I. Opening Questions

We began the day with questions we have about the impact of community leadership investments that we have not been able to adequately answer for ourselves through our evaluations. We have grouped the questions below to surface some of the themes that the group is most concerned about.

Ethics and Standards

• Are we holding ourselves individually and collectively to the highest standard of what is possible?
• How do you evaluate consistent with politics you are trying to encourage?
• How can evaluations have meaning for people being evaluated?
• How can we do evaluations that honor participants?
• How can we conduct evaluations consistent with the non-western paradigm of our programs?

Context

• How is collective leadership influenced by context?

Assessment and Program Design

• How do we make grassroots leaders more effective and continue to sustain their passion?
• What is the dynamic of a community and how do you help them accomplish change without losing their vibrancy?
• What is the minimum bundle of program elements that it takes to make real change?
• How can we prepare grassroots leaders with hard skills without causing them to lose their connections?

Indicators

• What are appropriate indicators of success for measuring the change we are promoting?
• How do we weight perceptual verses footprint indicators?
• How can we develop outcomes and impacts that “fit” grassroots populations?

Program Impact

• Are we doing enough at the community level in the countries where we work? If we do, how can we have a national impact?
• What are the key practices that we are engaging leaders in and can we measure its impact?
• What is the real tipping point to show that leadership changes community?
• How much time will it take before we see the results of cultivating a positive support network?
• Can we show definitively that positive change results from our efforts?

Communication and Dissemination
• What do we call the work we are doing?
• How can we measure outcomes and impacts that can be translated to other audiences?
• How can we develop a language that unifies our work and yet captures uniqueness?

II. Learning Objectives
• Deepen our collective understanding about how to leverage community change through our leadership development efforts
• Test and introduce possible modifications to program logic modeling that will increase learning and program performance
• Facilitate an exchange of lessons and resources
• Cultivate sustainable learning and collaborative relationships

III. Exploring How Change Occurs: Creating a Resource List

Claire Reinelt, “Leadership and Systems Change” -- Attachment A
Resource List -- Attachment B

IV. Recruitment and Selection

Inquiry Questions:
• Who does your program recruit and why have you chosen this participant group?
• What do you believe about the ways in which this group may be positioned to influence the change you are seeking?
• What do you believe about the composition of the group and why?
• Is there any research or evidence that has influenced your assumptions about who you are targeting and how to have the greatest impact?

Ford Family Foundation seeks to be inclusive and not target “the usual suspects,” focus is on the business, elected, and undiscovered community leaders in about equal proportions. The focus is 300 small towns in Oregon.

The Community Leadership Program in New Haven, CT emphasizes the importance of having personal resonance with the process, being grounded in the particular and not general, and to start with key confidants and then expand/widen circle of decision.

The Kettering Foundation seeks “people of like mind who are really ready to connect with the larger group.” They are influenced by Daniel Yankelovich and the Public Agenda Foundation and ideas of David Mathews that reflect notions of Jeffersonian democracy so people can assume self responsibility. Timing is crucial. A “readiness” to
implement must be there. It can be difficult to discern such readiness. They value key practices that develop sufficient social capital and provide a space to try new ideas of leadership whether successful or not; in short, a “learning laboratory”.

NWAF focuses on community *qua* community rather than focusing on the individual. They use the LeadershipPlenty curriculum. Leadership “for what” drives their selection; they use both formal and informal guidelines for selection. They look for outcomes that are values-based for both project and community change efforts. The Foundation tries to be sensitive to growing relationships well and recognizes that the dominant leadership culture can sometimes confounds such efforts.

The Jane Fellows offered a unique perspective on recruitment. The program was formed around building on the contributions of one community leader, Jane Russell. The program seeks to identify, select, and provide leadership supports to individuals who embodied the same values and leadership attributes. The implicit assumption is that with additional resources and training, individuals with these shared characteristics will be able to carry on the legacy of Jane Russell's leadership in the Seattle community. This approach differs from many strategies that hold an assumption that it is important to select individuals with attention to the organizational arena through which they will be able to exercise their leadership and influence. The issue of whether it is important to support Jane fellows with organizational resources to extend their influence has emerged as an interesting point of discussion but without a clear verdict.

The Kellogg Leadership for Community Change Initiative works with a lead organization to recruit a diverse cohort of 25 Fellows in selected communities that includes historically underserved or marginalized groups. The KLCC leadership experience requires an extended period of time to enable fellows to engage in the development of individual and group skills within the context of community, and to address a specific issue, such as teaching and learning through a community initiative.

V. Connectivity

All of the leadership programs nurture and support connectivity among their participants. In our discussion we delineated various reasons why connectivity is important, how to nurture it, and how to evaluate it. While connectivity is generally a positive outcome of leadership programs, the point was made that connectivity can have a dark side rooted in complex relationships and history within communities. One metaphor that was suggested to understand connectivity is “conduction” in which heat is generated by atoms coming into contact with each other.

**Why connectivity is important**
The following indicators were generated from the responses that people provided prior to the gathering and from the morning session on this topic.

**Well-being and courage**
- Reduces isolation by moving people away from despair, creating intimacy, helping people cultivate curiosity about self and other, increasing the feelings of being needed, feeling part of something larger than yourself
• Provides moral support, reinforces courage (Question: Does this put people at increased risk?)
• Supports healing
• Helps each other sustain and reinforce transformational changes
• Connects the heart and the mind
• Provides a vehicle for renewal, energy, shared responsibility

Learning
• Enables an exchange of information, sharing of promising practices, learning
• Exposes fellows to different ways of thinking, values and perspectives and creates opportunities to check your thinking, values and perspectives with those of others

Community-building
• Develops social capital
• Provides a vehicle for making meaning within communities, e.g., through storytelling
• Creates cultural change

Collaboration
• Promotes shared visioning
• Supports collective action
• Promotes cross-organizational relationships; boundary crossing; engages different parts of a system for change

Generates value
• Provides a vehicle for supporting the next generation
• Encourages innovation
• Allows people to build on each other’s assets
• Increases the scale of what can be done
• Provides value to the foundation

How to Nurture Connectivity
• Don’t be afraid of conflict; create a safe container for it
• Pay attention to the culture and make sure that values are transparent
• Getting people physically together is challenging – food helps, also need a strategy
• Pay attention to who comes back and how relationships are changing over time
• Question: How do you motivate people to come together that has less to do with being motivated by your status as a funder

How to evaluate connectivity
• Kendall Guthrie developed a log for tracking contacts by Jane Fellows; it has been difficult to make the time to complete the log at meetings
• There is always a tension between what you may want to do to track information and evaluate and what you can realistically do
• Another methodology is to create a map of who knows who, and identify the nodes of people who are connectors
• Use a pre and post survey to identify and compare how networks change over time
• Ethnographies can be a valuable methodology
• One measure of successful leadership is being appointed to the board of someone else’s organization
• Alumni activities indicate sustained impact

VI. Identifying Short, Intermediate and Long-term Program Outcomes
During this session participants were asked to identify the most important outcomes that their programs were trying to achieve, and to place them on a sticky wall according to the timeframe in which they anticipated they would be achieved. At the time of the meeting, we gathered some very interesting data but unfortunately did not have time to engage in collective analysis of the outcomes that were posted. Subsequently, we have analyzed the outcomes using a framework of transformation that was developed by participants at an LLC Evaluation Learning Circle Gathering last September that focused on defining indicators and strategies to evaluate personal transformation (see Attachment D). Participants later held a conference call to discuss whether the transformation framework was a useful way to organize the outcomes, and any insights that occurred by looking at the outcomes organized this way.

VII. Deepening our understanding of how program design elements support community change
In reviewing program materials that were shared in advance of the meeting, a list of program design elements was identified and may be found in Attachment C. Please note that this list is illustrative of the types of activities that programs are using. It is not meant to be a comprehensive list.

In addition to this list several other elements were mentioned:
• Support for alumni projects: resources, funds, convening
• Recruitment and Selection
• Communication with communities

Participants were asked to self-organize around design elements that they were most interested in discussing in more detail. Topics included: post-fellowship activities, stewarding resources, training to teach, institutionalizing change, popular education, collaboration, program logic models

Post Fellowship
• The group explored how to develop and sustain leaders over time
• Some promising approaches included providing a series of activities and opportunities to help fellows integrate what they learned and to use time to deepen and strengthen community
• Post-fellowship activities can be used to encourage and support cross-program collaboration around issues of common concern
Stewarding Resources
- A lot can be learned about how to work at the community level from focusing on select communities rather than having to be comprehensive
- Find ways to bring the community to existing resources
- It is important to pay attention to how resources may create dependency or cause separation anxiety

Training to Teach
- If you want to learn something, teach it
- Becoming a teacher/trainer changes how people are present with others and the work
- Teaching gives people an opportunity to step back from their usual roles and give them a perspective from the “balcony”
- Participants become advocates for your program
- When participants become teachers/trainers this creates a more sustainable leadership resource for the community

Institutionalizing Change
- There is a difference between institutionalizing leadership development programs and institutionalizing the project for the community
- When an outside funder brings an initiative into a community it shifts the dynamics in the community from the outset
- Institutionalizing a project or leadership effort has to be balanced with the loss or momentum or marginalization that can sometimes occur
- Foundations think too much about institutionalizing programs in nonprofits, when there may be other arrangements, associations, or forums that can more effectively carry out the work

Popular Education
- Popular education approaches empower communities to find their own voice
- Culture is valued and an integral resource for learning and making meaning

Collaborative projects
- Collaborative projects are used in two ways: at the beginning of the program to create early success, build agreement, and create momentum or at the end of the program as an expression of the collective will that has been generated
- Projects reinforce leadership skills, support policy changes, result in new allocations of resources
- Foundations need to model collaboration, e.g., walk the talk

Program logic model and a theory of change
- Program logic models map the relationship between the activities and the outcomes
- Theories of change focus on the assumptions of the model, what’s going on in the arrows, articulates why these activities will produce these outcomes
VIII. Learning Laboratory on Aligning program activities with program outcomes

During this session we explored the feasibility and learning potential of considering how specific program activities are linked to specific outcomes. Participants were asked to list their program activities in order of cost on the left side of a paper, list key program outcomes on the right side of the paper, and draw lines between the activity and the outcomes it is designed to influence. Comments on the experimental exercise include:

• It is difficult to separately select activities and link them to outcomes
• It is instructive to think about the time and resources we invest in each program element
• It is easier to connect program activities to short term outcomes more difficult as it goes out in time
• Logic models don’t reflect interactive effects over time
• It raises the question about what the minimum threshold of activities is that we need to produce outcomes
• We spend more resources on relationships than leadership experience
• How do you adjust program activities to get long-term outcomes?
• We need to be cautious about isolating the impact of activities on outcomes
• Is there a relationship between outputs and outcomes?

IX. Meeting Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+</th>
<th>∆</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Bill’s story</td>
<td>• More explicit about this as a leadership experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open space (would like more)</td>
<td>• More open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitation</td>
<td>• More time with definitions and assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Variety and flexibility</td>
<td>• Mix the tables more often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expanded expectations for work together</td>
<td>• Meet with people who have similar functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Liked having multiple stakeholders</td>
<td>• Learn more about story of new folks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Welcoming new people</td>
<td>• Contact information for each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Different types of leadership programs</td>
<td>• Agenda too big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Give new people more time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Open up discussion to frustration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How does breakthrough systems change occur? What factors contribute to the change process? What is the role of leadership development? These are questions that foundations, leadership program staff, and leaders themselves are all asking. In what follows, we discuss how leading thinkers in the field of leadership and systems change have answered these questions.

Malcolm Gladwell described how ideas and innovations spread in his book *The Tipping Point*. Using the metaphor of an epidemic, Gladwell contends that there comes a point where “the unexpected becomes expected, where radical change becomes more than a possibility. It is, contrary to all our expectations – a certainty.” Gladwell describes three factors that contribute to an epidemic: (1) the presence of certain types of people whom he calls connectors, mavens, and salesmen, (2) the “contagiousness” of the message, and (3) the context or environment that influences how quickly the innovation or idea will spread.

While Gladwell does not discuss intentional efforts to intervene in this process, David Bornstein in his book, *How To Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas*, describes how Ashoka: Public Innovators for Change selects social entrepreneurs and supports these entrepreneurs to scale up their ideas to achieve breakthrough results. According to Bornstein ideas need

“champions – obsessive people who have the skill, motivation, energy, and bullheadedness to do whatever is necessary to move them forward: to persuade, inspire, seduce, cajole, enlighten, touch hearts, alleviate fears, shift perceptions, articulate meanings, and artfully maneuver them through systems.”

In fact, champions often have a profound effect on transforming the system. Donella Meadows, author and founder of the Sustainability

---

Institute reflects, “I have watched in wonder as a new leader ... comes in, enunciates a new goal, and swings hundreds or thousands or millions of perfectly intelligent, rational people off in a new direction.”

Identifying and cultivating champions is critical to the change process; however, it is not the only leverage point.

There is a theory of change about how innovations occur, and how to support them to spread, that is grounded in the self-organizing principles of complex systems. Stephen Johnson in his book Emergence: The Connected Lives of Ants, Brains, Cities, and Software, calls this process “emergence.” Multiple agents interact following local rules. These local interactions result in a “higher-level pattern arising out of parallel complex interactions between local agents” (Johnson, 2001:19). Forms of emergent behavior are not static; they grow smarter over time responding to the specific and changing needs of the environment. In other words, they adapt. Change does not require a pacemaker, a champion, or a maven. Rather it requires “encouraging the clusters that generate the best ideas.” Johnson goes on, “the vision for the future comes from below out of the ever-shifting alliances of smaller groups.”

In this view, diversity is extremely important. Margaret Wheatley, author and president of a global leadership foundation reflects, “if, as leaders, we fail to encourage unique and diverse ways of doing things, we destroy the entire system’s capacity to adapt. We need people experimenting with many different ways.” Wheatley goes further to suggest that diversity is in fact the path to unity. She acknowledges the paradox but concludes that if we are “willing to listen eagerly for diverse interpretations, we discover that our differing perceptions originate from a unifying center. As we become aware of this unity in diversity, it changes our relationships for the better. We recognize that through our diversity we share a dream. Then, magical things happen to our relationships. We open to each other ... People step forward to work together.”

The emphasis in this theory of change is not individuals but collectives, or “communities of practice.” Communities of practice are important because learning occurs in community. In fact, learning occurs rapidly in communities when that learning will help people improve their

---

People seek out those who have the knowledge and experience they need. As people find each other and exchange ideas, good relationships develop and a community forms. This community becomes a rich marketplace where knowledge and experience are shared. It also becomes an incubator where new knowledge, skills, and competencies develop.” Some of these communities will unleash the resources and ideas that will bring about breakthrough change if they have a nurturing environment, if they are selected to survive. According to Donella Meadows, “the selection mechanism can be whatever the market will reward or whatever governments and foundations will fund or whatever meets human needs or solves an immediate problem.”

One of the most powerful leverage points for systems change is “shifting the mindset or paradigm out of which the system itself arises.” Paradigms are the deepest beliefs that people share about how the world works. When people manage “to intervene in systems at the level of paradigm [they] have hit a leverage point that totally transforms systems.”

Leaders, the programs that are supporting them, and the foundations that are funding them, are ultimately looking to profoundly shift the system’s paradigm. This process, at times, is slow, but there is, according to Donella Meadows, a deliberate strategy for achieving this shift.

“In a nutshell, you keep pointing at the anomalies and failures in the old paradigm, you keep speaking louder and with assurance from the new one, you insert people with the new paradigm in places of public visibility and power. You don’t waste time with reactionaries; rather you work with active change agents and with the vast middle ground of people who are open-minded.”

This is the work of leaders.

---

6 This is evident from both Paolo Freire’s work on critical education and the work of Etienne Wenger on communities of practice.
7 Margaret Wheatley, “Supporting Pioneering Leaders as Communities of Practice: How to Rapidly Develop New Leaders in Great Numbers,” The Berkana Institute, 2002.
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• Tupelo: The Evolution of a Community (1999)

Wilfred Drath
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• Collaborating for Change: Appreciative Inquiry (2000)
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• Better Together: Restoring the American Community (2003)
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• Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity (1999)
• Cultivating Communities of Practice (2002)

Jack Mezirow
• Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress (2000)

Albert Memmi
• The Colonizer and the Colonized (1991)
Frantz Fanon
• The Wretched of the Earth (1965)

Decolonization within Indigenous Nations
• Marie Battiste, Reclaiming Indigenous Voices
• Linda Thiwai Smith, Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples
• Taiaiake (Gerald) Alfred, Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto
• Fredrick Wiseman, Voices of Dawn
• George Tinker, Spirit and Resistance: Political Theology and American Indian Liberation

Robert Chambers
• Rural Development Putting the Last First (1991)

Patrick J. Dubbs (Alaska Native Knowledge Network)
• Collected Essays http://www.ankn.uaf.edu/dubbs.html

Cornelia Butler Flora et al.

Abraham Maslow
• Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs – Here is a Web site that gives an overview of the hierarchy of needs http://web.utk.edu/~gwynne/maslow.HTM

Andrew Jones and Don Seville
• Action-to-Outcome Mapping: Testing Strategy with Systems Thinking (available at www.sustainer.org)

Centers and Program Resources

❖ Rural Development Initiatives http://www.rdiinc.org/
❖ Highlander Research and Education Center http://www.highlandercenter.org/
❖ National Storytelling Network http://www.storynet.org/
❖ Heartland Center for Leadership Development http://www.heartlandcenter.info/
  o Clues to Rural Community Survival Workbook
❖ The Sustainability Institute www.sustainer.org
❖ Mind Mapping Resource Center www.innovationtools.com/resources/mindmapping.asp
❖ North Central Regional Center for Rural Development
  o “Using Community Capitals for Asset Mapping”
Evaluation Resources

- Leadership Learning Community (LLC)  www.leadershiplearning.org
  - Deborah Meehan, Executive Director
  - Claire Reinelt, Convenor, LLC Evaluation Circle
- Center for Assessment and Policy Development  www.capd.org
- Innovation Network  http://www.innonet.org/  ; releasing a web-based database in April
- Blueprint Research and Design  http://www.blueprintrd.com/
- Atlas-TI for analyzing qualitative data  http://www.atlasti.com/
- University of Wisconsin – Program Development and Evaluation – on-line tutorial in developing a program logic model  http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicmodel.html
- KLCC Community Change Framework  -- identifies outcomes and evaluation questions for stages of community process

Web sites for Each of the Programs

- Horizons Initiative  http://www.nwaf.org/Programs.aspx?pg=Programs/Horizons.htm
- Jane Fellows  http://www.trff.org/grant_programs/jr_fund.asp
- CLP – no Web site available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Activities</th>
<th>Ford</th>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Horizons</th>
<th>KCCC</th>
<th>June Fellows</th>
<th>CLP</th>
<th>Packard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual/Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Plan/Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Dialogues</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retreat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Curricula</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-learning packet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Web sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool kits</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storytelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer community</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visits</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Funds/Mini-Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-trainers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site/listserv</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program of self-study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/inter-community learning community</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Felt Community Desire/Need</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identification of Short, Intermediate and Long-term Program Outcomes

During our meeting in Gig Harbor we asked participants to identify the most important outcomes that their programs were trying to achieve, and to place them on a sticky wall according to the timeframe in which they anticipated they would be achieved. We have organized these outcomes based on a framework of transformation that we began exploring at an LLC Evaluation Learning Circle gathering last September at the Kellogg Foundation. This framework had four change domains: changes in thought and feeling; changes in behavior (what is said and done); changes in interaction (who participates and how they interact); and changes in collective action. Using the outcomes that were generated in Gig Harbor this framework is further elaborated with relevant sub-headings. We have added one additional category which we label Results. These include changes in economic development and poverty reduction; youth, family and neighborhood; health and education; civic participation; and community leadership, among other quality of life measures.

1-3 Years

**Changes in Thought and Feeling**
- Improved community self-image (dysfunctional to functional)
- More confidence that leads to stronger voices

**Changes in Behavior (What is Said and Done)**
- More agile citizens
- Increased hard leadership skills among fellows (grantwriting, financial literacy)
- Increased soft skills by leaders

**Changes in Interaction**

**Participation and Inclusion**
- Diversity of participation
- More people involved in community leadership (civic engagement)
- Different community initiative participants – more reflective of who is affected
- Increased support among grassroots leaders
- More inclusive decision-making
- Increased citizen participation
- Leadership spread inclusively across demographics of the community
- Actively seeking diversity of opinions, demographics
- Increasing and diverse pool of skilled leadership working together on priority issues
- More people at community meetings
- Involvement of those typically excluded in community decision-making

**Interaction**
- Increased interaction among diverse groups
Changes in Collective Action
Social Capital, collaboration and partnerships
• More successful collaborations and partnerships
• Neighborhood-school partnerships at grassroots level
• Presence of active collaboration (put up by two different participants)
• Collaborative momentum
• Increased social capital among fellows

Organizations and Programs
• New types of organizations develop
• New programs/services that address community identified issues
• Bigger organizations with more $ and greater reach
• More services targeted at Fellows’ issues
• Create or deepen rural community partnerships to reduce health disparities through organizational change
• Increased numbers of qualified board members for non-profits

Community Awareness, Planning and Celebration
• Plan of action/community celebrates accomplishment
• Community celebration
• A collective action is taken to reduce poverty in the community
• Build regional coalition to work for sustainable salmon fishery
• Community members understanding community assets and challenges
• Increased sense of community awareness (both needs and resources)
• Provide trained leaders for community mobilization of community identified issues

Resource mobilization
• Existing assets mobilized in new ways to achieve movement in a project
• Issue identification and mobilization
• Better utilization of internal and external resources
• Sustained action toward defined goals
• Participants become resources to each other
• Improved grant applications and increased numbers from rural communities

Policy Action
• Enact smart growth policies
• Create or enhance rural community-based health promotion initiatives

Results
Community Leadership
• New faces in formal leadership roles
• Increased volunteer hours
• New and emerging leaders filling leadership positions
• Increased demand for leadership development
• Resolution of divisive community issues by local people
Youth, Family and Neighborhood
  • Increased family involvement in families of low-performing students
  • Cleaner streets and sidewalks

Health and Education
  • Improved student success

Civic Participation
  • Increased voter turnout at local, state, federal levels

3-5 Years

Changes in Thought and Feeling
  • Greater confidence among disenfranchised to speak up and speak out
  • Reduced isolation (perceived and real) of non-profit sector
  • Community leaders empowered to dream
  • Increased community courage
  • Community members feel greater sense they can influence the system
  • Increased sense of community

Changes in Behavior (What is Said and Done)
  • Leadership graduates are in positions of leadership at community level and beyond
  • Interest groups going beyond their immediate self-interest
  • Community leaders teaching leadership to others
  • Participants replicate values-based collaborative leadership development practices
  • Increased community vitality

Changes in Interaction
  Participation and Inclusion
  • Increased neighborhood participation in community projects or institutions leading to stronger community organizations/institutions
  • New community voices in leadership of local organizations and elected policymakers

Interaction
  • Stronger intergenerational mentoring and interacting
  • Cross-cultural relationships between leaders

Changes in Collective Action
  Social Capital, collaboration and partnership
  • Sustained collaborative action
  • Improved civic partnerships
  • Collaborations created by partnerships*
Organizations and Programs
• More and higher capacity projects being completed that are making a measurable difference in the community
• CLP alums intentionally create/develop leaders within their organizations
• Norms and cultures of non-profits in New Haven change in ways consistent with the values/principles of CLP
• Improved organizational capacity

Community Awareness, Planning and Celebration
• Community action based on needs
• Stories more broadly shared within the community
• More public awareness and appreciation for the value of grassroots leadership as evidenced through increased media coverage, funding, and responsive public policy
• Community able to identify most significant issue to coalesce around and take action towards (because they have data, understand strategic action, can garner funding)
• Community able to say they are stronger by clearly pointing to indicators supporting that outcome

Resource mobilization
• Attract more money
• Leadership program continues without foundation support after four years and continues for five additional years
• Increased local investment of all capitals

Policy Action
• A policy change (worked for and achieved) that will help reduce poverty
• Greater influence for policy changes
• Public policy reflects concerns of community

Results
Community Leadership
• A cohort of trained and empowered local leaders

Economic Development/Poverty Reduction
• Increased economic development

Youth, Family and Neighborhoods
• New community facility – state park
• Increased participation in post high school learning opportunities (formal, non-formal)
• Major community center

Health and Education
• Better and increased access to health care, education, etc.
• Improved clinic, schools, fire hall
• Demonstrable benefits to people served by non-profit organizations whose leaders participated in CLP seen in community level data (health, education, etc.) ; e.g., fewer children removed from their homes

5+ Years

Changes in Behavior (What is Said and Done)
• Community members teaching, sharing, demonstrating what they have learned to others

Changes in Interaction
Participation and Inclusion
• More avenues for amplifying the community’s voice on important issues as evidenced by increased representation in decision-making bodies such as policy panels, boards of directors, neighborhood associations, etc.
• More people and more inclusion of diversity in deliberation and decisions on policy and issues affecting the common life

Changes in Collective Action
Policy Action
• Develop future vision/agreements on timber, environmental balance and enact
• Continued evidence of empowered action (e.g., joint advocacy on action among individual who would benefit from the changes and the leaders of non-profit organizations)*

Results
Community Leadership
• Increased agreement, cross-sectoral and culturally inclusive, on major issues: economic framework, use of resources, development, etc.
• Cross-cultural relationships develop; reduce isolation; increase cultural competence of traditional institutions
• Increased number of community leaders involved in political process
• Multiple paths/mechanisms for exercising leadership
• Revitalized communities
• More robust community problem-solving and decision making
• Increased community capacity to identify and mobilize on public health issues
• Community sustains leadership development systems*
• Increased commitment to common good

Economic Development/Poverty Reduction
• Increased economic diversity
• Increased average annual household income
• More family wage jobs in the long term
• Increasing community vitality so that those who choose can find meaningful employment to support themselves and their families while allowing for quality time with their family and community
• Poverty reduction
• More diverse opportunities for earning a living and living a good life
• Community reduces poverty and stems flow of population outmigration
• Lower unemployment/increased employment

**Youth, Family and Neighborhoods**
• Improved youth readiness for adulthood
• Improved family functioning
• Improved quality of neighborhood life

**Health and Education**
• Increase number of communities replicating best practices for health promotion in rural Washington