) of the participants have successfully mobilized or coordinated a new project. Nine projects related to economic viability, nine projects related to building inclusive communities, six projects related to community leadership, and four projects related to community decision-making.

Key Items of Evaluation

Community Development Academy—The Community Development Academy evaluation reported above was piloted for the first time in 2007. We plan to conduct the survey annually to assess how participation in the course translates into the increased capacity of the participants and leads to changes in communities. The challenge is that some participants will have completed 1 course and others all three. By the time each participant completes all three courses they could have seen the online survey three times. This could lead to survey fatigue and affect the quality of the data collected. Analysis of the results of the 2007 survey will result in revisions to the program. The instrument will be reviewed and revised based on analysis of the survey results and the needs of the program.

Strengthening Nonprofit Community Organizations—There is currently no systematic programmatic evaluation. Evaluations of workshops will focus on the learning from that event. Much of the work in this program area is ongoing and in consultation with nonprofits over time. A framework for programmatic evaluation is being designed to focus on eight core areas of work: collaboration, strategic planning, working with volunteers, marketing, board development, starting a nonprofit, financial management, and basic operating guidelines. A one-page questionnaire will be developed for each program area. In addition, a case study protocol will be developed that can be conducted with selected organizations to collect in-depth data that evaluates our work with nonprofits over time.

Alianzas—The Alianzas program is also developing a framework for evaluation similar to the Strengthening Nonprofit Organizations program. One of the larger efforts has been focused on building networks of stakeholders and service providers. These relationships have led to a number of programmatic opportunities. The challenge is to effectively measure the contribution of this work. The Bi-national Health Week is developing evaluation measures to evaluate the impact of that program.