

# Improving Stakeholder Collaboration

A special report on the evaluation  
of community-based health efforts

---

COLLABORATION

GROUP HEALTH  
community  
foundation

# Improving Stakeholder Collaboration

A special report on the evaluation  
of community-based health efforts

---

## Table of Contents

Introduction . . . . .	3
Participating Initiatives . . . . .	4
Beginning the Dialogue . . . . .	5
The Stakeholder's Perspective . . . . .	7
Defining Best Practices and Approaches . . . . .	11
The Role of Evaluation in Capacity Building and Sustainability . . . . .	15
Community-based Evaluation, Cultural Competence, and Diversity . . . . .	19
Next Steps: Pushing the Boundaries . . . . .	23
Acknowledgments . . . . .	26

Dear Colleagues,

Community-based efforts to improve the health of individuals and populations hold considerable promise for funders, health practitioners, and community organizations. Partnering with community groups to solve problems locally has great potential because of the inherent strengths of communities, their residents, and their resources. Other stakeholders such as funders and evaluators can help communities build capacity and strive toward sustainability. Because community-based interventions and initiatives are by definition so complex, the potential and need for collaboration is even greater.

In recent years, we have organized three national working conferences of experts in community-based health improvement to explore the challenges, dilemmas, opportunities, and innovations in the *evaluation* of such work. It is our goal that the conferences and proceedings will contribute to improved practice in community-based evaluation, and strengthen partnerships among funders, practitioners and evaluators.

We acknowledge the wise guidance of a national steering committee and the support of our 13 funders, 25 initiatives, and hundreds of represented communities, as well as our speakers, panelists and facilitators. We thank all the participants for their energy, ideas, and commitment.

We hope these discussions will continue, and that they will serve to improve the field of community health and its evaluation.

Sincerely,



Bill Beery  
Vice President/Programs  
Group Health  
Community Foundation



Gary Nelson  
Senior Program Officer Group  
The California Wellness Foundation

## Participating Initiatives

### **The Allina Foundation**

Improving Attendance and Participation among Students with Asthma  
in the Minneapolis Public Schools

### **American Legacy Foundation**

Tobacco Use Cessation and Prevention

### **Annie E. Casey Foundation**

Community Health Worker Evaluation Toolkit

### **Mary Black Foundation**

The Healthy Community Initiative

### **The California Endowment**

The Public Health Initiative's Partnership for the Public's Health  
Rural Community Assistance Corporation's Agriculture Worker Health  
and Housing Program

### **The California Wellness Foundation**

The Health Improvement Initiative  
The Children and Youth Community Health Initiative  
The Teenage Pregnancy Prevention Initiative  
The Violence Prevention Initiative  
The Work and Health Initiative

### **Centers for Disease Control and Prevention**

#### **Colorado Trust**

Teen Pregnancy Prevention  
Home Visitation Learning Group

#### **Health Resources and Services Administration**

Community Access Program

#### **Hogg Foundation for Mental Health**

Greater Houston Collaborative for Children

#### **The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation**

Allies Against Asthma Fighting Back Initiative  
Turning Point Initiative

#### **Kaiser Permanente**

Community Health Partnerships

#### **Kansas Health Foundation**

School and Community Sexual Risk Reduction Replication Initiative

#### **The W. K. Kellogg Foundation**

Turning Point Initiative  
Community Care Network Demonstration Program  
Community Voices: HealthCare for the Underserved—A National  
Demonstration of Local Visionary Models  
Comprehensive Community Health Models of Michigan Initiative

#### **Dorothy Rider Pool Health Care Trusts**

Measurable Enhancement of the Status of Health

#### **Sierra Health Foundation**

Community Partnerships for Healthy Children Initiative

## Beginning the Dialogue

The idea of the community-based health program is simple—to improve the health of people and the communities in which they live. And who better to improve health in a community than the community itself? Increasingly, foundations and grant makers are providing major funding for community-based approaches to health promotion and disease prevention. With community-based support, local coalitions—unlike outside interventions—can utilize community knowledge and perspectives to create effective, appropriate programs that improve community health.

As a program begins to take form and the stakeholders—funders, evaluators and community leaders—are established, the situation becomes more complex. Who is in charge? What aspects of the program can be evaluated? How will we know if the program is successful? Is it good and right for the community? How can we make it better?

***It's about our willingness as individuals and teams to participate and challenge each other—to get involved, discuss issues, ask questions and learn from it.***

Bill Beery, Group Health  
Community Foundation

The major stakeholders of community-based health programs face significant challenges as they work together to affect change. Differing and sometimes conflicting agendas about the implementation and maintenance of these programs can have an impact on program success and create tension and uncertainty.

Additionally, the role of evaluation is evolving. As demand increases for concise ways to evaluate the status and sustainability of community-based health programs, traditional evaluation tools become less effective in measuring both processes and outcomes.

In response to these challenges, the Group Health Community Foundation held its first working conference, titled *Evaluating Community-Based Health Initiatives: Dilemmas, Puzzles, Innovations and Promising Directions* in February 1998. The conference brought together three key groups of stakeholders in community-based initiatives—funders, evaluators, and practitioners—to investigate barriers in and solutions for evaluating the effects of community-based health initiatives. The conference was a success and its conclusions were outlined in the booklet *Making Outcomes Matter: Evaluating Community-Based Health Initiatives*.

To continue the dialogue, the Group Health Community Foundation, a national advisory group, and multiple funding partners sponsored two more working conferences titled *The Evaluation of Community-Based Health Efforts: Challenges and Opportunities* in San Mateo, California, and Chicago, Illinois, in 2000–01. During these conferences, the stakeholders again shared the latest thinking and experiences in the evaluation of community-based programs. Four major topics were discussed:

- The Stakeholder’s Perspective
- Defining Best Practices/Approaches to the Evaluation of Community-Based Efforts
- The Role of Evaluation in Capacity Building and Sustainability
- Community-based Evaluation, Cultural Competency, and Diversity

Participants heard provocative and stimulating presentations from leaders and then, in small groups, set out to combine their experience and expertise to provide ideas for innovation and collaboration. This special report highlights the perspectives, forward-thinking ideas, questions, and conclusions of the 160 participants representing more than 500 communities.

# The Stakeholder's Perspective

Developing and funding a community-based health program is as complex as implementing the program itself. In the first Plenary Session of the *Evaluation of Community-Based Health Efforts: Challenges and Opportunities* conferences, presenters offered their own perspectives to sharpen the distinction of stakeholder roles in the purpose, implementation, and results of evaluation, and challenged participants to create new ways to deal with differences and identify common ground. The following summarizes the ideas presented.

## **From the Funder's Perspective**

Funders have tangible, measurable goals. We look at the bottom-line, which is focused on judging program performance and improving the funding decision-making process. We are accountable in these ways to our boards of directors. Evaluation helps us collect and analyze information and make informed decisions. Funders must, however difficult, strive to improve the quality of those decisions to help create the conditions that will help those we support succeed.

## **From the Evaluator's Perspective**

Conventional evaluation methods alone may not be effective in measuring community-based efforts. In traditional evaluation, there is the expectation of a standard intervention that is implemented across all participating sites. But a cookie-cutter intervention doesn't work. Communities are dynamic and unique. While traditional methods should be used where possible, interventions and evaluations should be tailored to meet each community's needs.

Evaluators typically balance the interests of funders—who think about long-term outcomes but sometimes want to see them sooner than is possible—and the community, which is focused on making the program work. A rethinking of evaluation methods and approaches to include measurement of intermediate outcomes can help to bring the expectations of stakeholders closer together.

## From the Community's Perspective

From the community perspective, evaluation means tension and dilemma. Who is in charge? What's the goal? While the funder's objective is return on investment, and the evaluator's objective is scientific credibility, the community's objective is improved quality of life. Current evaluation techniques offer very little to communities because these techniques usually don't reflect the community goals. Furthermore, a community might focus only on how it will be evaluated and strive to fulfill those specific

***We can start today by taking a closer look at the real issues.***

***Numbers are important, but so is the human factor.***

Edna Lee,  
Westside Health Authority

criteria. Evaluations rarely demonstrate an understanding of a community's context.

All stakeholders should understand a community in greater context and seek to get buy-in from the community early in the process. We all have the same goals, but want to meet them in different ways. It is

important to identify these differences while designing evaluations. Communities need to meet with other stakeholders without having a pre-established agenda. At the same time, other stakeholders need to understand that resources for evaluation take away resources for the intervention, and that can be difficult for communities to support.

For communities, evaluations are meaningful only when they are useful to people in the community. Evaluations should be win-win propositions, providing for feedback along the way to determine if the

community is on the right track or needs a course correction. To make sure the results are useful to communities, communities must have a role in shaping the evaluation.

***We really need to be aware of what I would call the pitfalls of measurement and ensure that we're measuring objectives that are in fact showing progress in the communities at some level... We have to once again go back to the issue of what it is that we are measuring and what we consider to be measures of success, and that's for evaluators as well as for communities...***

Romana Hasnain-Wynia, PhD,  
Health Research and Educational Trust

## GROUP OBSERVATIONS

### Stakeholder Perspectives

---

#### *Stakeholders Negotiate Goals First:*

- Not all stakeholders agree on the purpose of evaluation, nor is it uniformly defined in the field. It is important to acknowledge at the very beginning that each stakeholder has a different agenda and then negotiate common goals across stakeholders.
- Stakeholders should consider shifting the evaluation paradigm to put the goals of the community first, not the goals of funders.
- Stakeholders must develop together a clear understanding of purpose, goals, criteria, and vision.

#### *Collaboration Among Stakeholders:*

- Funders, evaluators, and the community should collaborate and hold meetings throughout the program's design, planning, and implementation.
- Consider including social determinants of health in health programming and evaluation.
- Each stakeholder group should be an equal partner in the process, collaborating from level political, economic, and technical positions.
- Stakeholders should establish and maintain good communication, and funders and evaluators should be visible in the community.
- The evaluation process should begin at the outset, not after the work is under way. Evaluators should include the community in the evaluation design and confirm that chosen methodologies make sense to all stakeholders. Evaluators should create an evaluation that is a work-in-progress and supports the efforts of the community.

#### *Change and Flexibility:*

- Evaluators should analyze all information gathered in evaluating the program, including qualitative data that don't fit easily into statistical models.

- Stakeholders should acknowledge that things will change during the course of the program and remain flexible.
  - All stakeholders should understand how change occurs, what constitutes change, and what constitutes success. Evaluators should report the changes and identify why they occurred.
- 

***In my previous life as an evaluator, one of the things I learned was that there were times in which one did not want to proceed with an evaluation... The outcomes were not clear; people didn't agree on what the outcomes were; it wasn't clear that anyone would do anything with the outcomes; and there seemed to be a lot of confusion about the program... I'm wondering if there is a similar kind of argument or condition in which it would not be wise to invest in a community-based health initiative.***

Gary Nelson, PhD,  
The California Wellness Foundation,  
in reference to the fictitious  
"New Millennium Foundation"

# Defining Best Practices and Approaches

In the second Plenary Session of the conferences, speakers presented a variety of approaches for evaluation of community-based health efforts. Participants were asked to consider how they could incorporate different evaluation approaches to meet stakeholder needs. The presentations and discussion groups focused on the following topics.

## **Establish Standards**

Establishing standards for feasibility, accuracy, and practical procedures gives evaluation credibility and helps to answer questions about a program. When a funder asks, “Is your program a good one?” explain why it is by using an established program framework (see example on page 13).

***Best practices sometimes means the best practices that you can manage.***

Laura Leviton, PhD,  
The Robert Wood  
Johnson Foundation

## **Communicating Complexity**

Evaluators must understand and communicate the issue of complexity to stakeholders. For example, it is impossible to provide a snapshot of current conditions and expect everything to be the same five years from now. Stakeholders need to anticipate community conditions and systems changes that ultimately can influence outcomes.

## **Use of Tools**

Evaluation is complex and requires a variety of tools to be effective. Evaluators must think critically and consider a tool’s appropriateness. If the question is, “How are you implementing your initiative?” then using tools that measure process, such as a program event log, are indicated. If the question is, “Are we making a difference?” then evaluators can use outcome-based tools, such as data from surveys about behavior change among people targeted in the intervention. Outcome measures explain the overall impact that occurs as a result of individual actions. By using a variety of tools—process, intermediate, and outcome measures—a program’s critical components are illuminated.

## Measuring Critical Components

Evaluation tools can track and measure the following critical components:

- *Targeted mission and vision*—The community has a common purpose and aims for a specific goal.
- *Leadership*—Both distributed and charismatic leadership within an initiative.
- Progress of the *action plan*—The implementation of selected strategies to affect specific changes related to desired outcomes.
- The institution of *new policies, programs, and practices*, and how they affect the environment.
- The hiring of *community mobilizers* to be the agents of change within the community.
- Instances when *technical assistance* is provided.
- Occasions during the course of the program when stakeholders receive *documentation and feedback*.

## Measuring Intermediate Outcomes

Community initiatives evolve over time. Most programs receive funding in two- to five-year intervals, but change may not occur in a community for 10–20 years. Evaluation, community partnerships, and problem solving are a collaborative effort. Community partnerships bring important values, tools, and attributes to the partnership. Evaluators can provide a broader perspective and evaluate the efforts of the program in the context of a community in which 300 other projects might be taking place. Community change is connected to more distal outcomes that might not be measurable in the time period provided.

***If you want to change the way people behave, you have to change the environment in which they operate.***

Vincent Francisco, PhD,  
University of Kansas

## Example of a Logic Model: Steps in Evaluation Practice

---

- Engage stakeholders
- Describe the program
- Focus the evaluation design
- Gather credible evidence
- Justify conclusions
- Share lessons learned and ensure their use

## Standards in Effective Evaluation

---

- **Utility**—Serve the information needs of intended users
- **Feasibility**—Be realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal
- **Propriety**—Behave legally, ethically, and with regard for the welfare of those involved and those affected
- **Accuracy**—Reveal and convey technically accurate information

From *Framework for Program Evaluation in Public Health*, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

*For more information about tools, visit The Community Tool Box Web site at <http://ctb.ukans.edu>.*

## GROUP OBSERVATIONS

### Best Practices and Approaches

---

#### *Build Trust and Respect*

- Evaluators can benefit from learning to speak the language of stakeholders. Using language and concepts familiar to stakeholders can help evaluators communicate about issues of complexity.
- Effective communication among stakeholders contributes to overall success. Stakeholders can develop a communication infrastructure that allows community values to be incorporated into the process. It is also important for evaluators to establish face-to-face contact with program staff to promote sharing of complex information. Site visitors are encouraged not only to meet with community members, but also to take time to understand how the community works and get to know the people at a more personal level.

#### *Communicating Change*

- By initiating the use of a framework that is agreed upon by all stakeholders, evaluators can educate stakeholders about the theory of change underlying the initiative and the evaluation. It is essential for *all* stakeholders to understand the dynamic nature of the community and how change influences outcomes and necessitates course adjustments. The evaluation plan has to be flexible, indicate trends, and use qualitative data.

#### *Collaboration*

- Stakeholders should determine up front whether they want to fund a process or achieve results. Many funders provide funding to traditional evaluations because it is familiar and comfortable, but traditional evaluations might not be useful or meaningful. Some stakeholders believe that collaboration will solve all of a community's problems. Stakeholders should clarify together what the goal of collaboration will be.
  - The perception of evaluation is that it is secondary. If evaluators are not in the early stage of an initiative, they cannot guide the conversation, listen, and become part of the overall development team.
-

# The Role of Evaluation in Capacity Building and Sustainability

The third Plenary Session of the conferences focused on sharpening the role of evaluation in building and sustaining community-based efforts. Presenters challenged participants to consider the role of evaluation in improving a program as well as proving it.

## Options for Building Capacity

- **Sharing Power**—Capacity building occurs with substantive community involvement—placing community members in governance and decision-making roles. When participants are involved in making decisions, they become committed and have a sense of accountability. Community members should have a voice in framing and focusing the evaluation. Too easily, community members can dismiss an evaluation as useless if it doesn't include their input.
- **Telling the Story**—Qualitative data adds depth, detail, and meaning, and improves the understanding of statistical relationships. Evaluators should surrender the false sense of control that comes from precise counting and scoring, formulating/testing hypotheses, and relying on statistics and the prevailing scientific method. Telling stories can increase the community's confidence and awareness, and build capacity by acknowledging, valuing, and respecting resident input.
- **Avoid Simplistic Interpretations**—Each community has a complicated story. Evaluators can link facts with values. Emphasize participant observation, inductive reasoning, and findings expressed in words as well as in numbers. Move beyond the moralistic explanations for conditions in communities to reveal the structures and issues that underlie problems.

***When people's values and aspirations are consonant, then they are predisposed to remain involved over the long-term.***

Robert Goodman, PhD,  
Tulane University

- **Accessibility**—In many cases, evaluations can be dry and unappealing. With the use of narrative or storytelling in film or electronic formats, the wisdom and insights of the community can be novel and interesting and, most of all, accessible.

### **Measurable Conditions that Lead to Sustainability**

A community's ability to sustain a health initiative can be measured. A model for sustainability includes:

- **Standard Operating Routines**—The community members (funders, evaluators, and community-based organizations) meet, schedule activities, and hold planning sessions.
- **Shared Values and Aspirations**—The community members develop a shared vision and have a sense that they, as a group, can make a contribution to an identified problem.
- **Convergence into Functioning Partnership**—Leaders emerge and the group mobilizes to implement the plan.
- **Integrated Norms**—The vision and values of the community stakeholders reflect the vision and values of the community itself, and lead to sustained initiatives.

### **Measurable Internal Conditions that Negatively Impact Sustainability**

A community's internal structure can hinder its progress. Problems occur when communities have:

- Conflict or lack of unity.
- No processes in place, or a lack of organization and political connection.
- Passive leadership, internal bickering.

This often decreases the ability to extend influence outside the community and limits access to outside resources.

*Unfortunately, programs, initiatives, and evaluations are operated by a group that is sometimes different functionally and economically from the people who are being helped.*

Elaine Peacock,  
Oakland, CA

## GROUP OBSERVATIONS

### Evaluation's Role in Capacity Building and Sustainability

---

#### *Define Capacity Together*

- Stakeholders can define what capacity means within a particular community in the beginning of the program. With a clear, consistent definition of capacity, specific desired outcomes can be determined and evaluation methods can be selected that will measure the progress in reaching outcomes.
- Capacity can be measured broadly in terms of the community's self-sufficiency, improved working relationships among organizations, systems change as an ongoing sustaining effort, and the ability to leverage resources.
- Evaluation can identify gaps in a community that will impede progress.
- Capacity is connected to sustainability.

#### *Helping to Build Communities*

- Evaluators can help the community articulate what community capacity is and help identify strengths, weaknesses, and barriers.
- Community involvement increases capacity. Communities can help determine the priorities of evaluation, participate in the evaluation design, and identify research questions that are meaningful to the community. Subsequently, communities have the data, know how to manipulate them, and can share and communicate information to others.
- Evaluation clarifies needs within the community and can provide information to local residents, improve skills, and increase understanding of what the program is about.

#### *Attract More Resources*

- Evaluation not only documents a program, but also identifies specific strengths and issues within a community. With this specific information in hand, communities can seek new funding and gain access to other resources.

- Evaluation can be used to inform policymakers and decisionmakers who make decisions that affect the community.

### *Storytelling*

- Qualitative evaluation offers important nuances in a community and creates connectivity that can support capacity building and sustainability. The community's understanding and involvement in the evaluation process is key to a program's overall success.
-

# Community-based Evaluation, Cultural Competence, and Diversity

Discussion in the last Plenary Session of the conferences focused on exploring evaluation in increasingly diverse community settings and discussing approaches to address the challenges. The following highlights key messages from the presentations and group discussions.

## Recognize and Respect Diversity

No two communities are exactly the same. For instance, African-American communities in Chicago and in Cleveland are different from one another. Evaluators need to

take time to understand how a community operates—to learn the language in the community, find out who the community leaders are and who makes the decisions, and understand how they interact with one another and the community. Additionally, evaluators should confront their personal biases. Evaluators bring their own culture, attitudes, and values into the interaction and the

decision-making process no matter how objective they want to be.

The evaluation team should reflect the community it measures, but it is naïve to assume that being of the same race as the community's residents brings with it a neighborhood perspective.

*All* team members should understand the dynamics of the local community. Culturally competent evaluation has the ability to integrate the evaluation message with the values and norms held by members of the community.

***There is at least as much diversity within any given culture as there is across cultures.***

Linda Murray, MD,  
Cook County Bureau of  
Health Services

***Culturally competent evaluation is intimate. It's interpretive. It's passionate and experience-driven, giving rise to recognition of a variety of ways of knowing.***

Robert Goodman, PhD,  
Tulane University

## Communicate the Value of Evaluation

Some community-based organizations may not be aware of the value of evaluation, much less how to conduct one. Evaluators can facilitate community buy-in by actively communicating the potential benefits of evaluation and how it can influence their success.

## Changing the Power Balance

The inclusion of residents in the evaluation is a critical step to changing the balance of power between the evaluator and the community. Not only can residents become a major audience in the findings, but because they actually live in the community, they can benefit from the knowledge gained long after the initiative is over. Meaningful power sharing would involve residents in the formulation of questions, in data collection and analysis, and in report writing and dissemination. Power sharing in evaluation means striking a balance between the evaluator's and community's goals.

## Give the Community a Voice

In evaluation design, the value placed on diversity influences the questions asked, the goals and indicators selected, the measurement and data collection, and the ways the evaluation findings are reported to multiple audiences. Evaluators can develop tools that help articulate the stories of the community. In this way, evaluation uses the community's own words to speak for itself about the impact of a program—about how a program changed their lives and what it has meant to them. With the story come experience, meaning, and value.

***It's easier to try to change the world than to try to change us.***

Alicia Procello,  
The California Wellness  
Foundation

## GROUP OBSERVATIONS

### Evaluation, Cultural Competency, and Diversity

---

#### *Willing to Learn*

- Evaluation teams need to be willing to learn and be sensitive to the culture. Evaluators have an education and skills, but may know little about the community.
- Spending time in a community enables evaluators to better understand the community members' perspectives. Evaluators need to listen, have respect, and trust that the members will teach them.
- Evaluators should seek to overcome their own biases.
- There is no common language in evaluation. People may use the same words, but they mean different things. To be effective, evaluators should learn the community's language and provide feedback and results of the evaluation in culturally appropriate ways.
- Sometimes evaluation focuses on a community's deficits rather than on its assets. Evaluators need to include the assets or the evaluation can reinforce power/class/race biases.
- Evaluators should seek to ensure that power/class/race issues are addressed not only within the community, but also within the evaluation team.

#### *Standards*

- Funders and evaluators should communicate but not impose their standards and expectations on the community. Evaluation sometimes comes across as a judgment, an approach that is seldom helpful.

#### *Challenges to Cultural Competency*

- Current federal guidelines are rarely supportive of culturally appropriate evaluation.
- Schools of Public Health don't place sufficient importance on the teaching of cultural competency.

- In-depth work with communities requires time, money, and resources that aren't available. Evaluators often aren't paid to get to know a community.

### *Work for Policy Changes*

- Evaluators can promote change. The first step begins with educating funders and policymakers about the importance of cultural competency and helping them become culturally competent.
  - Efforts should be made to increase diversity on boards of directors and within the health workforce.
-

## Next Steps: Pushing The Boundaries

Trying to influence and improve people's lives is a complex undertaking. Issues of power, trust and respect among a program's stakeholders can impede the progress of even the best community-based health care initiative. These two working conferences were designed to identify the challenges and dilemmas involved with the evaluation of community-based programs and to open the dialogue among all stakeholders to suggest some approaches, innovations, and solutions to those dilemmas and tensions.

In the last session of the conferences, participants discussed specifically what they heard and learned, and how they could begin to make changes. Using strategies well known to community-based organizations, they established a common goal: To affect change within their own professional communities. Participants made personal commitments to:

- Continue the free exchange of ideas with constituents in their communities and try to shift the evaluation paradigm in community-based programs. They agreed that bringing together stakeholders—funders, evaluators, and the community—to further the dialogue would be beneficial at state and local levels. Through these discussions, stakeholders could raise awareness to influence policy and practice changes.
- Learn more about the other stakeholders participating in their programs and establish common goals. Participants acknowledged the importance of all stakeholders learning the languages of the other stakeholders involved. By understanding and acknowledging the individual stakeholder agendas, participants could begin to establish commonalities and seek tools to better communicate what was happening in a community and determine how the stakeholders could provide support.

- Incorporate the values of the community-based program—such as trust, respect, and understanding—into the evaluation process. Participants acknowledged that the field of evaluation has evolved at a slower pace than the community-based programs themselves. Some vocalized their commitment to developing a culturally diverse evaluation team and recognizing the benefits of differing perspectives.
- To hear more of the stories behind the data and to include storytelling in the evaluation. With regard to building capacity, participants realized the value of letting the community define capacity building rather than allowing the data to drive improvement and measures of improvement.
- To engage all stakeholders—including the community—in the definition and goals of capacity building.

Participants agreed that change would not be immediate or dramatic, but change could begin as stakeholders reevaluate their goals and evaluation methods and seek outcomes that reflect a community's context.

## Participant comments:

---

*"I learned that there is a growing momentum toward a more realistic, feasible, and respectful approach to evaluating community programs."*

*"I intend to look at my biases as an evaluator and look to the people I work for and with, for ideas and sensitivity."*

*"I am more confident that our community can help design evaluations that are of benefit to the community."*

*"The evaluation work seems no less difficult, but it seems more important to tackle it."*

# Acknowledgments

## Presenters for *Community Based Health Efforts: Challenges and Opportunities*

### **November 2000—San Mateo, CA**

---

#### **Stakeholder's Perspectives**

Larry Hill

Partners for Health  
North Richmond, CA

Gary Nelson, PhD

The California Wellness Foundation  
Woodland Hills, CA

Emma Sanchez, PhD

San Francisco State University  
San Francisco, CA

#### **Best Practices**

Vincent Francisco, PhD

University of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS

Laura Leviton, PhD

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation  
Princeton, NJ

#### **Building Community Capacity and Sustainability**

Nora Lynn Buluran

Rockville, Maryland

Elaine Peacock

Evaluation Consultant  
Oakland, CA

Mildred Thompson

Policy Link  
Oakland, CA

#### **Diversity and Cultural Competency**

Alicia Procello

The California Wellness Foundation  
Woodland Hills, CA

Curtiss Takada-Rooks, PhD

San Jose State University  
San Jose, CA

#### **Summary Panel**

Gary Nelson, PhD

The California Wellness Foundation  
Woodland Hills, CA

Dorothy Meehan, PhD

Sierra Health Foundation  
Sacramento, CA

Celestine Walker

Neighbors Acting Together Helping All  
Pasadena, CA

Chuck McKetney, PhD

Contra Costa County Health Services  
Martinez, CA

### **March 2001—Chicago, IL**

---

#### **Stakeholder's Perspectives**

Bill Beery

Group Health Community Foundation  
Seattle, WA

Romana Hasnain-Wynia, PhD

Health Research and Educational Trust  
Chicago, IL

Edna Lee

Westside Health Authority  
Chicago, IL

#### **Best Practices**

Marshall Kreuter, PhD

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
Atlanta, GA

Steve Fawcett, PhD

University of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS

## **Building Community Capacity and Sustainability**

Robert Goodman, PhD  
Tulane University  
New Orleans, LA

Dorothy Meehan, PhD  
Sierra Health Foundation  
Sacramento, CA

## **Diversity and Cultural Competency**

Linda Murray, MD  
Cook County Bureau of Health Services  
Chicago, IL

Ivy Fairchild  
Columbia University  
New York, NY

## **Summary Panel**

Doug Easterling, PhD  
University of North Carolina  
Greensboro, NC

Lynn Blanchard, PhD  
Measurable Enhancement of Status of  
Health Initiative  
Allentown, PA

Durrell Fox  
Community Healthworker Network  
Brookline, MA

## **Conference Facilitators**

---

Bill Beery  
Group Health Community Foundation  
Seattle, WA

Beth Casey  
Health Research and Educational Trust  
Chicago, IL

Shawn Foster  
Health Research and Educational Trust  
Chicago, IL

Steve Graham  
Kaiser Permanente  
Vallejo, CA

Howard Greenwald, PhD  
University of Southern California  
Sacramento, CA

Kathleen Hebbeler, PhD  
SRI International  
Davis, CA

Michelle Johnston  
Center for Civic Partnerships  
Sacramento, CA

Diane Littlefield  
Center for Collaborative Planning/Public  
Health Institute  
Sacramento, CA

Mia Luluquisen, DrPH, MPH, RN  
Partnership for the Public's Health  
Oakland, CA

Dave Pearson, PhD  
Group Health Community Foundation  
Seattle, WA

Sandy Senter  
Group Health Community Foundation  
Seattle, WA

Susan Stanford  
Group Health Community Foundation  
Seattle, WA

Mary Walls  
Group Health Community Foundation  
Seattle, WA

**Thank you to the organizations that endorsed  
and/or sponsored the conferences**

The Allina Foundation

Annie E. Casey Foundation

The California Endowment

The California Wellness Foundation

Colorado Trust

Dorothy Rider Pool Health Care Trust

The Foundation Consortium

Group Health Community Foundation

Health Resources and Services Administration

James Irvine Foundation

Kansas Health Foundation

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Sierra Health Foundation

The W. K. Kellogg Foundation

## **Conference Planning Committee**

Bill Beery

Group Health Community Foundation, Seattle, WA

Judy Chynoweth

The Foundation Consortium, Sacramento, CA

Doug Easterling, PhD

University of North Carolina, Greensboro, NC

Steve Fawcett, PhD

University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

Marshall Kreuter, PhD

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA

Dorothy Meehan, PhD

Sierra Health Foundation, Sacramento, CA

Gary Nelson, PhD

The California Wellness Foundation, Woodland Hills, CA

Pamela Paul-Shaheen, DrPH

Center for Advancing Community Health, Okemos, IL

Mary Pittman, DrPH

Health Research and Educational Trust, Chicago, IL

Lillian Rea

Group Health Community Foundation, Seattle, WA

Shoshanna Sofaer, DrPH

Baruch College, New York, NY

**Group Health Community Foundation**

1730 Minor Ave Ste 1500

Seattle WA 98101

206-287-4645

[www.ghcfoundation.org](http://www.ghcfoundation.org)



GROUP HEALTH  
community  
foundation

Improving the health of our communities

1730 Minor Ave Ste 1500  
Seattle WA 98101