CITY OF OAKLAND

AGENDA REPORT

2008 NOV 20 PM 1: 19

OAKLAND

OFFICE OF

THE CITY CLERK

To:Public Safety CommitteeFrom:Dan Lindheim, Acting City AdministratorDate:December 2, 2008

Re: A Report Adopting the Measure Y (Violence Prevention and Public Safety Act of 2004) Evaluation Report for the First Quarter of FY 2008-2009

SUMMARY

The first quarter evaluation of the implementation of Measure Y community policing and violence prevention programs is hereby submitted to the Oakland City Council. The independent evaluation, performed by Resource Development Associates (RDA), covers the first three months of violence prevention program implementation (July – September 2008) under the new evaluation contract, effective July 16, 2008.

This quarterly report is an update on the progress of violence prevention programming and community policing efforts. The report incorporates the process evaluation work performed by the previous evaluator, Berkeley Policy Associates (BPA/RAND). The process evaluation answers the following key performance questions, as adopted by the Measure Y Oversight Committee:

- 1. Are the funded programs implemented as intended by Measure Y?
- 2. Are Measure Y resources being spent to provide services to the target communities?
- 3. What implementation challenges do programs face?
- 4. How are these challenges being addressed?

These are *process* questions focused on start-up implementation. At the time of the BPA process evaluation, there was consensus among the Measure Y Oversight Committee, the evaluator (BPA), and staff, that the initial nine months of programming was insufficient time to comprehensively assess Measure Y program impact. Consequently, the present contract with Resource Development Associates is an *outcome* evaluation – to ascertain the extent to which Measure Y violence prevention programming reduces and prevents violence in Oakland.

FISCAL IMPACT

This is an informational report, fiscal impacts are not included.

BACKGROUND

Passed by Oakland voters in 2004, Measure Y is a comprehensive effort to address the root causes of violence including poverty, unemployment, discrimination, substance abuse, educational failure, fragmented families and domestic violence. The initiative provides over \$20 million per year for increased fire safety, police services and violence prevention programs. The initiative mandates an independent evaluation of the overall Measure Y program including the number of people served and the rate of crime or violence reduction achieved.

KEY ISSUES AND IMAPCTS

Measure Y's violence prevention program component supports street outreach, violence prevention activities in schools, formerly incarcerated reentry services, after-school employment and sports programs, gang prevention programs and services for victims of domestic abuse and sexually exploited minors. The violence prevention programs – 27 programs run by 18 grantee organizations within 15 strategies - have generally been implemented according to plan.

Resource Development Associates is laying the groundwork for the outcome evaluation of Measure Y violence prevention programming. This includes the development of evaluation tools and a review of data collection practices and systems. Logic models are being developed for each violence prevention strategy and evaluation coaches have been assigned to each strategy cluster group. Ultimately, RDA will identify the strengths and challenges of each grantee and the logic models will inform the cluster-level and initiative wide logic models.

For the initial sixteen months of Measure Y, the deployment of problem-solving officers (PSOs), the cornerstone of the community policing initiative, was delayed due to a lack of available PSOs and a lack of equipment and training, frequent transfers of officers out of assigned community policing beats, and infringement on the PSOs time. Additionally, the implementation of community policing in Oakland was compromised by a lack of

Dan Lindheim	
Measure Y Quarterly Evaluation	

community participation. Community meetings involving the PSOs are generally poorly attended by residents and business leaders, and some of those who do participate report being intimidated and harassed by neighborhood criminals, particularly in high-stress neighborhoods.

The Oakland Police Department recently deployed the full contingent of fifty-seven (57) problem-solving officers. During the first quarter period covered by this report, Resource Development Associates has used stakeholder input and best practices research on key elements of community policing to design several tools to track community policing and Neighborhood Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) activities, including:

- 1. Integrated NCPC/Community Policing Scorecard: The scorecard will track problem solving activity, community involvement and crime trends by beat.
- 2. Action Focused Agenda for NCPS: The purpose of the action-agenda is to track problem-solving activities, collaboration, community involvement and attendance at NCPC meetings in order to assess the overall functioning, activities and successful strategies of the NCPCs.
- 3. Community Policing Case Study: A case study will be conducted on six NCPCs.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Measure Y Initiative mandates an independent evaluation of all funded programs. Resource Development Associates was selected through a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process in June 2008. A combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods will be used in the assessment. The qualitative methods include structured interviews with department and program managers and staff, review of program and management documents, and focus groups with community stakeholders and program participants. The quantitative methods include analysis of program data on officer deployments, crime reports, and violence-prevention program data, which include participant background characteristics, patterns and achievement of program milestones.

SUSTAINABLE OPPORTUNITIES

Economic: A viable community policing and violence prevention program will result in a reduction in crime and violence and garner enhanced resident participation and engagement in our neighborhoods and commercial areas.

Environment: There are no environmental opportunities identified in this report.

Social Equity: Overall public safety efforts are enhanced with an effective community policing and violence prevention program.

DISABILITY AND SENIOR CITIZEN ACCESS

There are no ADA or senior citizen access issues identified in this report.

RECOMMENDATONS(S) AND RATIONALE

Staff recommends the Oakland City Council approve and accept the First Quarter Evaluation Report as submitted by independent evaluator Resource Development Associates. The outcome evaluation is progressing in compliance with the mandate of the Measure Y Initiative.

ACTION REQUESTED OF THE CITY COUNCIL

Staff requests the Oakland City Council accept the Measure Y First Quarter Evaluation Report.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Bake Assistant to the City Administrator

APPROVED AND FORWARDED TO THE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

dministrator

Measure Y Evaluation First Quarterly Report: Fiscal Year 2008-2009 August 21, 2008-October 6, 2008 Prepared by: Resource Development Associates, Gibson & Associates & Mark Morris Associates

Measure Y First Quarter Evaluation Report: 8/21/08-10/06/08

1

I. Measure Y Overview

The Measure Y initiative was passed by Oakland voters in 2004 and provides approximately \$19 million in funding for community policing efforts, violence prevention programs, and fire services each year over a ten year period. This year, 2008, is the third year of the initiative. The initiative aims to reduce violence and its associated social problems through a multi-pronged approach that is informed by the principles of prevention, effective policing, and the targeting of resources to the most at-risk populations and neighborhoods. Measure Y serves Oakland youth and adults through a wide range of violence prevention strategies, including diversion and reentry, youth outreach, employment and training, family violence and mental health services, gang intervention and prevention, schoolbased prevention, Mayor's Street Outreach, Violent Incident Response, Police Services, and Oakland Police Neighborhood Services. Through contracts with community-based organizations, the violence prevention component expands preventive social services to the most at-risk youth and adults within Oakland, with an emphasis placed on youth and children. The police services component funds a range of community policing services and equipment.

II. Overview of the Evaluation and First Quarter Activities

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the extent to which the Measure Y initiative is reducing and preventing violence in Oakland by tracking and measuring program and participant processes and outcomes. It is aimed at creating a system of continuous program improvement by sharing information on providing the results of the evaluation to inform program development and policy level decision making. In addition information on best practices and mapping Measure Y efforts against what has been found to work will be an ongoing part of this effort so that as the initiative matures the results of the effort will increasingly improve.

Berkeley Policy Associates' and RAND's previous evaluations have laid a foundation for this year's evaluation. The evaluation builds on their efforts, while also incorporating new methods to enhance the overall evaluation. Additional methods include:

- Determining long term change in attitudes and perceptions of crime among Oakland residents
- Measuring the ways in which Violence Prevention and Community Policing programs are mapped against established best practices in their respective fields
- Providing an evaluation coach and individual evaluation report for each Violence Prevention Program
- Improving the Measure Y system's capacity to collect and analyze meaningful outcome data that captures program impact upon schoolbased, employment, crime and recidivism outcomes

- Creating a community of learning among the violence prevention programs through cluster meetings and best practice research
- Providing additional tools and systems for enhanced data collection at the program, cluster and initiative level
- Creating a *Scorecard* to summarize NCPC-PSO partnership activities and the impact the NCPC-PSO community policing efforts are having on beat-level crime and neighborhood level quality of life
- Conducting an in-depth case study of community policing and NCPC/Neighborhood Watch activities through a case study of six police beats.

Summary of First Quarter Activities

The purpose of this report is to apprise stakeholders of the evaluation activities during the first 2.5 months of our evaluation effort from the period spanning August 21, 2008 through October 6, 2008. We have not provided any data analysis of outcome or process measures. We will provide such information in our February report.

These first few months can generally be characterized as our effort to learn about the stakeholders, the key individuals and the organizations involved in the initiative, while also reviewing data that is currently being collected, examining data systems, and piloting outcome analysis methods using samples of the data. We have received an orientation on utilizing the CMS system and have analyzed what is contained in the system. We are preparing a request for a dump of information from the CMS system that we will utilize for our second quarter report. In relation to the Violence Prevention component, we have begun the work of providing evaluation coaching to all grantees, begun to develop logic models for the programs, clusters and the initiative as a whole, and have finalized plans for data collection. For the community policing component, we have learned about the available data systems and methods of collection, while also finalizing plans for data collection during the second quarter.

We were glad for the opportunity to meet with the evaluators from the last cycle, Berkeley Policy Associates and RAND, and to begin to coordinate and incorporate their work into our evaluation plan and approach. We have agreed to keep each other informed so that our ongoing quarterly reports and their final report are complimentary.

Our beginning efforts during these past two months have been consistent with our overarching evaluation approach which is to utilize evaluation as a way to measure the impact of program on the clients and community they serve, while also aiding them with tools, information, and research on what works. Our goal is to foster a learning environment at all levels of the Measure Y initiative.

III. Key Evaluation Activities

During the first quarter of fiscal year 2008-2009 we have focused on finalizing the evaluation plan and laying the groundwork for evaluation activities by reviewing

Measure Y First Quarter Evaluation Report: 8/21/08-10/06/08

available data collection systems, meeting and discussing important evaluation questions with key stakeholders and implementing data collection activities. This section is organized as follows:

- Stakeholder Engagement
- Evaluation Design
- Data Collection & Analysis
- Next Steps for the Second Quarter

Stakeholder Engagement

We have dedicated significant time to meeting with Police, Department of Human Services, and Neighborhood Services staff, as well as grantees to gather their input on our proposed evaluation design and to learn about their current practices and systems of evaluation. The table below outlines these meetings over the past two months.

Area	Attendance	Purpose	Outcome
Initiative- wide	Measure Y Oversight Committee	Meeting to present evaluation design, discuss evaluation questions and obtain input.	Incorporated input into evaluation design. Gathered evaluation questions.
Initiative- wide	Oakland Department of Human Services: Measure Y Program Monitoring Team	Meeting to discuss differences between monitoring and evaluation activities.	
Initiative- wide	DHS, City Administrator's Office Staff: Sarah Bedford, Jeff Baker, and Dyanna Christie, Deputy Chief David Kozicki		
Community Policing	RAND- Jeremy Wilson, PhD Associate Director, Center on Quality Policing, RAND Corporation	Phone conference to discuss RAND's current community policing evaluation activities and report.	Incorporate tools and activities into case study and community policing evaluation. Use RAND's evaluation results as a baseline for Community Policing.

Stakeholder Meetings: August 21, 2008- October 6, 2008

Area	Attendance	Purpose	Outcome
Community Policing	Neighborhood Services: Claudia Albano, Manager and NCPC evaluator, Kim Gilhuly	Two meetings to discuss existing data collection and evaluation activities and proposed evaluation plan.	Develop integrated NCPC and Community Policing score card and action agenda for use with NCPCs to track activities. Identify NCPCs for inclusion in case study.
Community Policing	Police Services: Deputy Chief David Kozicki	Meeting to discuss existing data collection and evaluation activities and proposed evaluation plan.	Develop integrated NCPC and Community Policing score card.
Community Policing	Police Services: Eastmont Problem Solving Officers	Meeting to view the current data system that some PSOs are currently using to enter information about community policing activities.	Understanding of data systems and needs to track community policing activities.
Community Policing	Police Services: Marie Mason, Crime Analyst	Meeting to view the current data system capabilities and limitations.	Request for data to conduct benchmark, mapping and trends analysis in crime activity.
Violence Prevention	Department of Human Services Staff	Meetings to review evaluation plan, clusters, logic models and CitySpan database.	Assign evaluation coaches to clusters, plan quarterly meeting, develop logic models, and pilot outcome data.
Violence Prevention	Violence Prevention Grantee Quarterly Meeting	Quarterly meeting to review our approach to evaluation, a basic introduction to the principles, purpose, and value of evaluation, and break out groups by cluster.	Shared understanding of evaluation approach and purpose. Develop cluster- level logic model based on input.
Violence Prevention	Citywide Meeting with all VPP grantees	Overview of evaluation approach, conducted cluster-level group meetings to discuss common goals, outcomes and data collection strategies.	Feedback from agencies to clarify where programs within clusters differ. Shared understanding of evaluation approach, purpose, activities and timeline.
Violence Prevention	Violence Prevention Grantees- 29 agencies	Interviews with VPP managers to collect information on purpose, goals, and outcomes for logic model designs.	29 agencies contacted. 70% of logic models drafted. 10% drafting is in process. 20% still scheduling interview.

As the table outlines, we have met with a wide-range of stakeholders over the past two months, incorporating their input, perspectives and experience into our approach and activities. One meeting that was particularly successful was our first quarterly meeting with Violence Prevention Program grantees, attended by more than 45 people. The meeting included a review of our approach to evaluation, a basic introduction to the principles, purpose, and value of evaluation, and break out groups by cluster to begin to create shared outcomes and measures. At this meeting, grantees also had an opportunity to network with similar programs, ask questions about evaluation, and provide feedback on their evaluation needs. The meeting was viewed as highly successful by grantees and City Staff, with 79% reporting in the meeting feedback survey that the meeting had met their expectations. Grantees were particularly pleased with an

"Great overview of goals and purpose of evaluation. I'm excited for this partnership!" Participant at 9/25/08 Quarterly Meeting

"I look forward to more time to work with other organizations and to talk about each other's challenges, concerns, and ways to collaborate; also to help pick up ideas and share stories." Participant at 9/25/08 Quarterly Meeting opportunity to meet in breakout groups with their clusters and share information, strategies, and challenges.

Evaluation Design

During the first quarter, significant effort has been dedicated to assessing existing data collection systems and capacities and designing data collection tools,

informed by a review of background documents, meetings with stakeholders, and the piloting of outcome data. Because we strive to create ownership among users of the evaluation, we have incorporated their input into the design of evaluation tools and activities. Below we describe the key activities we have completed in relation to evaluation design.

Community Policing/NCPC Data Collection Tools

Using the input from stakeholder meetings and best practices research on key elements of community policing programs, we have designed several tools to begin to track community policing and NCPC activities, including:

1. Integrated NCPC/Community Policing Scorecard: We have created a draft of an integrated NCPC and Community Policing scorecard that will track problem solving activity, community involvement and crime trends by beat (see attachment). This scorecard will be revised during the second quarter with input from PSOs, NSCs, and NCPC participants. This Scorecard will provide an easily understood beat-level summary of PSO-NCPC activity and the impact of that activity. (See Appendix C)

2. Action Focused Agenda for NCPCs: We have developed an action-focused agenda to be piloted at NCPC meetings during the second quarter. The purpose of the action-agenda is to track problem-solving activities, collaboration, community involvement, and attendance at NCPC meetings so that we are better able to report on the overall functioning, activities and successful strategies of the NCPCs. We are also helping NSD develop protocols and tools to better engage

Measure Y First Quarter Evaluation Report: 8/21/08-10/06/08

and activate new participants and to foster the continued development of Neighborhood Watch programs. (See Appendix C)

3. Criteria for NCPC Inclusion in the Case Study: We will be conducting a case study on community policing and problem solving within six NCPCs in Oakland. As a first step, we have been working with Neighborhood Services Division and City Administrator staff to identify a list of ten potential beats. This list will be reviewed by OPD, with a final selection being made by November 1. We have agreed on the following criteria in developing a final list:

- Measure Y Funded PSOs: The NCPC-PSO partnerships selected will include at least five beats with PSOs funded by Measure Y.
- Overall Functioning: The final list will include NCPCs with a range of overall functioning: 2-3 high functioning, 1-2 moderate functioning and 1-2 low functioning NCPCs.
- Criminal Activity: NCPCs operating in neighborhoods with significant levels of criminal activity will be prioritized.
- Geography: In order to ensure geographic representation, NCPCs will be selected from East, West and Central Oakland.

Violence Prevention Pilot Outcome Data Match

In order to ensure that we are able to successfully provide outcome information by program type such as employment, re-entry, and school based services, we conducted a pilot outcome data match of individuals served in Measure Y employment programs with parole data. This has helped us understand what type of information is currently available through the CitySpan database, as well as the type of information we will receive from other institutional data systems and the general quality of such data. The preliminary data was made available to City staff, and this exercise will help us develop informed recommendations for improving data collection techniques and analysis in subsequent quarters. While we have not had the opportunity to view the school, probation, and juvenile justice archival data, we are looking forward to receiving these data sets shortly.

Data Collection & Analysis

During the first quarter, we focused on developing tools, reviewing data collection practices and systems, and finalizing the plan for data collection of community policing and violence prevention programs. We have been laying the groundwork for data collection and analysis during the second quarter, while also developing logic models for the Violence Prevention grantees.

Logic Models

Logic models represent the first step in developing an understanding of what the initiative is trying to accomplish, how it is being accomplished, and how we will know if it is working. We are in the process of developing initiative, cluster and individual logic models, having focused our attention this quarter on developing individual program level logic models. The program level logic models provide important information about current data collection practices, help us to

Measure Y First Quarter Evaluation Report: 8/21/08-10/06/08

understand the strengths and challenges of each organization, and will be used subsequently to inform the cluster-level and initiative-wide logic models.

Evaluation coaches have been working with each agency to create a logic model for each of their funded programs (some have more than one funded program). Evaluation coaches are responsible for a single cluster of programs, gathering information from the CitySpan database and through one-on-one interviews with program directors or managers. We have accomplished the following:

- 1. Evaluation coaches have contacted all 29 agencies.
- 2. Of the 29, 79% or 23 have been interviewed.
- 3. Logic models have been drafted for 70% of all agencies.
- 4. Six programs still need to be interviewed.

Appendix A outlines the status of logic models for all agencies and Appendix B provides a sampling of completed logic models.

In our interviews with program managers, we have been impressed with the level of interest in the evaluation, as well as a sincere desire on the part of practitioners to communicate their story more effectively and to learn more about best practices in their fields so that they may best serve their clients.

Next Steps for the Second Quarter

Building on our work during the first quarter, we plan to move more actively into the data collection and analysis phase of the evaluation. We plan to conduct the following activities during the second quarter:

1. Community Policing/NCPC Data Collection: During the second quarter, we will begin collecting data at the six NCPCs identified for inclusion in the case study through site visits, observations, and key informant interviews with stakeholders and residents; problem solving officers and neighborhood services coordinators will begin collecting data for use in the integrated scorecard. We will also conduct best practice research and develop a logic model for community policing.

2. Survey of Oakland Residents: We have engaged a professional survey company to conduct a sample household survey of Oakland residents to determine their knowledge of Measure Y and to gauge their perceptions of public safety. The survey is being developed and will be conducted during the second quarter.

3. Violence Prevention Component Data Collection: We will finalize the remaining program-level logic models and begin creating cluster-level logic models. We are in the process of developing a site visit protocol and will conduct site visits to funded programs during the second quarter. We will also be developing a report on best practices to the programs by strategy area.

4. Analysis of Outcome Data: We will conduct an analysis of outcome data for the Violence Prevention Programs looking at outcomes in relation to parole

violations, truancy, suspensions, expulsions, and employment for inclusion in the second quarterly report.

5. Evaluation Tools for 2009 Contract Cycle: As we become familiar with the tracking systems and measures currently in place, as well as the range of practices being implemented within each strategy area, we will develop a set of recommendations for evaluation tools and standards of service to inform the contract requirements for the 2009 contract cycle. For example, in order to compare outcomes across similar programs we need to have clear definitions of what is contained in service delivery categories. We are observing that definitions of services such as employment, case management, and counseling vary among programs as does the amount of time spent with each program participant. In order to assess the degree of effectiveness of programs it is also necessary to assess how individuals improve or change over time. This requires base line individual assessments and exit assessments.

IV. Preliminary Findings

The findings we present here are based on our meetings with stakeholders and review of current data collection systems.

1. Strong Stakeholder Support for Evaluation and Program Improvement

Measure Y stakeholders, from police officers to providers and City staff have welcomed the evaluation, expressing a genuine commitment and enthusiasm as partners in this evaluation effort. In our conversations with Violence Prevention Program providers, we have been impressed by their desire to understand and use evaluation, their level of engagement in creating logic models that accurately reflect their work, and their strong interest in learning from other local practitioners and best practices in their strategy area.

The Police Services and Neighborhood Services Division staff members have also been very enthusiastic about the evaluation of policing efforts, openly sharing challenges related to staffing, data collection, and resource allocation. Both divisions have expressed interest in receiving technical assistance with the creation of tools and systems to better capture their programs' activities.

2. Community Policing Component Lacks a City-Wide Data System

The lack of a systematic city-wide data system to report data on community policing efforts represents a challenge for the evaluation. Currently there is no data system that is being utilized by all community policing officers to record their contacts with NCPC or their community policing problem solving activities. The system that does exist was constructed to track a specific effort called "Beat Health" which focused primarily on nuisance properties. We have been encouraged by the willingness and readiness of all police officers that we have spoken with to assist with evaluation activities, as well as their interest in establishing a useful system of data collection. But for now, the absence of systematically collected data on police activity represents a significant challenge to assessing the degree to which OPD is meeting the conditions outlined in

Measure Y First Quarter Evaluation Report: 8/21/08-10/06/08

Resolution 72727. The lack of data also stands in the way of correlating what is working to specific types of policing activities and intensity of those activities.

3. Need for Expanded Data Fields to Measure Outcomes of Violence Prevention Programs

We are still testing the efficiency of utilizing the current system of data matching and analysis. We want to ensure that we can produce creditable and useful information about program outcomes. We will be making requests to enrich the amount of information that we receive for outcome analysis.

We are still looking at the current tools and procedures for data collection and will make some recommendations regarding intake and exit assessments in the next quarterly report.

V. Recommendations

1. Establishing a Baseline for Community Policing

It is necessary to establish a baseline description of community policing operations in order to measure change and improvement over time. We need to clarify and come to agreement on what the current and desired community policing component of the initiative looks like in Oakland. OPD has now reached full deployment targets. Prior to full deployment being achieved there was much debate about how realistic it would be to fully implement Resolution 72727. It is vital to achieve a shared understanding of precisely what the community policing model means in Oakland, so that the evaluation can determine the degree to which that model is being implemented and so that we can conduct research to determine the degree to which this model has been implemented effectively in other communities.

We recommend creating a logic model for community policing derived from articulated goals, activities, and short and long term outcomes as articulated by the community police officers. A shared understanding of what the community policing program looks like in its current form as well as what those practices look like when mapped against best practices in the field is essential to the evaluation.

The fact that new police officers have been hired and that all beats will now have PSOs creates an opportunity for introducing city wide data collection methods so that we can better understand how community policing is working in Oakland. We recommend creating a user friendly data system that captures the following:

- Number of NCPC participants actively involved in NCPC activities
- □ PSO involvement in NCPC activities
- Consistency and duration of PSO assignments to NCPC beats
- Extent of PSO involvement in ongoing problem solving activities related to NCPC priorities and neighborhood crime
- □ NSC involvement in NCPC activities

- Involvement of other City departments and the contribution of resources applied to solving NCPC priority issues
- □ Involvement of other community organizations and institutions
- Development of new Neighborhood and Merchant Watch programs
- Extent to which NCPC-PSO partnerships collaborate with other Measure Y programs, particularly outreach programs
- Extent to which NCPCs are cultivating new, stronger neighborhood level leadership that advocates for neighborhood issues

The evaluation will examine the correlation between each of these factors and changes in neighborhood level crime, with the intent of identifying what factors have the highest correlation with reductions in neighborhood crime.

2. Evidence Based Practices

In order to maximize the use of Measure Y dollars we believe that all programs should be required to identify and utilize evidence-based practices that are tailored to meet the needs of the populations they serve. This will provide the City with a mechanism of ensuring that programs are meeting certain standards and that funded programs are doing what has been found to best work with the populations they serve. At a minimum, programs should be able to refer to the model or models that their programs are developed from and articulate how they prepare and train staff to ensure quality. We also recommend that the Community Policing program activities be mapped against established best practices in the field.

The contracts for next fiscal cycle should be used to standardize services within each strategy or cluster. Measure Y has an opportunity in the next funding cycle (July 2009) to build in standards for program implementation, clarifying, for example, what minimum activities constitute intensive case management or what the evidence-based practices that make for effective employment and training service delivery are. Program activities and practices should be mapped against best practices to ensure that the Initiative is funding services that have been shown to make a difference in the lives of the clients served.

3. Developing Interim Measures for Tracking Outcomes

Over the past two months, grantees and other Measure Y stakeholders have expressed a variety of expectations in regards to the impact that violence prevention services should have on reducing crime and violence in Oakland. Among some, there is the expectation that the services and interventions provided by the programs will result in an immediate and measurable reduction in crime. Research has shown that when programs are deployed with the highest standards, incorporate evidence-based practices and reach a sufficient number of clients, they result in changes in the client and over time will contribute towards a community that is healthy and safe. In conducting an outcome evaluation, it is important to develop interim measures that effectively capture changes in individual participants after a certain level of service. We recommend

Measure Y First Quarter Evaluation Report: 8/21/08-10/06/08

the creation of assessments that allow us to track individuals at baseline and at an intermediary point so that our evaluation more effectively captures the impact of the Violence Prevention programs.

VI. Attachments

Appendix A: List of Programs with Drafted Logic Models

Appendix B: Sampling of Logic Models

Appendix C: Community Policing Scorecard Draft & Tools

Agonov Providing Convision	Evaluation Coach	Status
Agency Providing Services California Youth Outreach	Amiko	Draft
Oakland Unified School District	Amiko	Draft
Oakland Unified School District - Alt Ed	Amiko	Draft
Project Re-Connect	Amiko	Draft
Alameda Health Care Services Agency	Brightstar	Draft in process
America Works	Brightstar	Draft in process
Goodwill Industries of the Greater East Bay	Brightstar	Interview scheduled
Mayor's City Jobs Programs	Brightstar	Interview scheduled
Youth Radio	Brightstar	Draft
Youth Sounds	Brightstar	Draft
Catholic Charities of the East Bay	Diana	Draft
Youth ALIVE!	Diana	Draft
Alameda County Sexually Exploited Minors Network	Kayce	Draft
City County Neighborhood Initiative	Kayce	Draft
East Bay Agency for Children	Kayce	Draft
East Bay Asian Youth Center	Kayce	Draft
Healthy Oakland	Diana	Draft in process
Leadership Excellence	Kayce	Draft
Radical Roving Recreation	Diana	Scheduling interview
Sports4Kids	Diana	Interview Scheduled
Youth Uprising	Kayce	Draft
Allen Temple	Lorenza	Scheduling interview
Attitudinal Healing Connection	Lorenza	Draft in process
The Mentoring Center	Lorenza	Draft
Volunteers of America Bay Area	Lorenza	Draft
Youth Employment Partnership	Lorenza	Scheduling interview
Early Childhood Mental Health Collab (works w/Family Violence Law Center)	Moira	Draft
Family Justice Center with Youth Justice Center	Moira	Draft
Family Violence Law Center	Moira	Draft

•

•

Ļ

•

.

ME	MEASURE Y PROGRAM-LEVEL LOGIC MODEL: YOUTH JUSTICE INSTITUTE				
Cluster:	Special Services – Exposure to Violence				
Cluster Purpose:	To identify children and youth at the earliest point of exposure to violence, to connect survivors with supportive services and advocacy so that reoccurrence is prevented.				
Program Purpose	To provide direct services, case management, education, and therapeutic services to girls who have been victims of crime or are Juvenile Justice system involved – to reduce their victimization and recidivism rates.				
Program Goals:	To ensure that at-risk girls receive gender-responsive services, to reduce recidivism, to reduce victimization				
Resources:	Staff, Access to Juvenile Hall, Relationships with referring agents (attorneys, probation, other service providers), Juvenile Justice system buy-in, Volunteers for case management, Funding, Access to probation data, Access to OUSD data, Access to adult jail and probation data, tracking system (beyond the agency's relationships with the girls)				
Impact:	To create a gender-responsive system that addresses trauma in the lives of young women exposed to violence and involved in the juvenile justice system				
Assumptions:	That interventions such as gender-specific case management, individual therapy, in-custody street-law education and advocacy, and a modified version of the evidence-based <i>Voices</i> program will help provide girls with protective factors against both offending and victimization.				

• .

· · · ·

.

. .

.

.

YOUTH JUSTICE INSTITUTE LOGIC MODEL

-

Activities	Resources	Process Measures	Short-Term/Intermediate Outcomes (< 1 year)	Long-Term Outcomes (1-3 years) Sources of Data
		Sources of Data	Sources of Data	
Objective I: To reduce victin	nization among girls in the c	community who have been e	exposed to violence or involved	in the juvenile justice system
YJI customized gender- specific program (modified from <i>Voices</i>) to girls in the community – 9 girls in two cycles per year (18 total per year)	Curriculum, staff, referrals, court orders or voluntary participants	18 youth per year participating in 12- week curriculum (attendance tracking, CitySpan database)	More awareness regarding relationships, fewer victimizations, better choices, more pro-social skills (not currently measured)	Healthy relationships without violence, less victimization
Individual cognitive- behavioral therapy to 9 girls	MFT Intern, PhD supervisory, trainees from local university,	Weekly participation in one-hour therapy sessions by 9 young women for one year (attendance tracking, CitySpan database)	Reduction in traumatic stress (not currently measured)	Healthy relationships without violence, less victimization
Objective II: To reduce recit	divism among girls in the co	mmunity who have been ex	posed to violence or involved in	the juvenile justice system
Intensive Case Management to 30 juvenile justice system- involved girls	Staff, volunteers, linkages to other service providers, referrals through juvenile justice system	5 girls in first quarter, 10 girls in second and third quarters, and 5 girls in third quarter completing at least three months of intensive case management	Stabilized lives, Less recidivism (checked against juvenile probation records)	Avoiding criminal offending and involvement in adult criminal justice system

-,

YOUTH JUSTICE INSTITUTE LOGIC MODEL

Gender-responsive and culturally competent Street law curriculum taught to 100 girls in- custody	Access to Juvenile Hall, buy-in of juvenile hall staff and administration	100 girls participating annually in advocacy course taught in custody	Increased listening skills, impulse control, understanding the system, girls working cooperatively with PD, PO, and more equipped to manage their lives for when they are released (not currently measured)	Reduced recidivism, better life choices
Objective IV: To raise awar Trainings for professionals, community outreach events, youth outreach events	System buy-in, facilities, publicity to target audience	, youth and the community a 100 individuals participating annually in 10 outreach and training events	Changes in staff behavior, greater awareness of gender and gender-role expectations among professionals, community and youth – post-training evaluation forms, focus groups with girls, pre-and- post-questionnaire measuring attitude/behavior	es for girls A juvenile justice system that is more responsive to gendered needs

YOUTH JUSTICE INSTITUTE LOGIC MODEL

Name of Person Interviewed (first last)	Julie Posada Guzman (director of policy)
Email address [check spelling carefully)	jguzman@yjinstitute.org
Phone number	510-387-5386 (cell) 510-267-8846 (office)
Fax number	(510) 267-8809
Alternate contact name (first last)	Gena Castro Rodriguez
Alternate contact position	Executive Director
Email address	gena@yjinstitute.org
phone	415-753-7670

Notes: In their first year Youth Justice Institute provided services to boys and girls but after that was asked to provide services to girls only. At the time they were called Girls Justice Initiative. They have developed their own gender-specific curriculum based on Stephanie Covington's *Voices*, which is an evidence-based, gender-specific trauma-informed intervention. For individual therapy they are using CBT, also an EBP. Their in-custody advocacy class and case management are not EBP, but are tailored to be culturally competent. They need help developing pre- and post- questionnaires for all program components.

MEASURE Y	MEASURE Y PROGRAM-LEVEL LOGIC MODEL: YOUTH ALIVE! CAUGHT IN THE CROSSFIRE /				
· · ·	STREET OUTREACH				
Cluster:	Youth Outreach				
Cluster Purpose:	To identify children and youth at the earliest point of exposure to violence and connect with supportive services and advocacy so that reoccurrence is prevented.				
Program Purpose	To promote non-violent lifestyles through intensive outreach and case management to youth who have been treated for violent injuries at Highland Hospital/Alameda County Medical Center and/or students enrolled in Castlemont Community of Small Schools who are identified as chronically truant and highly at risk for violence or not completing High School and are referred by principals, counselors and therapists.				
Program Goals:	To support positive alternatives to violence and to reduce retaliation, re-injury, arrest and truancy				
Resources:	Peer-based staff (Intervention Specialists), referrals from counselors, principals and therapists at Castlemont Community of Small Schools, referrals from Highland Hospital, collaborations with community based organizations, job training programs, medical and mental health providers				
Impact:	Reduction in % of youth enrolled in case management who will be re-injured by violence, arrested for violence or leave school before completion				
Assumptions:	 If Intervention takes place at earliest point of critical exposure to violence or risk of violence, youth are more open to making a change in their lifestyle. 				
	 Local community, peer based staff (intervention specialists) who have overcome violence in their own lives are uniquely effective in their interaction with violently injured youth. 				
	 That intervention at the point of injury due to violence in the form of long-term case management, goal setting, linkages to appropriate community services, mentoring home visits and follow-up will reduce retaliatory violence, re-injury and arrest. 				

-

.

YOUTH ALIVE! CAUGHT IN THE CROSSFIRE / STREET OUTREACH LOGIC MODEL

Activities	Resources	Process Measures Sources of Data	Short-Term/Intermediate Outcomes (< 1 year) Sources of Data	Long-Term Outcomes (1-3 years) Sources of Data
Objective I: To improve e	education attainment for y	outh who do not already	have a high school diploma	
Identify clients without GED or high school diploma, connect them to GED prep classes or enroll in high school	Intervention specialist (staff), partnership with Castlemont Community of Small Schools, linkages to appropriate educational support programs and GED prep programs	Up to 60 youth per year receiving case management services, internal reports, # of youth completing program, internal monthly staff reports, case notes, client folders NOTE: All "Needs addressed" data accessible <u>only</u> as long as youth is enrolled in Youth ALIVE!	Continued youth enrollment in High School/GED prep High School graduation Completion of GED prep GED certification Data Sources: Internal reports	Improved life choices, increased opportunities for success, reduced violence and injury Data Sources: Internal reporting ends and tracking data is not available through CitySpan after youth exits the program(6 months)

Activities	Resources	Process Measures Sources of Data	Short-Term/Intermediate Outcomes (<1year) Sources of Data	Long Term Outcomes(1-3 years) Sources of Data
Objective II: To link all services	clients identifying employ	ment as a need with job t	raining programs and job	seeking and readiness
Assess needs, develop individual service plan with client to include short and long-term employment goals,	Staff, linkages to job training service providers, mentoring and coaching services	Placement of up to 60 youth per year, # of youth who have completed resumes, enrolled in and/or completed job	•Enrolled in job training program and/or employed	Ongoing employment, better life skills, less recidivism, violence, injury and arrest
provide resume writing and interviewing instruction, link to appropriate job training program, provide necessary clothing, tools for employment	resume training progra and found employs wing on, link to iate job program, necessary , tools for	training program, found employment	Internal measurement only – monthly status reports	Internal reporting ends and tracking data is not available through CitySpan after youth exits the program(6 months)
Objective III: To improv	e mental and physical he		1	
Identify clients and family members of clients in need of mental health services, link to appropriate services, provide follow-up through continued case management, provide referrals for necessary medical after-care	Staff, Highland Hospital, physical and mental health care providers, schools and CBO's	Up to 60 youth per year, internal reports	Reduction in traumatic stress resulting from injury Internal reports, some baseline information provided by partner agencies when youth are referred	Reduction in long-term mental health effects from traumatic stress Internal reporting ends and tracking data is not available through CitySpan after youth exits the program(6 months)

.

YOUTH ALIVE! CAUGHT IN THE CROSSFIRE / STREET OUTREACH LOGIC MODEL

YOUTH ALIVE! CAUGHT IN THE CROSSFIRE / STREET OUTREACH LOGIC MODEL

Activities	Resources	Process Measures Sources of Data	Short-Term/Intermedaite Outcomes (<1year) Sources of Data	Long Term Outcomes(1-3 years) Sources of Data
Objective IV: To build ALIVE! program.	individual social support r	network for each client t	hat will be available to them	after completion of Youth
Provide linkages to social support groups, accompany youth for introductions as appropriate	Staff, network of mentors, partnerships with appropriate CBO's (YMCA, Boys and Girls clubs, religious organizations)	Linkage of up to 60 youth per year to support networks , internal reports	Support system that will outlast enrollment in Youth Alive! Skill-set with which to make more positive life choices Internal reports, # of youth continuing in CBO – can establish enrollment only (no access to other organization's data)	Non-violent lifestyle, reduced recidivism, strong support system, positive role models, trusting relationships, strong set of life skills, better decision making abilities Internal reporting ends and tracking data is not available through CitySpan after youth exits the program(6 months)

Notes:

Youth ALIVE! Is currently considering how to "exit clients out" of their program. Process could include a client satisfaction survey. Would like help creating effective survey.

City Span does not provide tracking capabilities through any partner organization's data, making measurement problematic. No access to OUSD, probation or CBO data.

Same of Person Interviewed (first last)	Marla Becker
Email address [check spelling carefully)	mbecker@youthalive.org
Phone number	510-594-2588 ext. 307
Fax number	510-594-0667
Alternate contact person	Kyndra Simmons
Email address	ksimmons@youthalive.org
phone	510-594-2588 ext. 309

MEASURE Y PROGRAM-LEVEL LOGIC MODEL: CCEB-CRISIS RESPONSE AND SUPPORT NETWORK

Cluster:	Special Services – Exposure to Violence / Violent Incident Response
Cluster Purpose:	To identify children and youth at their earliest exposure to violence, to connect survivors with support services and advocacy so that reoccurrence is prevented.
Program Purpose	To provide crisis intervention and intensive support services to the families, friends, relatives and classmates of Oakland homicide victims up to age 30.
Program Goals:	To offer support, financial aid and advocacy on behalf of the people affected by the victim's death - to avert retaliatory violence, and reduce traumatic stress.
Resources:	Staff, OPD (call-outs) referrals, network of (60) peer-based volunteers , training services, partner agencies, funding (death-related costs), network of contractors, access to Measure Y network, ability to refer to mental health care professionals(social workers)
Impact:	Person's ability to navigate grief, treatment for traumatic stress experienced by people directly affected by violent death, reduction in retaliatory violence
Assumptions:	 People who receive skilled intervention immediately after crisis will navigate grief and recovery better than those who do not. If we can engage community members in providing support for friends and neighbors affected by trauma, clients will become providers by becoming active in violence prevention activities and/or the CRS Network

CCEB-CRISIS RESPONSE AND SUPPORT NETWORK LOGIC MODEL

Activities	Resources	Process Measu		Long-Term Outcomes
		Sources of Data		(1-3 years)
			Sources of Data	Sources of Data
	de intervention services o families and avert reta		nutes of 'call-out' (family notification	on of death) to provide
Immediate comfort, support, and guidance. Advocacy, linkages to appropriate services	Referrals from Oakland Police or other agency partners, Trained CRSN First responders, funding for	Serve members of 60 family groups per year, 200 individual service clients per year, internal reports. Client	Better navigation of grief, ability to resume healthy living, participation in higher level of support services, reduction in retaliatory violence	Community participation in recovery support activities, violence prevention
appropriate services	sudden death services	satisfaction/expression of gratitude	Alameda County referral outcomes (on CitySpan database, internal reports, # served	# of individuals committing volunteer time

.

•

CCEB-CRISIS RESPONSE AND SUPPORT NETWORK LOGIC MODEL

. -

.

Activities	Resources	Process Measures	Short-	Long Term Outcomes
		Sources of Data	Term/Intermediary Outcomes (<1year)	(1-3 years)
			Sources of Data	Sources of Data
Objective: II: To provide in stress: behavior issues, tr		to people affected by vi	olent death reducing long	g term effects of traumatic
Family Service activities: intensive emotional support, linkages to appropriate services, financial aide and support to address the 'business of death', referrals to higher level, on-going mental health/counseling/parenting services Youth service activities: intensive outreach in schools, community settings, link to ARJOY services: circles of support	Volunteers, relationship with local schools, Police Department, State Crime Victim's Fund, other partner agencies: ARJOY / Alameda County Mental Health Services	# of signed consent forms, # of follow up visits/client hours, internal reports/referrals, sign in sheets, client interviews and satisfaction surveys (just beginning process)	Families and youth build support system through referrals to better navigate their grief Client surveys, sign in sheets NOTE: Data access (OUSD, DJP) not supported by Measure	Recovery from trauma No reoccurrence of violence, criminal offenses Change in community culture – additional volunteers, more knowledgeable school personnel, church participation in support services Indicators: # of new individual volunteers, active support from churches and community
or other youth support groups, conflict resolution classes			Y funding Consent forms are difficult to obtain for youth – limits access to any relevant data from partner agencies	 # of individuals participating in memorial events "Shoot Hoops Not Guns" NOTE: no real measurement tool in place -

·

,

CCEB-CRISIS RESPONSE AND SUPPORT NETWORK LOGIC MODEL

NOTES: CRSN has been active for 17 months and is volunteer-based with no full-time employees. Their paid staff is part-time and provides direct services: short term encounters with clients making it difficult to obtain signed consent forms. Clients are only registered in their database if they are active for a minimum of 4-6 weeks. CCEB wants to build its staff and a capacity.

Measure Y classifies them as a "lay" organization; after 17 months, CCEB believes it needs to professionalize their services if they are going to be able to measure their success. Professional service providers keep verifiable records and have access to data currently unavailable to CCEB. CCEB estimates that 60% of their cases need professional case management from a mental health professional or social worker.

Measuring outcomes has been difficult – it takes years to see outcome and there are many intangibles. How do people deal with grief? Were they re-traumatized before the healing process is completed? This month, CCEB has begun to re-visit and interview clients 6-8 weeks after incident to offer continued services, encourage clients to remain in or seek long-term services and conduct a client satisfaction survey. They need help developing the survey.

Millie Burns will provide summary of leveraged resources.

Name of Person Interviewed (first last)	Millie Burns
Email address (check spelling carefully)	mburns@cceb.org
Phone number	510.768.3188 Cell# 510-867-0376
Fax number	510-451-6998
NO ALTERNATE CONTACT	

Appendices C: Community Policing Draft Scorecard and Tools

NCPC-PSOs TOOLS & PROTOCOLS

The NCPC-PSO Scorecard

In the evaluators bid for the Measure Y evaluation, we proposed the development of a *Scorecard* to report on the NCPC-PSO partnership. The draft developed for the bid has been shared with leadership from OPD and from Neighborhood Service Department. The intent is for the *Scorecard* to summarize:

- Who attends each NCPC meeting and identifying how different stakeholder institutions are represented, how many new members are being recruited and how many veteran members are sustaining involvement;
- Who participates in NCPC meetings and how well are the meetings organized, and the degree to which they are consistently focused upon Priority Problems identified by the NCPC and the extent to which members feel the NCPC, NSC, and PSO are effectively working together to solve neighborhood problems;
- The degree to which the PSO, city agencies, Neighborhood and Merchant Watch representatives and other residents are involved in problem solving between meetings;
- The degree to which PSOs are adhering to the community policing model being employed in Oakland; and
- The extent to which Action Steps are completed and tracked, the kinds of resources accessed, and the kinds of problems that are identified and solved.

The *Scorecard* is still in a draft format and will undergo more changes as more meetings are conducted and as data collection tools are refined to provide the data that would fill this *Scorecard*.

NCPC Meeting Tools and Protocols

In its first two meetings, the Neighborhood Services Department and the evaluators agreed that NCPCs would benefit from achieving a better understanding of precisely who attends the meetings, what institutions are represented and how meetings operate. They also felt that a more structured approach to meetings would improve their effectiveness and help sustain participant involvement. The evaluators and NSD are excited about working together to create more tools and protocols to improve effectiveness and data collection.

Attached to this report are drafts of:

- Structured sign-in sheet designed to obtain consistent data across NCPCs as to the number attending, the kinds of institutions attending and the degree to which the NCPC is recruiting new members and sustaining the involvement of veteran members.
- Action Step Log: The Action Step Log is designed to walk members through a series of steps that ensure that at each meeting they systematically focus Priority Problems and track the extent to which they are being methodical in addressing the areas and implementing the action steps.

Protocols

Protocols (structured descriptions outlining how to implement specific steps in a process) are being developed to help each NCPC incorporate specific practices into their routine operations. Protocols are being developed for:

- U Welcoming, orienting, engaging and activating new members;
- Using the Action Step Log and tracking problem solving efforts;
- Selecting new Priority Problem areas

Other Protocols will be developed over time. These tools and protocols represent how participatory evaluation can both provide good data and improve operations.

DRAFT: NCPC-PSO Scorecard

.

NCPC-PSO Scorecard DRAFT: This is a very preliminary draft of a scorecard that we will use to summarize the work of the different NCPC-PSO partnerships. As you can see, it provides NCPC level data as well as district and City averages. This is a very preliminary version developed with leadership from the NSD, but it will be expanded to better capture police activity as we clarify what kind of data OPD can provide. The Scorecard will summarize meeting participation patterns, involvement from different organizations and institutions, and effectiveness / inclusiveness of meetings and then compare that with beat level crime data.

Measure	Description of Measure		District 1 NCPC # NCPC # NCPC # NCPC # NCPC # NCPC # NCPC # District City Ave								
		NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	District	ICity Ave
•											
1. / · · ·		An attend	lance sinn	in sheet h	ias been d	developed	to enable	every NCi	PC to repo	rt on nred	iselv how
NCPC Meeting Participat	ion						h institutio				
	# of meetings held in the			I			1		Í		
# Meetings	quarter										1
	Average # of people attending										
# Attending	all meetings in the quarter.									<u> </u>	
			ĺ						1		1
	# of weeks in quarter for which										
PSO assigned	a PSO was assigned to NCPC.				<u> -</u>				ļ		<u> </u>
	# of weeks in quarter for which			ļ							· /
NSC Assigned	an NSC was assigned to NCPC.				┣────				<u> </u>		
	% of meetings held in the										
	guarter for which the assigned										1
# PSO Attending	PSO was in attendance.										
# 150 According	r 50 was in accendance.		<u> </u>	ŀ	┢────					1	
	% of meetings held in the								1		
	guarter for which the assigned										
# NSC attending ·	NSC was in attendance.										
# of Other City Staff	# of City Staff attending							1	1	1	
Attending	meetings during the quarter.										
					ļ						
5	# of Neighborhood Watch Reps	í	í	í	[í –	1	í		í	1
Reps Attending	Attending in the quarter.		ļ			ļ	ļ		<u> </u>	ļ	
							1				
# of OUSD Reps Attending	# attending for quarter	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>						
# of Measure Y Outreach											
Reps Attending	# attending for quarter										
# of Other Measure Y VPP					<u> </u>			· · ·		1	
agencies attending	# attending for quarter										
						1			1	ŀ · · · · ·	
# of merchants Attending	# attending for quarter				1		1]		
# of faith community reps									1	1	
attending	# attending for quarter							l			
· · ·							allow for				
· · ·							question o	heck-box	satisfactio	on survey	will be
Meeting Operations / Ef	fectiveness	distribute	d at the e	nd of ever	y meeting	J.					

DRAFT: NCPC-PSO Scorecard

NCPC-PSO Scorecard DRAFT: This is a very preliminary draft of a scorecard that we will use to summarize the work of the different NCPC-PSO partnerships. As you can see, it provides NCPC level data as well as district and City averages. This is a very preliminary version developed with leadership from the NSD, but it will be expanded to better capture police activity as we clarify what kind of data OPD can provide. The Scorecard will summarize meeting participation patterns, involvement from different organizations and institutions, and effectiveness / inclusiveness of meetings and then compare that with beat level crime data.

Measure	Description of Measure District 1										
		NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	District	City Ave
	# of meetings where there were										
	minutes from the last meeting to										
Minutes	review	1									
					1					1	
	# of meetings in which minutes			1							
	identify specific priority problems			1							
Problems identified	to be solved			1							
	# of meetings in which there				1					ļ	
	was a review of actions taken in										
Actions	relation to each priority area.			l							
	# of meetings in which							-		<u> </u>	
	significant progress was made	ł			ļ						
	on one or more priority										
Progress	problems.							1			
	Number of problems solved								·		
	satisfactorily as reflected in the										
Problem Solved	minutes		-								
# of nuisance problems	Need to define nuisance, crime,		1	·					1		
solved	and quality of life.										
# of crime problems	Need to define nulsance, crime,		1	· · · -		1	1		1		
solved	and quality of life.										
# of quality of life	Need to define nuisance, crime,								· · · · ·		<u> </u>
problems solved	and quality of life.	1									
	Number of problems where the	1		1	<u> </u>					i	
	solution involved use of multiple										
Resources .	City resources				,						
								1			
NCPC Membership Rating	% of NCPC members who were										
of Mtgs.	highly satisfied with the meeting	i									
	% of NCPC members who were			i		Î				1	
	highly satisfied with the problem		•		1						
NCPC Membership Rating	solving capacity of the NCPC-]						•
of Solutions	PSO partnership				l					[
	% of NCPC members who were		1			1					
NCPC Membership	highly satisfied with							4]
Satisfied with PSO Activity	theinvolvement of the PSO.							1		-	
										1	
	% of NCPC members who agree				ĺ						
NCPC Membership	with statement relating to the										
Satisfactoin with Meeting	degree to which all participants	1									
Facilitation	were able to contribute.	1									

DRAFT: NCPC-PSO Scorecard

NCPC-PSO Scorecard DRAFT: This is a very preliminary draft of a scorecard that we will use to summarize the work of the different NCPC-PSO partnerships. As you can see, it provides NCPC level data as well as district and City averages. This is a very preliminary version developed with leadership from the NSD, but it will be expanded to better capture police activity as we clarify what kind of data OPD can provide. The Scorecard will summarize meeting participation patterns, involvement from different organizations and institutions, and effectiveness / inclusiveness of meetings and then compare that with beat level crime data.

data. Measure	Description of Measure					District 1					
	j	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #		NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	District	City Ave
NCPC Membership	% of NCPC members who were	1							1		
satisfaction with NSC	highly satisfied with		1								
activity	theinvolvement of the NSC.										
		which the	PSO is a	dhering to	Resolutio	n 72727.) activity v The kind (
Problem Solving Officer	Activity	and the e	valuators	are meeti	ng with O	PD to try t	o fix this.				
	# of days that PSO operated on										
# of Days on Beat	the beat for the NCPC										
# of NCPC meetings PSO presents data on crime and / or PS activity.											
# of other community meetings PSO attends											
Other	Others to be added as ways to measure/collect data are identified.										
Other Neighborhood Pro	blem Solving Activity	activities	-		1	T	herwise) a		1	1	
New Nelghborhood Watch Programs	# of new NW programs established in quarter										
New Merchant Watch	# of new MW programs					1					
Programs	established in quarter										1
Other											-
Changes in Neighborhoo		for the se correlatio	cond quai n with cha	terly repo anges in cl	ort. We wil rime patte	l then be a rns. In th	OPD, we a able to exa is way we ns in crim	amine PSC hope to i)/NČPC ac	tivity and	look for
changes in Reighborhot	Increase or decrease in		o partiers	ыпра утеги Г	Signinean		TS ur critu	ç. 1	I	<u> </u>	1
+/- homicides	homicides over last quarter				ļ	ļ		ļ			
+ / - assaults	Increase or decrease in assaults over last quarter	<u>-</u> -			<u> </u>						
+ / - burglaries	Increase or decrease in burglaries over last quarter								ļ		
+ / - auto thefts	Increase or decrease in auto thefts over last quarter				ļ			ļ			
+ / - robberies	Increase or decrease in robberies over last quarter	•		1	-		1		1	1	

٦

.

NCPC-PSO Scorecard DRAFT: This is a very preliminary draft of a scorecard that we will use to summarize the work of the different NCPC-PSO partnerships. As you can see, it provides NCPC level data as well as district and City averages. This is a very preliminary version developed with leadership from the NSD, but it will be expanded to better capture police activity as we clarify what kind of data OPD can provide. The Scorecard will summarize meeting participation patterns, involvement from different organizations and institutions, and effectiveness / inclusiveness of meetings and then compare that with beat level crime data.

~

Measure	Description of Measure					District 1					
		NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	NCPC #	District	City Ave.
Other	Other crimes can be added as desired.	~									
			ļ	ļ	ļ	ļ					
Changes in Community Perceptions			l st a samp y district.	l ling of que	l estions tha	l at will be in	l ncluđed in	l the citywi	 ide survey	l and disag	l Igregated
% of respondents who are fearful								L			
% of respondents who feel neighbors will help each other											
% of respondents who feel it is safer than one year ago (or some time frame)											
% of respondents who feel police are addressing neighborhood problems											
% of respondents who are involved in an NCPC											
% of respondents who are involved in a Neighborhood Watch program											

NCPC SIGN-IN SHEET

NCPC

Location

Date

Instructions: There it is not necessary for you to provide your full name, but it is important for us to understand how many institutions or organizations are involved so we can identify what kind of involvement contributes to the most effective neighborhood problem solving. Please check all boxes that apply. We also want to know if your NCPC is attracting new members or keeping members involved over time. So please check the box in the far right column that best applies. Thank you for your service to your community!

Name		_	Institutions or	Organizations			Length of Involvement
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		🔄 Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
	🔲 PSO	Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		six months-year
							More than a year
	🔲 Co-Chair	C Other OPD	🔲 OUSD	E Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
	🔲 PSO	Public Works	🔲 Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
	NSC 🗌	Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		six months-year
							More than a year
	🔲 Co-Chair	C Other OPD		E Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
	🔲 PSO	Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		Six months-year
							More than a year
	🔲 Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
	PSO	Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		Six months-year
						<u> </u>	More than a year
	🔲 Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
	🔲 PSO	Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		Six months-year
		·					More than a year
	🔲 Co-Chair	Other OPD	🔲 OUSD	Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
	PSO	Public Works	🔲 Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		six months-year
							More than a year
	🔲 Co-Chair	Other OPD		🔲 Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
	🔲 PSO	Public Works	🔲 Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		six months-year
							More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting

Name			Institutions or	Organizations			Length of Involvement
· · ·	PSO	Public Works	Outreach	🔲 Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
	NSC	Other city	Other M. Y.	🔲 Resident	Couth 🗌 Youth		six months-year
							More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD			NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
•		Public Works		Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		Six months-year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
		Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Vouth	·······························	six months-year
		,					More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		🔲 Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
	🗌 PSO 🛛	Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		six months-year
							More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD Public Works	OUSD	Faith	NeighWatch	County Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth	Agency Specify.	six months-year
							More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
	PSO	Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	🗌 Other M. Y.	Resident	🔲 Youth		six months-year
							More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
		Public Works		Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Dther M. Y.	Resident	🗌 Youth		Six months-year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD	OUSD	Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
		Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		six months-year
							More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD	OUSD	Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
	🗌 PSO 👘 👘	Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	🔲 Resident	Vouth		six months-year
							More than a year
	Co-Chair			Faith	NeighWatch		First Meeting
	PSO SC	Public Works Other city	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
							More than a year
·	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
		Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months

Name			Institutions o	r Organizations			Length of Involvement
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		six months-year
	Co-Chair PSO NSC	Other OPD Other OPD Other OPD Other City	OUSD Outreach Other M. Y.	Faith Merchant Resident	NeighWatch	County Agency Specify:	First Meeting Eess than 6 months six months-year More than a year
	Co-Chair PSO NSC	Other OPD Public Works Other city	OUSD Outreach Other M. Y.	Faith Merchant Resident	NeighWatch	County Agency Specify:	First Meeting Less than 6 months six months-year More than a year
	Co-Chair PSO NSC	Other OPD Other OPD Other Works Other city	OUSD Outreach Other M. Y.	Faith Merchant Resident	NeighWatch	County Agency Specify:	First Meeting Less than 6 months six months-year More than a year
	Co-Chair PSO NSC	Other OPD Public Works Other city	OUSD Outreach Other M. Y.	Faith Herchant Resident	NeighWatch	County Agency Specify:	First Meeting Less than 6 months six months-year More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD Public Works Other city	OUSD Outreach Other M. Y.	Faith Kerchant Resident	NeighWatch	County Agency Specify:	 First Meeting Less than 6 months six months-year More than a year
	Co-Chair PSO NSC	Other OPD Public Works Other city	OUSD Outreach Other M. Y.	Faith Merchant Resident	NeighWatch	Gounty Agency Specify:	First Meeting Less than 6 months six months-year More than a year
	Co-Chair PSO NSC	Other OPD Dublic Works Other city	OUSD Outreach Other M. Y.	Faith Merchant Resident	NeighWatch	County Agency Specify:	First Meeting Less than 6 months six months-year More than a year
	Co-Chair PSO NSC	Other OPD Public Works Other city	OUSD Outreach Other M. Y.	Faith Merchant Resident	NeighWatch	County Agency Specify:	 First Meeting Less than 6 months six months-year More than a year
,	Co-Chair PSO NSC	Other OPD Dublic Works Other city	OUSD Outreach Other M. Y.	Faith Merchant Resident	NeighWatch	County Agency Specify:	First Meeting Less than 6 months six months-year More than a year
	Co-Chair PSO NSC	Other OPD Public Works Other city	OUSD Outreach Other M. Y.	Faith Merchant Resident	NeighWatch	County Agency Specify:	First Meeting Less than 6 months six months-year

Name			Institutions or	Organizations			Length of Involvement
							More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
		Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		six months-year
							More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
		Public Works		Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		six months-year
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Other OPD				Country .	More than a year
1	Co-Chair	Public Works	OUSD	Faith	NeighWatch		First Meeting
				Merchant		Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
· .		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident			six months-year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith		County	More than a year
		Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	NeighWatch	County	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident		Agency Specify:	
							six months-year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	More than a year
		Public Works		Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth	Agency Specify.	six months-year
							More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
		Public Works		Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.		Youth	rigonoy opcony.	six months-year
							More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
		Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
	NSC	Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Touth	5 7 7 7	six months-year
							More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
		Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		six months-year
		· · ·					More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
	D PSO	Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	Dther M. Y.	🗋 🗋 Resident	🗋 Youth		Six months-year
	L						More than a year
	🔲 Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
	D PSO	Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 months
		Other city	🔲 Other M. Y.	Resident	C Youth		Six months-year
							More than a year

,

Name				r Organizations			Length of Involven
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
	D PSO	Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 moi
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Vouth		six months-year
		_ ·					More than a yea
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
	PSO	Public Works	Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 mo
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Vouth	······································	six months-year
							More than a yea
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
			Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 mo
•		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		six months-year
						1	More than a yea
		Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
			Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 mo
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth		six months-year
							More than a year
	Co-Chair			Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
			Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 mo
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth	, igency opeony.	six months-year
							More than a year
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch'	County	First Meeting
			Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 mo
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident	Youth	Agency opeony.	six months-year
							More than a yea
-	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
			Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 mo
		. Other city	Other M, Y.	Resident			six months-year
							More than a yea
	Co-Chair	Other OPD		Faith	NeighWatch	County	First Meeting
			Outreach	Merchant	MerchWatch	Agency Specify:	Less than 6 mo
		Other city	Other M. Y.	Resident		- Agency opeony.	six months-year
							More than a year
L		<u> </u>	I			l	

-

•

NCPC ACTION-DRIVEN AGENDA

NCPC

Location

Date

Action Agenda

The action agenda responds to two needs. The first need, expressed in surveys given to NCPC members for an evaluation conducted by Kim Gilhuly indicated that they would like a structured agenda that focused on following up on actions related to their priority areas. The second need responds to the need for data for the evaluation to better understand how effectively the NCPCs are working together and solving high priority community problems.

The Action Agenda will be tied to a series of protocols in which the NSCs and NCPC chairs will be trained. Initially there will be protocols for:

- U Welcoming, orienting, engaging and activating new NCPC members (TBD)
- □ Using the Action Step Log (see other attachment for a draft fo this)
- □ Identifying new Priority Area Problems: A draft of this protocol was developed by NSD and will be revised in collaboration with the evaluation team during Quarter II.
- Others to be developed by NSD and the evaluation team
- I. Welcome New Participants
 - A. New participants introduce themselves, indicate why they have come to the meeting, and identify if they are affiliated with any organization.
 - B. Co-Chair describes opportunities for involvement, distributes new member orientation packet, and indicates that after the meeting the new member will have an opportunity to meet with the Co-chair and NSC to discuss opportunities for involvement.
- II. Old Business
 - A. Review of Action Step Log: See attached. This will be a core part of each meeting and will focus the NCPC squarely upon problem solving activities.
- III. New Business
 - A. Identify New Priority Area Problem (this will be done whenever one or more of the three high priority problems has been addressed/solved, so that there will always be three Priority Problems being addressed by the NCPC. The protocol will provide specific criteria for Priority Problems and guide the NCPC through discussion and prioritizing of candidates for selection.
 - B. Report from NSC
 - C. Report from PSO
 - D. Report from Neighborhood Watch Committee
 - E. Report from Merchant Watch Committee
 - F. Planned Actions?
 - G. Presentations
- IV. Stipulate Next Meeting Date and Adjourn

NCPC ACTION STEP LOG

NCPC

Location

Date

Action Step Log Instructions: At each NCPC meeting, flip charts will be used to chart the date that the need for an action step is identified and will record who will be responsible for that action. In addition, the flip charts will record what kind of City or other resources are needed to advance or support the action. This information twill be then summarized into the format below after the meeting and then distributed at the next meeting for review. At each meeting, during Old Business, the NCPC will review the Action Step Log and record the degree to which each step has been completed under the results columns. In this way, the NCPC will begin to systematically track their progress and develop an expectation of accountability about completion of action steps. NSCs would be trained to record the information needed to complete the Action Step Log and would train NCPC participants to record, as well. Separate logs would be maintained for each of the three Priority Problems identified.

Priority Area I	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Desired Outcome:								
Type of	🗌 🔲 Graffiti 👘 🛄 Public	Drink 🗌 🗖 Drug s	ales 🗌 abandoned 🔲 I	Blighted [Violent	Other	🗌 Other	
Problem:	Prostitution Burgla	iry 🛛 🗌 Speed	ing cars prop	perty C	rime	serious crime		
Key Strategies	5:							
	Planning	Steps & Resource	es Sought			Results		
Date	 Action Steps 	By Whom	New Resources Needed	By Whom				
					🗌 No	Some	Outcome	
		D PSO		D PSO	progress	progress	Achieved	
		Other City		City Other City				
		Residents	-	Residents				
			·		🗌 No	Some 🗌	Outcome	
		PSO			progress	progress	Achieved	
		Other City		Cher City				
	,	Residents		Residents				
]					🔲 No	Some 🗌	Outcome	
					progress	progress	Achieved	
		City Other City		Other City				
		Residents	·····	Residents				
					🔲 No	🗌 🗌 Some	Outcome	
					progress	progress	Achieved	
		Other City	•	Other City			•	
		Residents		Residents				
					No No	Some 🗌	Outcome	
					progress	progress	Achieved	
		Other City		Other City				
L		Residents		Residents				

Priority Area II	:							
Desired Outco	me:							
Type of	Graffiti Dublic	Drink 🗌 Drug s	sales abandoned	Blighted	Violent	Other	Other	
Problem:	🔄 🔲 Prostitution 🕴 🛄 Burgla	ry 🔄 Speed	ing cars	property	Crime	serious crime		
Key Strategies								
	Planning	Steps & Resource	es Sought			Results		
Date	Action Steps	By Whom	New Resources Neede	ed 📔 By Wh	nom			
						🗌 Some	Outcome	
-				PSO	progress	progress	Achieved	
		Other City			r City			
		Residents		🔄 🗌 Resid				
					No 🗌 No	Some 🗌	🗌 Outcome	
		🗌 PSO		🗌 PSC) progress	progress	Achieved	
		Other City			r City			
		Residents		Resid	lents			
						Some 🗌	Outcome	
				🛛 🗌 🔲 PSC	1	progress	Achieved	
		Other City			r City			
		Residents			lents			
						🗌 🗌 Some	Outcome	
		D PSO			_ · •	progress	Achieved	
· ·		Other City			r City			
		Residents		Resid				
						🗌 🗌 Some	Outcome	
		PSO		🛛 🗌 PSC	· •	progress	Achieved	
		Other City			r City			
		Residents		🗌 🗌 Resid	dents			

• •

.

Priority Area I	II:								
Desired Outco	ome:	• · · · · •							
Type of	Graffiti Dublic	Drink 🔲 Drug s	ales 🗌 abandoned	Blighted	Violent	Other	Other		
Problem:	Prostitution Burgla	ry 🛛 🗌 Speedi	ing cars	property	Crime	serious crime			
Key Strategies:									
	Planning	Steps & Resource	s Sought			Results			
Date	Action Steps	By Whom	New Resources Neede	ed <u>By W</u> hoi	m				
					No No	Some 🗌	Outcome		
		PSO		🔲 PSO	progress	progress	Achieved		
		Other City		Other C					
		Residents		Resider					
				NSC	🗌 No	Some	Outcome		
		PSO		🗌 🗌 PSO	progress	progress	Achieved		
		Other City		Cher C					
		Residents		Resider					
					🗌 No	Some 🗌	Outcome		
		PSO		🛄 PSO	progress	progress	Achieved		
		Other City		Cher C					
		Residents	<u></u>	Resider					
					🗌 No	Some	Outcome		
		PSO		🗌 PSO	progress	progress	Achieved		
		Other City		Contraction of the Contraction o					
	·	Residents		Resider					
				I 🔲 NSC	No 🗌 🗌	Some 🗌	Outcome		
		PSO		D PSO	progress	progress	Achieved		
		Other City		🛛 🗌 🗌 Other C					
		Residents		Resider	nts				

.