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Sponsored by
Evaluation of CTC in PA
In the beginning…
Evaluation Resources

• CTC Evaluation I: 4 year project, 21 CTC sites
• Until that point:
  – No unified evaluation instrument
  – Little understanding of key factors behind CTC or general community coalition success
  – Little prior evaluation of CTC beyond case study
Over Four Years of Evaluation…

Prevention Center at Penn State developed

• an interview for Prevention Board members and mobilizers

• reliable scales to measure CTC functioning

• an understanding of needs of CTC sites (and made recommendations to PCCD)

• a greater understanding of factors underlying CTC success
Prevention Knowledge

Training and T.A.

CTC Project functioning (internal and external)

Barriers: lack resources, infighting, turnover

Pcv’d CTC Effectiveness

Change in Community Outcomes

Sustained Prevention Planning

Cmt’y Readiness

EXPANDED MODEL of CTC
CTC Evaluation II?

- Leveraging PCCD’s investment
- Action-research: support local CTC Boards
- CTC Philosophy: Science supporting practice

➢ Develop online mechanism for brief version of the evaluation instrument. Coordination with RSC’s essential.
Web-based Self-Assessment System

- Mobilizer sends board member email addresses to Prevention Center
- PSU programs survey and sends out personal web link and password
- Board members fill out survey on-line
- Results securely downloaded and tabulated by Prevention Center
- Report generated for each CTC site
- RSC meets with board to present report and follow with action planning
**Example of Web Survey Item…**

32. Consider the following statements about the leadership of your CTC Prevention Board. For each statement, check how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The CTC leadership…</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...has the political knowledge and competence necessary to support CTC</td>
<td>![Strongly Agree]</td>
<td>![Somewhat Agree]</td>
<td>![Somewhat Disagree]</td>
<td>![Strongly Disagree]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...is skillful in resolving conflict</td>
<td>![Strongly Agree]</td>
<td>![Somewhat Agree]</td>
<td>![Somewhat Disagree]</td>
<td>![Strongly Disagree]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...adheres to decision-making procedures that the Prevention Board has adopted (for example, by-laws, voting procedures, member roles and positions)</td>
<td>![Strongly Agree]</td>
<td>![Somewhat Agree]</td>
<td>![Somewhat Disagree]</td>
<td>![Strongly Disagree]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SAMPLE REPORT

Community Report

CTC Site : ANONYMOUS
Cycle: XX

Number of respondents : 9

CTC Research Team, Prevention Research Center
Pennsylvania State University
402 Marion Place, University Park, PA 16802
Tel: 1-800-228-5690, Fax: 814-865-6004

Sponsored by
CTC-Web Domains
The areas that were studied in CTC-Web include the following:

- Board Membership
- CTC Process from Readiness to Sustainability
- Board Relationship
- Barriers Experienced
- Board Work Style
- Technical Assistance
- Board Leadership
Interpreting Results of CTC-Web

The following charts display results for each domain that we studied. Charts display results from a scale of 1→10 (unless otherwise indicated) where:

10 = Excellent
7 = Good
4 = Poor
1 = Very Poor

Example

Under Board Relationship, a “10” for Board Cohesion would mean that there is an excellent level of strong cohesion and group spirit.
Board Membership

**Board Stability**

Stability of board membership (Higher scores indicate lower turnover)

**Board Recruitment**

Ease in recruiting people with skill, talents, or political connections into the board
Board Cohesion
Unity and group spirit felt within the board

Board Conflict Management
Conflict managed in constructive manner and/or low level of conflict.

CTC Staff-Board Communication
Frequency and productiveness of communication between staff and board members
Board Directedness

Board has clear vision, goals, & community plan. The board has agreed on how it will function and the leadership adheres to the decision-making procedures adopted by board members.

Board Efficiency

Board members work hard and are highly efficient with little time wasted due to inefficiencies.
**Board Leadership Style**

The CTC Leadership provides praise & recognition, seeks out members’ views, and approaches members to assist with specific tasks.

**Board Leadership Competence**

The CTC Leadership is respected in the community, able to mobilize resources, has political knowledge and competence, is skillful in resolving conflict, and provides a strong leadership.
Summary: Interpreting T-scores

The t-score method is the same way results of the CTC Youth Survey for risk and protective factors are presented.

T-scores are useful ways of looking across domains because the average score is assigned a 50, and about two-thirds of scores are between 40 and 60, and about 95% of scores are between 30 and 70.

Over 60 is very good

41-60 is right in the middle of the pack – but scores in the low 40’s may indicate some difficulty.

50 is average

Under 40 is substantially below others

Slides 5-14 showed actual scores. Slides 16 – 20 will summarize your coalition’s ratings using a way of presenting data called t-scores.
Summary: CTC Ratings (t-scores), Part I
Summary: CTC Ratings (t-scores), Part II
## Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Compared to other sites</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Membership</td>
<td>Within middle range</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Relationship</td>
<td>Possible area of concern</td>
<td>🎧</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Work Style</td>
<td>Board directedness needs further reflection</td>
<td>🎧</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Leadership</td>
<td>Possible area of concern</td>
<td>![hammer emoji]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC Process from Readiness to Sustainability</td>
<td>Possible area of concern</td>
<td>![hammer emoji]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA needed &amp; experienced</td>
<td>Within middle range. TA experienced needs further reflection.</td>
<td>🎧</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Good**

Area worth further reflection & problem solving

Area requiring attention & action plan
Process Evaluation of

Presenting Reports to CTC Sites
Presenting Reports to CTC Boards

- Regional Strategic Consultants (technical assistance providers) attend local CTC meetings to deliver and interpret reports.
- N=27 to date
- Average of 12 members at each meeting
- Average of over 40 min. spent on the report (range of 15 to 105 minutes)
- After meeting, RSC fills out feedback form on how the board reacted to the report.
RSC Feedback Reports on Board Member Engagement

Scale:
- 1=not really, 2=a little, 3=some, 4=a lot

- Were board members interested in the report?
  Avg. Score: 3.6

- Did board members disagree with results?
  Avg. Score: 2.0

- Were the results perceived as helpful?
  Avg. Score: 3.5

- Were the results used to problem solve and plan?
  Avg. Score: 2.5
Did Board Members find the Survey Informative and Helpful?

Number of sites

Informative/Helpful (1=no)

Number of sites

0 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16

1 2 3 4
Did Board Members Disagree with the Survey Results?

- Disagreement (1=none)
- Number of sites

- 1: 12 sites
- 2: 3 sites
- 3: 6 sites
- 4: 2 sites
Employing Web Survey for Problem Solving

Number of sites

Level of Problem Solving (1=none)
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State-wide Scores

67 CTC Sites
Number of respondents : 552
Average Scores 67 CICS Sites
Latest vs Middle Cycles

- CamSupp
- BdDr
- St-Bd Comm
- BdEffic
- BdCohesion
- Can Mgmt
- Ldr Style
- Ldr Camp
- Bd Stable
- Recruitment
- Fid to Model
- Sustainability

Average late: [values]
Average mid: [values]
Scale
1 = Not needed
2 = A little
3 = A fair degree
4 = Need a lot