

MODULE VII--DEVELOPMENT OF THE CAA'S PLANNING PROCESS (continued)

Unit Title:	VII-C--Evaluation Process Narrative (EPN)	
Purpose:	To present GPMS requirements for evaluation; purpose of EPN; content and structure of EPN; submission requirements; acceptable elements of an EPN.	
Desired Outcome:	Participant will know the format of an EPN; will be able to conceptualize an EPN for his/her CAA; will be able to develop (draft) an EPN.	
Unit Topics:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction and Purpose 2. Requirements of the GPMS Rule 3. Timetable/Submissions 4. CSA Review of EPN 	
Suggested Educational Activities	Lecture and Walk Through of EPN Case Study (Example) (20 minutes)	
Specific Materials Utilized	Trainee's Workbook Handout of EPN Case Study (Example)	
Time/Material	Suggest Activity Sequence	Content Resource
20 min Tr. Workbk. Handout of EPN	Lecture on topics 1 through 4. Walk through Case Study EPN	Trainee's Manual, Module VII-C

C. EVALUATION PROCESS NARRATIVE (EPN)

The materials in this section are intended to introduce to both Board and staff members: (1) the purpose of the EPN in GPMS, (2) the requirements of the GPMS rule regarding the EPN, and (3) a comprehensive example of an EPN for a hypothetical CAA (pp. 5-9). This example is not intended to serve as a fill-in-the-blanks model. It should, when combined with a review of the GPMS rule, guide Boards and staffs in developing their own EPNs.

GPMS trainees should find this section useful in drafting in broad outline a process and schedule for their agencies and as a checklist for finished EPNs.

EVALUATION PROCESS NARRATIVE (EPN)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>	
Introduction and Purpose	1	(7-39)
A. Requirements of GPMS Rule	1-2	(7-39-40)
B. Timetable/Submissions	2	(7-40)
C. CSA Review of EPN	2-3	(7-40-41)
EPN--Subjects to be Covered	4	(7-42)
EPN--Sample Table of Contents	5	(7-43)
EPN--Project Impact Evaluation	7	(7-45)
EPN--Assessment of Management Practices, Including Planning	11	(7-44)

EVALUATION PROCESS NARRATIVE

Introduction and Purpose

Evaluation, like planning or program implementation, is most effective when done in a series of clear, logical steps defined and agreed on in advance. For this reason CAA evaluation activities for GPMS begin with the development of a detailed plan for doing an evaluation, or in GPMS nomenclature, an Evaluation Process Narrative (EPN).

All CAAs will follow the same format in developing this narrative, but they will enjoy substantial freedom in determining how and when to carry out the evaluation tasks the narrative will describe. If properly done, the EPN will provide the community, CSA, and the CAA an explicit description of the CAA's evaluation activities and the expected dates for their completion. It will insure that low-income people and community residents play a major role in evaluation. And, it will make it possible for CAAs to develop and effectively carry out a systematic anti-poverty program keyed to the CSA standards of effectiveness and the CAA's mission of attacking root causes of poverty. Finally, it will make it possible for both the CAA and CSA to spend more time on mission related as opposed to administrative tasks.

A. Requirements of the GPMS Rule

The CAA is required to describe how it will develop and carry out:

1. an impact evaluation of at least one high-priority project to determine if the project accomplished its goal, affected the cause of the poverty problem addressed by the project, and helped more poor people toward self-sufficiency.
2. an assessment of the four year planning process. (e.g. is the planning process being carried out as prescribed? Is it being carried out effectively and efficiently?)
3. an assessment of one or more management procedures and practices.

The Evaluation process narrative is, in effect, a "plan to evaluate" the required items.

For both the impact evaluation and the assessments of planning and management procedures, the CAA will describe:

- a. the specific structure that will be used, including the role and responsibility of the Board, committees, low-income people (including program participants), staff and others in the community as may be appropriate.
- b. the processes that will be used to:
 1. select the projects to be evaluated.
 2. to select the management practices to be assessed.
 3. to select the measurable performance criteria that will be used, sources of information, and techniques.
 4. to carry out the evaluation or assessment.
- c. the use of the products -- including how the CAA Board will review and act upon the assessment or evaluation reports, and how the

Evaluation Process Narrative
Page 2

A. Requirements of the GPMS Rule (Cont.)

information in these reports will be used to improve the performance of the agency, and how it will be used in development of the next Four Year Action Plan.

The structure and processes that the CAA will use to conduct an impact evaluation may be different from those used to carry out a management assessment. For each evaluation or assessment, the structure, processes and use of the products must be described.

Fundamentally, the EPN is a description of how the CAA Board and management will know the results of their program's efforts during the four-year action period and how this knowledge will be used to influence the next four-year plan. This is one basic responsibility of all directors and managers, in both the private and public sectors.

NOTE: Assessing project implementation and performance is considered separately under a later Section of the Rule, 1067.70-8, "Assessing Performance and Reporting Project Progress." Assessment is discussed in detail in Section XIV of the training materials. Performance assessment data will be used by most CAAs, however, in the evaluation process to "explain" why the project(s) did nor did not achieve the desired results.

B. Timetable/Submissions

1. Documents Required

- Three (3) copies of PPN & EPN
- Certification from presiding official (Board President) that Governing Board or Governing Officials have approved the PPN & EPN
- Recommendations of community action board if CAA is local government

2. Submitted to CSA --With the PPN 15 months before the end of the current Four Year Plan of Action

C. CSA Review of Evaluation Process Narrative

CSA Field Representatives should review the EPN preparation process to identify problems and provide assistance. Later, the Field Representative will review the submitted EPN for issues requiring discussion on the Planning Technical Assistance (PTA) and Prereview visits.

In its review, CSA will:

- Consider the weaknesses and strengths of the CAA's current evaluation activities.
- Review CAA reports and studies to see if they provide the CAA Board with reliable, useful findings and recommendations.
- Consider the abilities of the CAA staff and their need for evaluation technical assistance.
- Determine if the CAA has made policy commitments to assess performance

Evaluation Process Narrative
Page 3

C. CSA Review of Evaluation Process Narrative (Cont.)

and evaluate results.

- Determine if the CAA Board has clear responsibility for evaluation and if poor people and program participants are adequately involved in the evaluation process.
- Determine if the method for selecting areas of the CAA program to be evaluated correspond to the relative importance of the area to the CAA or CSA.
- Determine if the EPN describes how reports and studies will be used in the planning of the new Four Year Action Plan.

Within thirty (30) days of receipt of the PPN/EPN, CSA will issue a letter of approval, conditional approval, or disapproval with reasons stated.

SUBJECTS TO BE COVERED
EVALUATION PROCESS NARRATIVE

I. The Project Impact Evaluation

**II. Assessment of Planning/Management/Administrative Practices
and Procedures**

CASE STUDY
EVALUATION PROCESS NARRATIVE
SAMPLE TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

- I. Project Impact Evaluation
 - A. Introduction
 - B. Structure: Roles and Responsibilities
 - 1. Board of Directors
 - 2. Board Committees
 - 3. Low-Income Groups and Project Participants
 - 4. Other Agencies/Organizations
 - 5. CAA Staff
 - C. Processes
 - 1. Selecting projects
 - 2. Selecting criteria
 - 3. Designing impact evaluation
 - 4. Conducting impact evaluation
 - D. Products and Use of Products
 - 1. Establishing baseline planning data
 - 2. Amending work programs
 - 3. Developing work programs
 - 4. Sharing information
 - 5. Analyzing costs/benefits
 - 6. Providing public information
 - 7. Modifying project management
 - E. Schedules/Deadlines
 - 1. Project selection
 - 2. Criteria selection
 - 3. Design approved
 - 4. Data collection
 - 5. Evaluation implementation
 - 6. Evaluation products available
 - 7. Evaluation report-first project
 - 8. Second two-year work program
 - 9. Evaluation report-second project
 - 10. PPN/EPN development
 - 11. Four-year plan development

CASE STUDY
EVALUATION PROCESS NARRATIVE
SAMPLE TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

II. Assessment of Administrative and Management Practices and Procedures, Including Planning Process

A. Introduction

B. Structure: Roles and Responsibilities

- 1. Board of Directors
- 2. Board Committees
- 3. Low-Income Groups and Program Participants
- 4. Other Agencies/Organizations
- 5. CAA Staff

C. Processes

- 1. Review of Management Systems
- 2. Selecting Practices and Procedures
- 3. Selecting Performance Criteria
- 4. Conducting Assessments

D. Products and Use

- 1. Revising PPN
- 2. Developing PPN
- 3. Respond to Management Audits
- 4. Identify Problems
- 5. Revise Policies and Procedures
- 6. Revise Management Structures
- 7. Appraise Staff Performance
- 8. Achieve Economies
- 9. Identify Training Needs
- 10. Reporting

E. Schedules/Deadlines

- 1. Management System Review
- 2. Management Practices Selected
- 3. Performance Criteria Selected
- 4. Planning Process Assessment
- 5. PPN Development
- 6. Management Assessment

EVALUATION PROCESS NARRATIVE

I. PROJECT IMPACT EVALUATION

A. INTRODUCTION

NECAP will conduct an impact evaluation of at least one project from its two year grant application. This impact evaluation will determine:

1. the extent to which the project has contributed to achieving an agency goal;
2. the extent to which the accomplishment of the goal can be attributed to the project and its component activities;
3. the extent to which meeting the goal reduced or eliminated the basic cause of the poverty problem addressed by the goal;
4. the extent to which meeting the goal achieved the broad purposes of the Community Services Act as measured by the Standards of Effectiveness;
5. the impact of meeting the goal upon the lives of individual low-income persons and the target population as a whole.

B. STRUCTURE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Board of Directors

- a. Approve an evaluation process schedule and Evaluation Process Narrative (EPN)
- b. Create/appoint Planning and Evaluation Committee
- c. Select project(s) for impact evaluation
- d. Select criteria for impact evaluations
- e. Approve impact evaluation design and instruments
- f. Allocate resources to impact evaluation
- g. Participate in impact evaluation team work
- h. Review and approve impact evaluation report(s)
- i. Modify policies, plans based on impact evaluation results
- j. Present impact evaluation findings in public forums

2. Board Committee(s) (Planning and Evaluation)

- a. Review EPN requirements
- b. Make recommendations to the full Board regarding implementation of EPN requirements
- c. Recommend project(s) for evaluation
- d. Recommend criteria for evaluation

EPN (Cont'd)

I. PROJECT IMPACT EVALUATION (Cont'd)B. STRUCTURE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES (Cont'd)

2. Board Committee(s) (Planning and Evaluation) (Cont'd)
 - e. Recommend design for impact evaluation
 - f. Provide leaders for evaluation team(s)
 - g. Review goals developed during planning process for evaluability
 - h. Make recommendations regarding evaluation reports
 - i. Make recommendations for changes in plans, policies based on evaluation reports
3. Low-Income Groups and Program Participants
 - a. Recommend project(s) for impact evaluation
 - b. Test evaluation instruments for clarity, usefulness, reliability
 - c. Participate on evaluation terms
 - d. Receive, review and comment on draft evaluation reports
 - e. Recommend modifications to plans, policies and procedures
4. Other Agencies/Organizations
 - a. Provide technical assistance in evaluation design
 - b. Contribute data, other information
 - c. Participate on evaluation teams
 - d. Review and comment on evaluation reports
5. CAA Staff
 - a. Any role assigned by Board of Directors
 - b. Provide support and assistance to the Board, Committees, and low income groups re:
 - i. EPN requirements
 - ii. Evaluation design
 - iii. Participation (logistical, administrative details) in evaluation activities
 - iv. Information/data required for evaluation
 - v. Recommendations for modifications in plans, policies

EPN (Cont'd)

I. PROJECT IMPACT EVALUATION (Cont'd)C. IMPACT EVALUATION PROCESSES:1. Selecting Projects to be Evaluated

The Board of Directors will select projects to be evaluated after considering the following:

- a. Recommendations from low-income groups
- b. Recommendations from Board Committees
- c. Recommendations from evaluation reports re problem projects
- d. Project priority in four year plan (in top ¼)
- e. Target audience(s) for evaluation report
- f. Cost-benefit of evaluating project(s)
- g. Potential for generating valid, reliable evaluation data
- h. Opportunities for involving low-income people/groups in evaluation implementation

2. Selecting Criteria

The Board of Directors will select evaluation performance criteria after considering the following:

- a. CAA mission statement
- b. CSA standards of effectiveness
- c. Numbers of low-income people affected
- d. Self-sufficiency indicators
- e. Cost-benefit characteristics

3. Designing Evaluation

The Board of Directors will approve an evaluation design which will consider the following;

- a. Clarifying goals
- b. Determining audience for evaluation report
- c. Determining data needs and collection methods
- d. Determining who will conduct evaluation
- e. Determining evaluation schedule

EPN (Cont'd)

I. PROJECT IMPACT EVALUATION (Cont'd)

D. IMPACT EVALUATION PRODUCTS AND THEIR USE

The Board of Directors will use impact evaluation products to:

1. Establish baseline data for next planning processes, including:
 - a. Mission re-definition
 - b. Needs assessment
 - c. Resource analysis
 - d. Strategy selection
 - e. Goal setting
 - f. Evaluation process design
2. Redirect/amend current work programs
3. Develop second two-year work program
4. Share information with CAAs and other agencies operating similar projects
5. Achieve economies by examining cost/benefits
6. Promote public information efforts
7. Modify/change program management procedures

E. IMPACT EVALUATION SCHEDULES/DEADLINES

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Project(s) Selected | By -4 months |
| 2. Criteria Established | By -1 month |
| 3. Design Approved | By 0 month |
| 4. Data Collection begins | By 0-18 months |
| 5. Implementation | By 18 months |
| 6. Products Available | By 19,30,35 months |
| 7. Reports on First Evaluation Project | 6,15,24 months |
| 8. Review and Approval of Second Two Year Work Program | By 19-21 months |
| 9. Reports on Second Evaluation Project | 30,39,48 months |
| 10. PPN/EPN Development | 30-33 months |
| 11. Four Year Plan Development | 35-42 months |

EPN (Cont'd)

II. ASSESSMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES, INCLUDING THE PLANNING PROCESS AND AT LEAST ONE OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE/MANAGEMENT PROCESS

A. INTRODUCTION

NECAP will assess the administrative and management practices and procedures, including the planning process, to determine:

1. the extent to which practices and procedures are being followed;
2. the extent to which those practices and procedures are serving their purpose;
3. the extent to which there are problems in current practices and procedures (behind target dates, below performance standards, etc.);
4. what corrective actions need to be taken in current practices and procedures.

B. STRUCTURE: RULES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Board of Directors

- a. Approve assessment process
- b. Select assessment criteria
- c. Select practice(s) and procedure(s) to be assessed
- d. Approve assessment design(s)
 - i. instruments
 - ii. assessors
 - iii. schedules
- e. Assign committees to assessment work
- f. Modify change practices/procedures based on assessment findings

2. Board Committees

- a. Review practices and procedures and make recommendations on potential problems in committee's area of responsibility
- b. Recommend to Board at least one management practice/procedure to be assessed
- c. Review conduct of planning process against PPN; recommend changes/corrective action where necessary
- d. Review conduct of planning process against GPMS requirements; recommend changes/corrective actions where necessary
- e. Perform assessment(s) as scheduled
- f. Evaluate/assess job performance of Executive Director

EPN (Cont'd)

II. ASSESSMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES, INCLUDING THE PLANNING PROCESS AND AT LEAST ONE OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE/MANAGEMENT PROCESS (Cont'd)

B. STRUCTURE: RULES AND RESPONSIBILITIES (Cont'd)

3. Low-Income Groups and Program Participants

- a. Participate in all stages of planning process
- b. Provide feedback on adequacy of planning process steps and instruments

4. Other Agencies/Organizations

- a. Provide technical assistance in developing assessment design
- b. Provide assistance in implementing assessments

5. CAA Staff

- a. Any role assigned by Board
- b. Implement management and administrative systems
- c. Report systematically on operation of management practices and procedures
- d. Provide information re systems operations
- e. Provide assistance in designing assessment instruments
- f. Provide general staff support to Board and committees
- g. Incorporate assessment findings and recommendations into day-to-day management practices and procedures

C. PROCESSES:

1. Review of Agency Management Systems

The Board will review or assign to be reviewed the basic management systems which support planning and program management under GPMS. These include at a minimum:

- a. Board Operations
- b. Fiscal Operations
- c. Affirmative Action
- d. Interagency Relations
- e. Public Information
- f. Personnel Management

EPN (Cont'd)

II. ASSESSMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES, INCLUDING THE PLANNING PROCESS AND AT LEAST ONE OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE/MANAGEMENT PROCESS (Cont'd)

C. PROCESSES: (Cont'd)

1. Review of Agency Management Systems (Cont'd)

For each system the Board will reaffirm or establish:

- a. Basic function of system
- b. Management practices regulated by the system
- c. Role and responsibility assignments (Board, committees, community groups, low-income people, staff)
- d. Amendment procedures
- e. Records and documents
- f. Schedules, deadlines

2. Selecting Practices and Procedures to be Assessed

- a. Review of current management audits/evaluations to identify problems
- b. Recommendations from Board Committee(s)
- c. Identify target audiences for assessment(s) reports
- d. Determine costs/benefits of assessments
- e. Determine which practices and procedures are most critical to eligibility and achieving goals

3. Selecting Performance Criteria

- a. Review of previous management reviews and audits
- b. Review of minimum CSA requirements
- c. Review/establish deadlines and target dates
- d. Review of sound general management practices and procedures
- e. Seek/request technical assistance where needed
- f. Review participation levels in planning process
- g. Review amendments/changes required in Plan

4. Conducting Assessments

- a. Develop calendar/schedule for assessments
- b. Assign responsibilities for assessments
- c. Collect base-line data for assessments
- d. Design instruments for assessments
- e. Conduct assessments
- f. Report on assessments

EPN (Cont'd)

II. ASSESSMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES, INCLUDING THE PLANNING PROCESS AND AT LEAST ONE OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE/MANAGEMENT PROCESS (Cont'd)

D. ASSESSMENT PRODUCTS AND THEIR USE

The Board of Directors of NECAP will use products from planning process and administrative and management assessments to:

1. Revise or amend the current PPN
2. Develop the PPN for the next planning cycle
3. Respond to management audits by funding sources
4. Identify management/administrative problems
5. Revise agency policies and procedures
6. Revise/modify organizational and management structures and documents such as job descriptions
7. Appraise the performance of the Agency's Executive Director
8. Achieve economies in management/administration
9. Identify training/career development needs and priorities
10. Report to funding sources

E. ASSESSMENT SCHEDULES/DEADLINES

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Management System Review | By -6 months |
| 2. Management Practices/Procedures Selected for Assessment | By -3 months |
| 3. Performance Criteria Selected | By 3 months |
| 4. Planning Process Assessment Conducted | By 0 months |
| 5. Planning Process Assessment Report Prepared for PPN Development | By 3 months |
| 6. Management Practices Assessment Conducted | By 24 months |

GPMS ORIENTATION FOR CAA'S

A.	Needs Assessment	
	1. Problems to be addressed	1
	2. Goal of GPMS	
	3. Ideal performance standards	1
	4. Learning group analysis	2-4
	A. the audience	
	B. knowledge	
	C. skills	
	D. attitudes	
B.	Learning Outcomes/Objectives	5
C.	Content/Topics to be covered	6
D.	Training Methods	7
E.	Delivery Strategies	8
F.	Information Charts	10
	1. % of CAA'S entering different doors	
	2. GPMS orientation needs relates to entry door	
	3. Topics/Time needs relates to door	
G.	Staffing	13
	1. Implementation task forces	
	2. Training teams	
	3. Training assistance to CAAs	
H.	Costs	14-15
	1. CAA Travel and Per Diem (221)	
	2. CSA Travel and Per Diem (GD & A)	
	3. Materials (230)	
	4. Consultants (230)	
	5. Start-up/problem CAA visits (GD & A)	

A. Organizational Needs Assessment

1. Problems to be addressed.

- a. Over the years many CAAs have moved away from their 5-point mandate described in Section 201(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act.
- b. Existing management systems in use in CSA and CAAs have certain weaknesses, or have become obsolete in some respects. (Deficiencies in the community based-planning process as conducted in some CAAs through one example.)

2. Goals of GPMS

Each community action agency shall adopt a systematic approach to the achievement of the purposes of this title and to utilization of funds provided under this part. Such systematic approach shall encompass community based planning and implementation process which seeks to identify the problems and causes of poverty in the community, seeks to mobilize and coordinate relevant public and private resources, establishes program priorities, links program components with one another and with other relevant programs, and provides for evaluation all with the maximum participation of the poor.

3. Ideal performance standards.

- A. CAA's can more effectively address the requirements of the Act and achieve the CSA mission by carrying out a long-range, community-based planning process that is participatory in scope, requiring the involvement of both the poor and the other groups in the community.

- B. GPMS is both a mechanism for multi-year, community-based planning, and a mechanism to develop and implement goals and strategies (including non service strategies) to achieve measurable objectives. These goals and objectives must be linked in measurable ways to a reduction of the incidence of poverty in the community, and to an elimination of the causes of poverty in the community. The Grantee Program Management System is the vehicle through which CAA's will reorient their activities to better achieve the purpose of the EOA.
- C. GPMS also contains a set of performance standards that will be applied to CAA's

4. Learning Group Analysis.

- A. The audience - The participants in this orientation will include:
1. CAA Board members. The Board Chairperson and other representatives from the Board will attend, including representatives of low income people.
 2. CAA Executive Directors. Each CAA Director must attend.
 3. CAA staff. Usually this will be a person with responsibility for supervising the planning process, or other staff the CAA Director thinks should be familiar with the entire system.
 4. Others. Reps from community groups, etc.
- B. Knowledge - The amount of knowledge that participants have about general planning approaches and about existing CSA requirements will vary enormously among board members, community representatives and representatives from other organizations.

The GPMS orientation will not, however, serve as a general orientation to CSA, nor will be be "Basic Training" for Board members. The GPMS orientation assumes a working knowledge of the CSA/CAA world.

A. Needs Assessment (continued)

3. Learning Group Analysis

C. Skills

Boards members and representatives of other organizations will have general skills in overseeing publically funded programs.

CAA Executive Directors and senior staff have good general management skills in terms of their ability to administer publically funded programs. They have adequate skills to administer the GPMS and the planning requirements.

D. Attitudes

There are a number of negative attitudes that must be addressed.

They are:

1. Planning has no value to me unless there is a specific dollar pot available to fund the products of my planning efforts.
2. Services to individuals are the most feasible/most visible/most effective/easiest type of program for our CAA to administer.
3. Planning is at worst--make work--or at best--only a grants-writing activity. It is separate and distinct from the daily management and operation of our CAA. Planning is something that one staff person does, not something that all our staff do with the involvement of the community.

4. Long range planning and non-service strategies are difficult to "sell" to Board members and elected officials. They are interested in non-controversial, highly visible programs that produce immediate results.
5. Increased community participation will disrupt things. A broad-scale planning process may raise questions about my (Executive Directors) judgment or past recommendations. Planning may therefore be a threat.
6. How can I possibly plan for four years in advance when I don't know what I may be doing tomorrow? (ECAP, heat disasters, etc.)
7. I need more money to hire expert planners and to buy computers if our CAA is going to do community-based planning.
8. CSA won't follow through on this.
9. The planning process will only raise false-hopes and create expectations that we cannot fulfill.
10. GPMS will require too many changes in our scope of thinking, methods and personal habits of work.
11. Our resources are too limited we are overextended now. You cannot expect us to reduce services to
And other resources to do a planning process

B. Learning Outcomes/Objectives

1. To effect a rededication to the Mission of CSA among CAA Board and staff as described in Section 210-A of the EOA.
2. To orient CAA Board representatives, senior staff and others to the basic elements of GPMS, including:
 - a. CSA planning requirements.
 - b. Non service strategies as a type of strategy to be considered when deciding how to achieve goals.
 - c. CSA/CAA accountability relationships, including the roles of the Field Representative.
 - d. CSA administrative and funding standards.
3. To remove negative attitudes about planning, and to sell the value of planning and of G.P.M.S.
4. To provide sufficient information for a CAA to effect the CAA's transfer from GAP to GPMS, and for the CAA to understand the GPMS requirements they must fulfill for twelve months to twenty-four after they enter GPMS.

D. Training Methods

That format for each major content block (module) is:

1. Lecture/slide show or other method of content delivery (approximately 30 minutes).
2. Questions and answers. (approximately 10 minutes)
3. A workshop or some other exercise for participants to use to process and discuss the content. (approximately 1½ hours)
4. Reports back to a general session (approximately 30 minutes)
5. Synthesizing/summarizing/recapping what was learned and what was reported back, with opportunity for additional questions and answers. (approximately 20 minutes)

Participants will be asked to evaluate the session verbally and to complete a written evaluation instrument.

E. Delivery Strategies

All CAA's need three types of contact.

1. A general overview of GPMS, and information about the major elements of the system. This will require approximately 1/2 day. (This overview will always occur at the start of the second type of orientation. As a free-standing module it can also be used at state association meetings, Board meetings, etc.)
2. A review of the elements of GPMS in sufficient detail to enable the CAA to enter the system, and to operate for 12-24 months subsequent to entry. This orientation will take about 3 days. Regional Offices will have two major options about how to proceed here.

The first option is to do a description of the entire system and to review in some detail all major system requirements.

The "complete curriculum" requires about 3½ days.

The second option is to shape the training program so that detailed information is provided about the requirements the CAA will need to enter their assigned door, and to operate for 12-24 months subsequent to entry. The door through which a CAA is entering GPMS is based in part on their previously demonstrated ability to meet certain basic GPMS requirements. For example, CAA's that have already conducted an high-quality community-based planning process, that the Regional Office is accepts as satisfying basic GPMS requirements for the next four years, will not benefit greatly from spending a day and a half on GPMS planning requirements, which they already know how to fulfill and will not be repeating for 2 or 3 years. CAA's can therefore be grouped depending on which door they are entering, and this suggests which training topics need to be covered in the greatest depth.

ALL TRAINING TOPICS WILL, THEREFORE, BE COVERED IN MODULES.

Each module can be used independently. The modules to be used for a group of CAA's, and the amount of time to be spent on each module, can be varied depending on the needs of the trainee population.

3. The third type of orientation will take place through individual contacts between the Regional Office and the CAA. These contacts will address the specific needs and problems of the CAA, and will often be carried out in conjunction with some other visit or purpose, i.e. a Field Representative may be attending a Board meeting anyhow, and includes a one-hour overview of GPMS as part of that visit. In some cases, a start-up visit may be necessary.

As many as 50% of the 912 CAA's may require at least one start-up or problem-solving visit. In addition, more than one person may have to visit that CAA. A Field Representative may not, for example, be able to provide the kind of technical assistance that is needed, and another person would have to either make that visit or accompany the Field Representative.

G. Staffing

It is imperative that each Regional Office accept basic responsibility for implementing GPMS. This includes responsibility for identifying CSA personnel or other people who will have some responsibility for delivering the training. CSA must communicate a sense of ownership and enthusiasm for GPMS to CAA's. The only way to do this is to have Federal employees take a dominant, highly visible role in the CAA orientation sessions.

After a determination is made about which door each CAA will enter, regions can then, and only then, make valid judgments about how to best group CAAs to maximize the value of the orientation for those CAA's.

After they decide how to group they can then assess the "package" that will be shaped for those CAA's. For example, they may have one group of CAA's that have previously done a good job of multi-year planning (e.g. Oregon) and their orientation can be done on a state-wide basis, emphasizing the application and performance phases of GPMS. The subject matter to be covered in the application and performance phases can usually be handled adequately by a CSA employee.

In another case, there may be several CAA's that have not done an adequate planning process. The Regional Office may group them, emphasize planning, and determine that they need assistance in describing planning requirements. In this situation, an effort would be made to secure an outside resource, from a CAA, from

another Region, from CSA headquarters, or a consultant, to assist in the orientation.

The basic assumption, then, is that each CSA Regional Office will provide most of the trainers. On a region by region basis, a review will be made to identify the need, if any, for outside training resources. These resources will be obtained by a variety of methods, such as a regional office T&TA contract, or by allocation of consultant days from the national contract.

H. Costs of Orienting CAA's to GPMS

There are four major types of direct costs involved.

1. CAA travel and per diem costs to attend orientation.
2. CSA travel and per diem costs to deliver orientations.
3. Consultant assistance necessary to develop and to help deliver training, including production of materials developed by them.
4. CSA travel and per diem costs to provide individualized "start up" assistance to certain CAA's that have special problems to be overcome, etc.

1. CAA Travel and Per Diem (221)

If each of 912 CAAs sends at least 5 people to GPMS orientation, with larger CAA's sending as many as 25 people to orientation (in this case the session would be held in their city), the maximum number of trainees anticipated is 8,000.

If each person spends 2-3 days in the orientation session, it is estimated that travel and per diem costs will average \$200 per person. These extraordinary costs of travel and

per diem for GPMS implementation may or may not already be available in the CAA.

If not available, the estimated maximum additional costs would be 8,000 x \$200 or \$1.6 million.

The provision of these funds by CSA for this purpose has three major benefits.

- A. It insures attendance at training.
- B. It demonstrates CSA's commitment to GPMS.
- C. It is an enormous morale booster.

Most CAA's have has small grants (\$1,000 to \$2,500) made to them from FY 80 funds to enable them to pay for travel and per diem.

2. CSA travel and per diem costs to deliver orientations (GD&A)

The maximum cost is estimated below:

- 8,000 participants, with an average of 30 participants per session, requires 267 sessions.
- An average of four CSA employees per session, including the field representatives assigned to the CAA being orientated.
- An average cost of \$300 for travel and per diem per CSA employee per session.
- Four employees x \$300 = \$1,200 per session, x 267 sessions, produces an estimated cost of \$320,400.

It must be noted that this cost will vary considerably depending on how a region proposes to group CAA's the number of people in each session, and who they propose to use to deliver training.

3. Consultant Assistance (Section 230, FY 80)
 - A. CAA Orientation Program Development AND assistance on other tasks (Wandless, Knuti, Schiller, Reisset, Torphy, Masters, et. al.) \$ 50,000
 - B. Approximately \$173,000 to purchase stand-up trainers to supplement Regional Office training teams.
 - Average daily rate, \$250, 2½ days each session, for 186 sessions \$117,500
 - Travel/per diem, average \$300 session for 186 sessions 55,800
4. CSA start-up or problem-solving visits. (GD&A)
 - \$300 travel and per diem, each of 450 CAA's \$135,000
 - C. Materials Costs, about \$16,000 (Section 230) 16,000
 - Slide Shows 40 shows, 60 slides in each
 - Timeline charts (2,000)
 - Pizza wheel charts (2,000)
 - Workbooks (10,000)
 - Etc.

PROGRAM HYPOTHESIS

From Problem Analysis to Hypothesis

- Educated Hunch
- Series of if-then statements
- Hierarchy of statements that include proposed relationship between services and desired outcomes *simple to complex*
- Leads to development of goals and objectives

PROGRAM HYPOTHESIS

Purposes

- Helps make explicit assumptions about program expectations
- Establishes a framework that can be used to bring internal consistency to the program *logic*
- Should be used to examine inputs, throughput outputs and outcomes for their internal consistency

← TBB / TH200 / H2000

present prog = slow

YOUNG FAMILIES CAN PROJECT

HYPOTHESIS:

ADOLESCENT MOTHERS ARE AN EXTREMELY HIGH RISK POPULATION

THESE RISKS INCLUDE A STATISTICALLY HIGHER PROBABILITY OF DROPPING OUT OF SCHOOL, EXPERIENCING DIFFICULTIES WITH PARENTING INCLUDING THE HIGHER PROBABILITY OF ABUSING AND/OR NEGLECTING THEIR CHILD(REN) AND BECOMING DEPENDENT ON THE WELFARE SYSTEM

IF WE CAN IDENTIFY ON A CASE BY CASE BASIS THE MAJOR PROBLEMS/BARRIERS TO A MOTHER'S BECOMING SELF-SUFFICIENT AND

IF WE CAN DEVELOP A MEANINGFUL CASE PLAN THAT RELATES SERVICES TO THESE IDENTIFIED PROBLEM AND BARRIERS AND

IF WE CAN SUCCESSFULLY ELIMINATE SYSTEMIC BARRIERS TO SELF-SUFFICIENCY, THEN

WE SHOULD ACHIEVE POSITIVE CHANGES IN PROBLEM AREAS WHICH IN TURN SHOULD ULTIMATELY BE OBSERVED IN HIGHER RATES OF SELF-SUFFICIENCY

IN THAT A NUMBER OF BARRIERS WILL BE IDENTIFIED AS STRUCTURAL AND IMBEDDED IN THE HUMAN SERVICE SYSTEM, WE ASSUME THAT A CASEWORKER WILL NOT ONLY BE ABLE TO DEAL WITH THESE ON A CASE BY CASE BASIS BUT THAT THEY WILL EVENTUALLY BE DEALT WITH AT THE SYSTEM'S LEVEL THROUGH CHANGES IN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

15
C.M.P.



EVALUATION

Questions

- What types of clients?
- With what types of problems?
- Receiving what types of services?
- Achieve what results?
- At what cost?

APP ~~made~~ ^{for} ~~the~~
- ~~review~~ ^{for}
- ~~0~~ ⁰ ~~BR~~ ^{BR} ~~for~~ ^{for}

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Objectives: Criteria

- **Clarity** - To provide, to reduce # to understand, to make
- **Time Frame** By June 30, 1991; by the end of year ~~for~~ ^{first year} - multiple year plan impacts
- **Target of Change** 100 Families ~~will have received~~ ^{25-40% will be provided}
100 families will have received
25-40% will be received
- **Results to be achieved**
- **Criteria for documentation** 65 recorded by...
as reported by...
- **Responsibility** - Process only;
as reported by...

DESIGNING THE INTERVENTION

A Systems Approach

- **INPUTS**
Clients, Staff, Resources, Equipment, Facilities
- **THROUGHPUTS**
The service delivery process - the coming together of clients and all resources
- **OUTPUTS**
The completion of a service by a client
- **OUTCOMES**
The change in the client after treatment

PROCESS OUTCOMES

Throughputs

- Case Management
- Individual Counselling
- Group Counselling
- Financial Assistance
- Parent Training
- Job Training
- Housing Assistance

INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES

Client Outcomes

- **INDIVIDUAL BARRIERS**
 - Self Esteem
 - Mental Health
 - Substance Abuse
 - Physical Health
- **RELATIONAL BARRIERS**
 - Parenting Skills
 - Family Harmony/Discord
 - Degree of Family Support

INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES

Client Outcomes

- ENVIRONMENTAL BARRIERS

- Finances

- School Stress

- Housing

- RESOURCES, LACK OF

- Day Care

- Transportation

- Family Planning

13-19

ULTIMATE OUTCOMES

Client Outcomes

- Welfare Dependency
- Education
- Employment
- Child Abuse
- Repeated Pregnancies

- 1 Supplement
- 2 Beyond adon
- 3 Rural King
- 4 Don't work
- 5 Hazelwood

GPMS ORIENTATION
Trainer's Schedule

MONDAY, AUGUST 4, 1980

MSTERS

TIME	EVENT	
9:00 a.m.	WELCOME, LOGISTICS	Richard Rios William Allison
9:15 a.m.	RATIONALE FOR GPMS, AND HOW THIS CAME ABOUT	Laird F. Harris
9:45 a.m.	ORIENTATION AND OVERVIEW FOR WEEK QUESTION AND ANSWER	Laird F. Harris
10:15 a.m.	BREAK	
10:30 a.m.	ELEMENTS OF THE GPMS SYSTEM	Gaylyn N. Boone
	10 MINUTES SLIDE SHOW 20 MINUTES TIME LINE (PTS. OF FR INTERCESSION) QUESTION AND ANSWER	
11:30 a.m.	OBSTACLES TO LEARNING	Jim Masters
12:00 noon	LUNCH	
1:30 p.m.	GPMS PLANNING REQUIREMENTS (RULE) QUESTION AND ANSWER	Boyd Cameron
	REVIEW/APPROVAL OF PPN/EPN BY CSA QUESTION AND ANSWER	
	- COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN ALL - NEEDS ANALYSIS - RESOURCE ANALYSIS - VERIFIABILITY QUESTION AND ANSWER	
2:15 p.m.	BREAK	
2:30 p.m.	PPN WORKSHOPS	
4:00 p.m.	REPORTS, AND QUESTION AND ANSWER	Michael Buckley
4:45 p.m.	RECAP AND PREVIEW	Jim Masters
NIGHT PANELS:	HOW TO DO COMMUNITY-BASED PLANNING	
	1. RURAL ISSUES	Henry Hyde
	2. USING CENSUS DATA	Peg Borgers
	3. SETTING PRIORITIES	Rick Weakland
	4. URBAN ISSUES	Paul Bloyd
	5. USING INFORMATION ABOUT CAA OPERATIONS IN THE PLANNING PROCESS	Ed Payton

8:30

GPMS ORIENTATION
Trainer's Schedule

TUESDAY, AUGUST 5, 1980

TIME	EVENT	
9:00 a.m.	OVERVIEW	Jim Masters
9:05 a.m.	LISTENING	John Wandless
9:15 a.m.	CAA FOUR-YEAR ACTION PLAN REQUIREMENTS QUESTION AND ANSWER (WORKBOOK I)	John Wandless
10:00 a.m.	PLANNING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE VISIT (DESK EXERCISE)	John Wandless
10:20 a.m.	BREAK	
10:30 a.m.	NON-SERVICE STRATEGIES	John Buckstead Nick Carbone Jim Golub
12:00 noon	LUNCH	
	QUESTION AND ANSWER	
1:30 p.m.	STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW	Bernie Horowitz
2:00 p.m.	WORKSHOP ON GOALS/STRATEGIES	
3:30 p.m.	BREAK	
3:40 p.m.	REPORTS, FEEDBACK PANEL QUESTION AND ANSWER	
4:10 p.m.	ANOTHER VIEW (SKI T)	Jim Masters
4:30 p.m.	TRAINING EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK	Marge Schiller
7:30 p.m.	BILL MOYER'S JOURNAL: COMMUNITY ORGANIZING AND PLANNING	Nick Carbone Discussion Leader

GPMS ORIENTATION
Participant's Schedule

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 6, 1980

activity event

TIME EVENT

9:00 a.m. OVERVIEW Jim Masters

9:10 a.m. PRE-REVIEW PHASE Gaylyn N. Boone

- PURPOSE/FLOW
- ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

- * FOUR-YEAR PLAN
- * ELIGIBILITY
- * PPR
- * FUNDING/REFUNDING OBSTACLES
- * OTHER ISSUES AND CONCERNS

*events are
conducted
by staff activities*

too long

QUESTION AND ANSWER

PREPARE AGENDA FOR PRE-REVIEW VISIT
(DESK EXERCISE)

9:45 a.m. BREAK

10:00 a.m. WORKSHOP: PRE-REVIEW AND PRVM

11:30 a.m. REPORTING
QUESTION AND ANSWER

12:00 noon LUNCH

1:15 p.m. ~~ELIGIBILITY (WORKBOOK III)~~

→ Tomorrow

1:45 p.m. LETTER OF PROGRAM AND FUNDING GUIDANCE AND
APPLICATION PHASE (WORKBOOK IV)

Joe Reid
John Reid

- PREPARATION BY CAA
- CITIZEN REVIEW AND COMMENT
- PRE-FUNDING VISIT (DRAFT 512A'S)

- MEASURES
- TIMEFRAMES
- WORKSHOP INSTRUCTIONS

2:30 p.m. BREAK

2:45 p.m. WORKSHOP PRE-FUNDING VISIT John Wandless

4:00 p.m. REPORT AND FEEDBACK
QUESTION AND ANSWER

TIME

EVENT

~~4:30~~ p.m.

HEADQUARTERS OFFICE DIRECTORS

~~Joe Maldonado
Tony Jackson
Diane Elliott
Frank Jones
C. Christensen
Bob Landmann
Gerrold Mukai
Nita Graves~~

3:45 PM

5:30 p.m.

RECEPTION: PIERCE STREET ANNEX

Friday 1 PM

rule

CAA package

Implementation scheduling

8:30

clarity



GPMS ORIENTATION
Trainer's Schedule

THURSDAY, AUGUST 7, 1980

TIME EVENT

~~9:00 a.m. OVERVIEW~~ Jim Masters

9:10 a.m. PERFORMANCE PHASE Jim Gilbreth

9:20
40 min

- * TWO-YEAR OVERVIEW
 - * SELF-EVALUATION (WORKBOOK V)
 - * MONITORING/ASSESSMENT (WORKBOOK VI)
 - * PPR AND RESCHEDULING
- QUESTION AND ANSWER

~~10:00 a.m.~~ 15-MONTH PPR

- * IMPORTANCE
- * HOW TO USE

10:15 a.m. BREAK

10:30 a.m. WORKSHOP ON 15-MONTH PPR

REPORT/FEEDBACK

12:00 noon LUNCHEON WITH GUEST SPEAKER

about
Juan

1:30 p.m. RECAP OF GPMS FIELD REPRESENTATIVE ROLES Hector Morales

OTHER ROLES OF FIELD REPRESENTATIVE

SUPPORT ROLES
QUESTION AND ANSWER

Carl Shaw

2:30 p.m. BREAK

2:45 p.m. WORKSHOP ON CASE STUDIES

4:15 p.m. REPORT AND FEEDBACK
QUESTION AND ANSWER

5:00 p.m. TRAINING EVALUATION/FEEDBACK

Marge Schiller

4:30
shil
by ice

GPMS ORIENTATION
Trainer's Schedule

FRIDAY, AUGUST 8, 1980

<u>TIME</u>	<u>EVENT</u>	
9:00 a.m.	OVERVIEW AND RECAP	Jim Masters
9:10 a.m.	MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT ISSUES QUESTION AND ANSWER	Laird F. Harris
10:15 a.m.	BREAK	
10:30 a.m.	OBSTACLES TO EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION	Jim Masters
11:00 a.m.	WRAP-UP	Laird F. Harris
12:00 noon	SESSION ENDS	

Jim Harris