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ABSTRACT

Community coalitions are collectives (education, law enforcement, schools, and other sectors) engaged in needs assessment, resource identification, action planning, program implementation and evaluation to reduce and/or prevent substance abuse among youth and adults. The influences of finances, multiple sector representation, and the internal, working relations among those sectors on the scope of coalition evaluation plans were investigated. These three (capacity) factors have been suggested as critically important to shaping this type of planning.

The obtained data was used to predict the breadth of evaluation plans. The propensity for comprehensiveness was affected by finances and to a lesser degree by the number of sectors participating. Specifically, coalitions receiving greater than $50,000 per year showed a statistically higher tendency for more sophisticated planning than those receiving less.

In addition, the majority of coalitions tend to evaluate formatively rather than summatively, with few outcome indicators being measured. Coalitions should be looking at combinations of process (number of deliverables), intermediate (self report substance use questionnaires) and outcome indicators (public records such as arrests) to be fully accountable to funders and community stakeholders.
There was a relationship between the use of external evaluators and more complete evaluation plans. Likewise, reliance upon members was not related to items pertaining to same. These two findings suggest that utilizing consultants is necessary to demonstrate progress and show effectiveness while depending upon members may produce less in the way of evaluation.

The overall theme is that coalitions are often required to demonstrate results under conditions of low financial support and limited resources for hiring external evaluators. Adding to this is the fact that most members of coalitions have incomplete knowledge of evaluation processes and are not trained in them. Workshops and professional development opportunities would be helpful in improving awareness and possibly confidence toward evaluation, but enhanced funding is critical for the planning and implementation of better data collection strategies as carried out by external evaluation consultants.
Dedicated to the memory of my Grandmother Rush, the family chef of my childhood, who taught me to constantly stir the gravy over medium heat for the smoothest consistency.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Community coalitions are mechanisms for reducing substance use and the prevention of future use among youth and adults. They are comprised of multiple community representatives (i.e., stakeholders) and may be characterized as formal arrangements between groups or sectors of a community, in which each group retains its identity but works together toward reducing alcohol and drug use in their respective communities (CADCA, 2001). Coalitions are one way by which community sectors (education, law enforcement, schools) engage in a cycle of community needs assessment, resource identification, action planning, implementation and evaluation.

Planning in this context is often based on the literature of risk and protective factors (Hawkins, Catalano, & Miller, 1992). Coalitions rely upon community-based programs and interventions to reduce problematic behavior. Social norms programs, community events and law enforcement partnerships are common coalition activities that may influence community conditions. Coalitions target such efforts toward specific youth and adult groups (underage college students, rural teens) rather than individuals.

Coalitions either design or choose programs and evaluate their success. They develop internal evaluation plans, looking to their own members to implement them, or hire external evaluators with expertise in evaluation.
Coalitions with membership from multiple community sectors have been found to
be more effective in producing community changes than those comprised of a single
organization (Linney & Wandersman, 1996), as determined through evaluation studies.
The 1990s marked the beginning of evaluation literature germane to coalitions operating
within complex social milieus (across multiple community sectors). The intent of this
research is to investigate the relationship between processes found to be relevant to
coalition planning that may also influence evaluations.

Evaluation

When classic experimental and quasi-experimental designs (Campbell & Stanley,
1963) are used to evaluate coalition programs, they usually do not account for contextual
factors (community readiness, perceived legitimacy from community sectors or parental
support) (Goodman, 2000) that affect success or failure. Traditional methodology
inadequately deals with context, seeking instead to look at variables directly related to
programs and initiatives (e.g., increased awareness and substance use reduction as an
outcome of a social norms campaign).

Goodman (2000) suggests that there is a need to account for modifying conditions
that interact with coalition programs. For example, the effectiveness of a peer social
support initiative with community youth could be dependent upon ongoing parental
reinforcement. As a result, coalition evaluators should comprehensively examine
contextual variables through blocking in experimental design and/or observing indicators
over multiple points in time.
Coalition evaluations are particularly vulnerable to Type II errors when they do not take into consideration contextual variables. A coalition’s efforts may appear as invalid due to a lack of explained variance in a quantitative design - variance that may be explained to a greater degree by the context in which the program exists.

Causal connections between programs and outcomes such as a subsequent decrease in substance use are difficult to detect (Yin & Kaftarian, 1997) in the absence of multiple assessments over time and an understanding of the effects of contextual factors. Since coalition outcomes generally do not appear in a short period, the measurement of indicators across time periods is highly desirable (Berkowitz, 2001).

The advantage of assessing contextual variables in a longitudinal manner was noted in a cross site evaluation for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration-Center for Substance Abuse Prevention’s (SAMHSA-CSAP) community partnership program. Yin, Kaftarian, Yu, & Jansen (1997) reported high degrees of unexplained variance in multiple regressions for 24 CSAP community partnerships. One explanation for this result was that unidentified independent variables were operating within the environment, reducing both the power of the design and value of the findings. On the other hand, this study did find that illicit drug use prevalence among 8th and 10th graders in CSAP communities dropped incrementally over two points in time as compared to reasonably equivalent communities. This study relied on monitoring implementation and multiple assessments of various programmatic aspects to show program impact.
Type II error may also result when only a small portion of the target population was actually involved in a coalition effort. For example, impact evaluated through county-wide drug use questionnaires may show insignificant changes (Type II error) in substance usage because only a few individuals out of the targeted community respondents were affected (Gabriel, 2000). Small sample sizes with the unit of analysis being the community (1 unit) further limit the power of quantitative designs to detect results (Yin & Kaftarian, 1997).

Additional methodological issues relevant to coalition evaluations are a lack of matched control or comparison communities (Weiss, 1995) and the inability to achieve random assignment of communities in relation to a treatment or program (Berkowitz, 2001). When matching is not possible, as in single communities, time series designs tend to demonstrate movement toward short and long term effects within groups such as youth or parents.

In this discussion, it is important to differentiate proximal or short term effects from distal or long term ones. Proximal effects are based on “process” and “intermediate” indicators, while distal ones are referred to as “impact” indicators (CADCA, 2001). Proximal effects include changes in student resiliency and substance availability, while a distal effect would be an actual reduction in substance use among youth and adults. Distal effects should be measured over time to show sustained community change.

Process, intermediate and impact indicators have been gleaned from years of federally funded partnership community evaluations (CADCA, 2001). Indicators of process would be the number of training sessions conducted and how many individuals
attended them. Intermediate indicators include pre and post-testing for perception and behavioral changes among various stakeholders (parents, at risk youth, employees, alcohol vendors). Impact indicators (reductions in substance use/abuse in a target population such as high school or college students) are more difficult to collect and may require confidentiality agreements and guarantees. Despite the problem of measuring and determining impact, it is essential for demonstrating the substantive results of coalition initiatives or what is termed summative evaluation.

Given the propensity of coalitions to show non-significant results, outcome evaluations would likely benefit from linking proximal and distal data over time via multiple assessments. Gabriel (2000) suggested (in one workplace drug use prevention project) sequential measurement from proximal effects of employee training and corporate policy revisions to the distal effects of employee substance use rates.

A possible scenario within this framework is that while formative, intermediate indicators may show gains in knowledge of addiction issues among employees due to training and more consistent human resource procedures for dealing with on-the-job accidents, the summative aspects of the evaluation may not reflect expected reductions in drug use, as evidenced by drug test failure rates. Reasons underlying such results may be due to contextual and/or mediating factors - employee intent or motivation to curb substance use and/or the integrity of the training and human resources functions in question. In this case, the addition of self report data on intent to use, or another proxy for motivation to curb use, and establishing the integrity of program implementation through formative evaluation would help to establish linkages between proximal and
distal (substance use reduction) effects. Repeated assessments over time in proximal and distal areas would further legitimize these evaluation findings.

The above evaluation strategies require comprehensive planning and resources which are common deficiencies for community coalitions already stretched for time and resources. Many coalitions are unable to show significant distal results either in the short or long term due to inadequate evaluation planning. This, in turn, may lead to a loss of funding. Most coalitions do not collect ongoing systematic outcome data without having specific grant mandates to do so and/or access to evaluators with specialized skills (Berkowitz, 2001).

This is not surprising, in that few coalition members are trained evaluators or have full understanding of how to evaluate programs. The existence of coalitions depends upon a multitude of variables such as the degree of multiple sector involvement and positive relationships among community members (Mattessich, Murray-Close, & Monsey, 2001) who may serve on coalition boards or partner with coalitions. Due to financial limitations, coalitions frequently rely upon the minimal evaluation knowledge of their members for ideas and input.

Community members are often chosen for coalitions not because of evaluation expertise but for their strong personal relations, good communication abilities and a willingness to work toward the coalition’s goals in a collaborative environment. Collectively, this may be referred to as relational patterns. Relational patterns have been noted to positively impact how coalitions go about their planning and implementing their mission. Undoubtedly, they may have a similar effect on evaluation planning.
Relational Patterns

Decision-making processes that allow for the input of all coalition members foster positive interpersonal interactions and usually have an effect on how coalitions operate (Mattessich, Murray-Close, & Monsey, 2001). This aspect of how coalitions work (i.e., their internal functioning) may be captured through instrumentation, as depicted in Table 1.1. This matrix of propositions reflects communication and decision making processes, essentially internal relational patterns. Some of the dimensions in the table were adapted from The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory (2001).

Internal and external functioning are two separate entities (Feinberg, Greenberg, & Osgood, 2004) that are pertinent to the discussion. Community readiness to respond to a coalition’s efforts, for instance, is an important external condition that may interact with the internal workings of a coalition. Community readiness could be high while lower internal functioning precludes the coalition from being successful. Infighting and low participation among members are barriers to meaningful coalitions, particularly for planning and implementing programs and initiatives. Therefore, compromise, commitment, and communication patterns among multiple community stakeholders involved in coalitions, such as shown in Table 1.1, would seem to be critical to the success of a coalition.

In a subtle manner, the idea of multiple sector participation in coalitions is imbedded in the table. Virtually all coalitions cut across multiple sectors of a community and indeed depend upon mutual cooperation across them for planning and implementing coalition efforts.
Members compromise when necessary for making decisions.
Members have a high level of commitment toward accomplishing planned projects.
Members are open to different options before making decisions.
There is a clear sense of individual roles and responsibilities in the coalition.
All coalition members have the same opportunity for input into action planning/goal setting.
The coalition shares and/or rotates its leadership.
The coalition keeps all members informed about policies and activities.
Members understand the goals of the coalition.
Members have equal opportunities to express ideas in meetings.
Members believe that the coalition can impact the community.
The coalition keeps up with the work necessary to accomplish its goals.
On occasion, I have conversations with other coalition members outside of meetings.
There is a sufficient level of participation by coalition members to promote “ownership” of decisions.
The tasks of the coalition are equally distributed among its members.

Table 1.1: Propositions for Relational Patterns

Multiple Sectors

A positive climate is essential for coalitions, since representatives from varied community groups bring diverse perspectives to planning, implementation, and evaluation. Stakeholders come from schools, social services, local businesses, media, faith-based organizations, health/medical agencies, parent groups, resident/neighborhood groups, law enforcement, and elected or other officials. Individuals from these constituencies may sit on coalition boards or serve as community partners to facilitate implementation.

Comprehensive planning requires their input and support (Feinberg, et. al., 2004) for programs that span across communities (Hays, Hays, DeVille, & Mulhall, 2000). The more unique community sectors involved appears to be a key factor that correlates with the ability to change policy, implement programs and produce a comprehensive, research
based substance abuse prevention plan. The number of members attending meetings has similarly been linked to plan quality (Florin, et. al., 2000). Multiple stakeholder input is especially relevant in formative evaluations that demonstrate the alignment of programs to objectives and the activities and services they are delivering. Given the above evidence, it seems logical that multiple sector involvement would lead to more sophisticated evaluations utilizing both formative and summative principles.

Conversely, sectors represented may be relevant to planning and evaluation only in situations when there are positive relational patterns. Coalitions, like other collective enterprises, face arguments and turf protection which may be exacerbated by diversity in sector representation (Feinberg et al., 2004). In addition to the above factors, financial resources undoubtedly affect the scope of evaluations. Funding provides the means for hiring external evaluators who are more familiar than coalition members with linking intermediate effects and associated outcomes in environments fraught with competing influences.

Financial Resources

While relational patterns and multiple sectors are important, financial resources underlie the sustainability of coalition efforts. Funded coalitions receiving state/federal grant support usually have paid staff, office space for meetings, and political connections through community partnerships. These factors seem to enhance organizational capacity. Somewhat surprisingly, such coalitions often disband at the end of a grant cycle because they do not demonstrate effectiveness or gain a continuing supply of monetary resources (Himmelman, 2001). This may be due to poor relational patterns or from the coalition’s
formation in response to grant mandates rather than a genuine grassroots need to solve community problems.

Although a coalition’s forming in response to a funding opportunity rather than documented community need may be a negative factor in its long term sustainability, the amount of funding and the ability to pay part- or full-time staff for coalition work have been associated with the quality of a coalition’s planning processes (Florin et. al., 2000). Comprehensive planning appears to be contingent upon a fixed funding cycle with a clear demarcation point for ending, an important component in setting and achieving goals and objectives.

In a study of 51 Ohio prevention coalitions (Manchester, 2005), differences in perceived use of evaluation to determine outcomes were noted for coalitions receiving less and those with more than $50,000 per year. Evaluation was cited as an activity to determine impact more often among coalitions with higher funding levels. Coalitions with greater resources may hire external evaluators at a higher rate, possibly impacting evaluation scope especially those that would logically include linkages between proximal and distal effects over time.

Coalition evaluation should seek to document a coalition’s influence in a community by pursuing such linkages. However, coalitions, as just suggested, may not be evaluating efforts comprehensively due to limited expertise and financial resources. In addition, other factors (relational patterns and multiple sector representation) most likely have a strong influence on the scope of evaluation planning as well.
Significance of the Problem

The literature points to a gap between the science and practice (Chinman et. al., 2005) of coalition evaluation. Achieving and demonstrating outcomes at the local level is a challenging issue for coalitions with varying levels of expertise in evaluation, resource procurement, understanding of needs assessment, action planning and so forth. Numerous sources posit that there should be an examination of proximal and distal effects and their linkages, a strategy that would be dependent upon doing both formative and summative evaluation.

In this vein, Gabriel (2000) found poor connections between short term and long term outcomes in alcohol prevention coalitions. As an example, there is a need to demonstrate how reduced alcohol availability through vendor training leads to subsequent reductions in binge drinking among targeted college students. Beyond formative and summative undertakings, such evaluations would have to account for contextual variables and their impact on coalition activities and achieved outcomes. Yet, the degree to which federally and state-funded coalitions are evaluating their efforts formatively and summatively is unclear.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to explore and characterize the relationship between the scope (formative to summative) of evaluations planned by coalitions and how that scope is affected by relational patterns, number of community sectors and available financial resources. This investigation will highlight for scholars and practitioners the connections between proximal and distal effects as well as the strengths and weaknesses
in the evaluation processes of sampled coalitions. An exploration of the implied relationships would provide information about how key factors promote and affect the nature of evaluations in the field.

Objectives

The specified objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To describe the sample of studied coalitions in terms of the key predictor variables (relational patterns, represented community sectors and financial resources).

2. To describe the nature of evaluation planning (the criterion variable) among the sampled coalitions.

3. To collect data as indicated above by means of a survey method and follow-up interviews of coalition leaders and evaluators.

4. To determine relationships among the predictor variables and the criterion variable.

5. To draw conclusions about the alignment of coalition research and practice in relation to evaluation planning processes. The study will reveal relationships between the specified factors and the degree of formative to summative evaluation evident in evaluation planning. Finally, the study will examine whether evaluation plans conform to recommendations from the literature.
Research Questions

The following research questions will guide the study:

1. Are relational patterns, multiple sectors and finances influencing evaluation scope and if so, how do they affect specific parts (formative and summative) of the evaluation?

2. Are coalitions measuring multiple indicators over points in time in order to potentially demonstrate linkages between proximal and distal effects? What are the most common forms of indicators used by coalitions and how often are they being measured?

3. What is the nature of evaluation planning among the sampled coalitions?

   Are they relying upon their own members or external consultants for evaluation?

   Does evaluation planning aim to account for contextual variables to increase explained variance in results?

   Does evaluation planning appear to vary as a function of coalition profile (dominant community sectors, proportion of local versus federal funding, reliance on local/ in-kind donations)?
Methodology

Multiple regression was selected as the analytic method for the data being collected in this study. The main way of obtaining data will be by electronic surveys with a small number of follow-up interviews. Multiple regression was chosen due to its value in exploring relationships between a single dependent (criterion) variable (Evaluation Scope) and a set of independent (predictor) variables (Relational Patterns, Multiple Sectors, Financial Resources).

Multiple regression seeks to explain the degree of variance in the dependent variable through an assessment of each independent variable’s contribution to the overall relationship (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 2000) and then the overall contribution of the set of predictors to the criterion. This is accomplished in a simultaneous manner, whereby the importance of each independent variable is weighed in relation to the other independent variables and then they are collectively related to the dependent variable.

Analyses will be conducted at the $\alpha = .05$ level to determine the relationship of each predictor variable with the criterion variable before any form of ordering is considered. The assumption is that there are complex and reciprocal relationships among the predictor variables that preclude $a$ priori hypotheses concerning the importance of one over another. Another, almost covert assumption is that evaluation scope is part of overall coalition planning that begins with needs assessment, selection of initiatives based on needs, and ends with program evaluation within funding cycles unique to each coalition.
Instrumentation

The predictor and criterion variables will be measured through a self-report survey method and open-ended key informant interviews with coalition leaders and/or their evaluators to clarify responses. An initial version of the self-report instrument was developed from an examination of factors contributing to successful coalitions and from two focus group interviews. During field testing of the instrument (Manchester, 2005), quantitative measures using inter-item analysis and Principal Components Analysis (PCA) were employed to differentiate constructs in the instrument. The instrument for this effort has undergone extensive revision and improvement based upon what learned from the tryout of the initial version.

Fourteen questions on the new survey deal with Relational Patterns (see Table 1.1). The domain is scaled in a Likert-type, 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) format. Estimated financial resources will be reported on the questionnaire as two, 6-point items inquiring about funding levels from grants, in kind donations and local contributions. In the question related to multiple sectors, respondents will identify such representation in their coalition. The average number of unique community sectors will be measured per coalition.

This full instrument will be pilot-tested for content validity and then further improved before on-line distribution to coalition contacts located in two statewide directories in Ohio. They will be asked to answer the survey and direct it to other coalition members. Responses will be received through a centrally located web domain. On-line reminders and phone calls to contacts and/or leaders will likely increase
response rate among coalition members. Follow-up phone interviews will be employed to clarify responses, as feasible.

Respondents will rate the dependent variable, Evaluation Scope, via continuous data points 1-14 (see Table 1.2), on the web-version of the Coalition Inventory. Respondents will check yes and no points related to the assessment of process, intermediate and impact indicators, as relevant to evaluation planning in their coalitions during the current fiscal year. Although questions will be presented in simple format on the instrument, the responses to them will be summed to create a continuous interval scale as indicated in Table 1.2.

The scale of 1-14 (Table 1.2) is divided into two conceptual halves, where scores of 1-7 signify lower and scores 8-14 indicates higher levels of evaluation scope. This scaling suggests the formative to summative scope under which a coalition is evaluating its efforts. The scaling in Table 1.2 will satisfy the objectives of the study, specifically in exploring the relationships between the three predictor variables with the criterion of Evaluation Scope. Determining the degree of multiple assessments on process, intermediate and impact indicators will establish links between proximal and distal effects, an important component of defining the criterion variable. Aside from the main statistical analyses it will also be possible to compare coalitions on such variables as the documentation of contextual factors and the hiring of external evaluators.

Multiple responses per coalition will be summed to obtain majority perceptions for each level of evaluation scope. For example, if 67% of respondents from Coalition XYZ indicate multiple assessments of process and intermediate indicators related to an
initiative (which illustrates linkages between proximal and distal effects), the Evaluation Scope variable would be coded on the higher end of the scale as an “11”.

Follow up via key informant interviews will confirm group perceptions regarding the responses to Evaluation Scope. Coalition leaders and evaluators will be interviewed as key informants to further confirm the nature of evaluation for each coalition, when feasible. Since some survey respondents may have incomplete awareness of current evaluation plans, coalition leaders and evaluators may be interviewed about the use of multiple indicators, linkages between proximal and distal effects and the influence of contextual variables. The inclusion of contextual variables will be determined qualitatively from the interview and quantitatively from one question of the instrument.

Sampling

The sampling frame will be comprised of 147 Ohio prevention coalitions engaged in prevention initiatives, specifically in the area of substance use among youth and adults. Fifteen to 20 respondents per coalition are desired with scores being averaged. The unit of analysis is the coalition. With a reasonable response rate there should be sufficient data to support generalizability of the findings (Hair et al., 2000). With three predictor variables, the required data set is at least n=45 coalitions or 31% of the sampling frame.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formative</th>
<th>1. Planned/actual measurement of process indicators related to program implementation at one time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>2. Planned/actual measurement of intermediate indicators at one time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>3. Planned/actual measurement of impact indicators at one time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>4. Planned/actual measurement of process and intermediate indicators combined at one time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative and Summative</td>
<td>5. Planned/actual measurement of process and impact indicators at one time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative and Summative</td>
<td>6. Planned/actual measurement of intermediate and impact indicators at one time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative and Summative</td>
<td>7. Planned/actual combination of process, intermediate and impact indicators at one time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>8. Planned/actual measurement of process indicators at two or more points in time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>9. Planned/actual measurement of intermediate indicators at two or more points in time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>10. Planned/actual measurement of impact indicators at two or more points in time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>11. Planned/actual measurement of process and intermediate indicators combined at two or more points in time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative and Summative</td>
<td>12. Planned/actual measurement of process and impact indicators at two or more points in time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative and Summative</td>
<td>13. Planned/actual measurement of intermediate and impact indicators at two or more points in time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative and Summative</td>
<td>14. Planned/actual measurement of process, intermediate and impact over two or more points in time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: Formative and Summative Levels Pertaining to Evaluation Scope

Should limitations to the analysis result from actual sample size, the sample will be expanded to include all responses, with the individual (rather than the coalition) being
the unit of analysis. Under this second scenario, the sample size potentially expands into the hundreds for descriptive analysis.

The specific sampling frame (see Table 1.3) is a compilation of two Ohio directories of 147 coalitions listed as members in two separate statewide initiatives. Of the 10 Ohio coalitions that recently received funding as a new grantee from the Drug Free Communities (DFC) program administered by SAMSHA and the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), 7 are listed members of the first statewide initiative (see Table 1.3). Typical activities of federally funded endeavors include community forums on drug issues, youth summits, beverage server training, youth leadership training, social marketing campaigns and policy change. Twelve coalitions within this first grouping are receiving continuation dollars for efforts begun previously. Two of the member coalitions from the first grouping are receiving mentoring grants to increase their sustainability.

- Statewide Initiative #1  135 coalitions
- Statewide Initiative #2  12 coalitions

n = 147

Table 1.3: Proposed Sampling Frame Using an On-line Survey Method

Federal grantees (21 of the 135 members in Statewide Initiative #1) require evidence of both decreasing substance use and increasing collaboration among community sectors. The presence of federal grantees in the sample will likely produce variance in evaluation activity as a result of funding requirements related to evaluation.
Twelve coalitions, members of a second statewide initiative for campus-community coalitions (existing within higher education settings), will be included in the sampling frame. They are in various stages of development and became involved via temporary mini-grant funding offered between 1996 and 1998 with the goal of implementing prevention activities and programs (e.g., vendor training, alternative late-night events) on their respective campuses. The coalition representatives often come from sectors in the campus-community such as law enforcement, judiciary, and residence life. Since the end of their initial funding from the state, activity has ebbed and flowed due to changes in university leadership and alcohol prevention priorities. These coalitions are particularly susceptible to changing community conditions that affect sustainability.

Limitations of Study

One limitation to this study is the possibility of small sample size when the coalition is the unit of analysis. Similar studies have utilized sample sizes less than 50 (Feinberg et al., 2004; Florin et al., 2000; Yin et al., 1997; Hays et al., 2000). To determine the level of relationship that can be detected reliably with multiple regression, a table on desired power ($1-\beta > .80$) in relation to sample size was consulted (Hair et al., 2000). Accordingly, sample sizes between 50 and 100 ($\alpha = .05$) with 2 to 5 predictor variables could produce significant coefficient of determination values of 12 to 23%. These values reflect low relationships therefore caution would be in order when examining the results.
Evaluation knowledge among coalition members is not a predictor variable under study; however, its relationship to evaluation scope remains worthy of subsequent inquiry. Similarly, evaluation scope may be tied to other external and internal factors (community readiness, leadership effectiveness, coalition maturation) that are not part of this investigation.

This research is dependent upon the willingness of coalition members to respond honestly. Self reporting could be skewed to place the coalition in a positive light; however, responses from field testing with 28 member coalitions from the sampling frame (Manchester, 2005), provided low and high attitudes on most of the dimensions in being studied. Several coalitions indicated interest in participating in the current study.

Although the selected Ohio coalitions appear to be representative of prevention coalitions throughout the United States (with several possessing characteristics necessary to receive federal support), there may be limits to the degree to which results will generalize. The sampled coalitions are members of at least one professional development organization in which they receive networking and training experiences. Such exposure could increase their evaluation savvy, depending upon the actual types of technical assistance received. Attendance at training or technical assistance sessions, a proxy for interest in enhancing coalition processes, is not a variable in this particular study but might be looked at in the future as a possible predictor of comprehensive evaluation planning.
Definition of Terms

*Coalition*- Formal arrangement or collaboration between groups or sectors of a community, in which each group retains its identity but all agree to work together toward a common goal (CADCA, 2001).

*Community*- Individuals grouped by social commonalities, such as neighborhoods, teams and colleagues. Communities may be delineated around racial/ethnic lines (African American community), religious affiliation (Baptist community), geographic boundaries (a city), occupational similarities (medical fields) and socioeconomic groupings (public housing or welfare community) (Kaftarian et. al., 1997).

*External functioning*- Factors such as community readiness, multiple sector representation and perceived legitimacy of the coalition on the part of community leaders.

*Formative Evaluation*- The collection of information to help program planners improve developing programs or initiatives. Involves the monitoring of program implementation to understand movement toward goals and objectives and make adjustments to initiatives if necessary (Herman, Morris, & Fitz-Gibbon, 1987).

*Impact Indicator*- Signifies reductions in at risk behaviors such as substance use or violence. Assessed at the level of the groups or communities (student surveys, student alcohol violations) and relates directly back to original program goals.

*Intermediate Indicator*- Signifies attitudinal and/or behavioral changes immediately or soon after coalition activities have taken place. Examples include pre/post testing as a result of training or other forms of involvement with the coalition, legislative or political
community changes and activities related to reducing harm and risk (e.g., reducing advertised drink specials on a campus setting).

*Internal functioning*- Coalition factors that deal with member participation levels, task focus, and member cohesion *(Feinberg et. al., 2004).*

*Process Indicator*- Related to what takes place in a program such as types of activities undertaken, the number of people involved, the number of sectors represented, etc. *(CADCA, 2001)*

*Sector*- A part of the community from which a representative or stakeholder (due to employment, volunteer service or social status) is recruited to serve on or partner with a coalition. Examples are school districts, social services, higher education, business/retail, media, faith-based organizations, law enforcement, parents and students/youth.

*Stakeholder*- A representative of a community sector with an interest in a project or program related to community improvement. Stakeholders may be funders, advocates, community members or combinations such as law enforcement personnel (school resource officer, DARE officer), college or university faculty members (program consultants), business leaders (school-business partnerships), mental health personnel (counselors) or parent group leaders (PTA). A stakeholder may serve as a coalition member or as a community partner to the coalition.

*Summative Evaluation*- Used to help decision-makers determine whether implemented efforts have achieved desired program outcomes *(Herman et al., 1987).* May include an assessment of whether the initiative or program differentially affects particular participants or locales.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The intent of this study is to examine how the capacity of a prevention coalition, as defined by its member relations, multiple community sector representation, and financial resources, influence evaluation planning. Evidence is presented in this literature review that supports the value of these capacity factors in facilitating comprehensive plans.

Coalitions are prone to showing weak impact due to a number of barriers associated with implementing programs in complex community systems. Relevant to this discussion are the extent to which process, intermediate, and outcome indicators are used in coalition evaluations. Such indicators and the need to measure them over time to chart progress toward goals are of particular interest.

The Nature of Coalitions

Alcohol and drug prevention coalitions are comprised of representatives, from varied community sectors, who work together to implement and coordinate activities aimed at reducing substance use (CADCA, 2001). Members of these citizen-based networks may come from law enforcement, education, retail, public health, mental health, and others. They are community partners, or stakeholders, who hold different views, interests, and concerns relevant to neighborhood problems. For example, law
enforcement officers may be involved in citing bar owners for serving alcohol to minors in a campus environment and college officials may sanction students for alcohol policy violations.

Current prevention models are based upon diverse societal representation to facilitate funded efforts (Hawkins, Catalano, & Miller, 1992; DeJong et. al., 1998). Prevention coalitions are essentially community alliances that seek monetary sources of support for their endeavors. Frequently funds are obtained from federal and state agencies which require adherence to ecological risk and protection models (Hawkins et al., 1992) or components of environmental management theory (DeJong et. al., 1998). Federal and state dollars are available in the form of grants to fund activities aimed at reducing at risk behaviors brought about through poor community dynamics e.g., heavy alcohol advertising, neighborhood drug traffic.

Accepted proposals for funding reflect prevention science which is grounded in 19th century philosophies that originally focused on changing aspects of the environment (pollutants, water sanitation systems) to improve public health. Modern societal challenges have prompted expansion of such frameworks, with coalitions now channeling resources toward reducing sexually transmitted diseases, teen pregnancy and underage drinking rates, among other issues.

Implicit in many funding paradigms is the notion of collaboration, which can be defined as the “process through which multiple stakeholders identify a common mission, allocate resources, and engage in activities to achieve the mission” (Rog et al., 2004, p. 249). Working collectively, a prerequisite to effective partnerships, generally starts
with cooperation among agencies to solve community problems, coordination (of same) and finally, collaboration is at the upper end of this continuum (Mattessich, Murray-Close, & Monsey, 2001). Civic networks at the lower levels of the continuum are tentative by nature, with many factors such as community readiness, finances and positive working relationships among stakeholders responsible for propelling the group from cooperation to collaboration.

Short term projects tend to occur more often under coordination and cooperation conditions due to lesser amounts of resources from involved constituents. The two conditions are indicative of younger alliances or ad hoc task forces designed to address immediate issues such as a spike in driving under the influence of alcohol. By contrast, full collaboration would be noted by extensive sharing of resources, greater communication, strong interactive decision-making and long term planning. Participating organizations must offer financial and personnel resources over the long term for synchronized efforts.

Financial resources, the adequacy of partner relationships, and the number of represented community entities (collectively referred to as capacity factors) influence the degree of collaboration (Mattessich et al., 2001). The importance of these variables in underlying comprehensive evaluations of prevention practices is stressed in the literature (Butterfoss, 2002; Chinman et al., 2005; Fawcett et al., 1995; Feinberg, Greenberg, & Osgood, 2004; Florin, Mitchell, Stevenson, & Klein, 2000; Hays, Hays, DeVille, & Mulhall, 2000; Johnson, Hays, Center, & Daley, 2004). Evaluation processes frequently require collaboration with stakeholders responsible for implementing and participating in
programs (Gabriel, 2000; Herman, Morris, & Fitz-Gibbon, 1987; Metfessel & Michael, 1967). In turn, programs that occur as a result of comprehensive planning may produce intermediate effects (attitudinal and behavioral) upon targeted groups and longer term behavioral change (Fawcett et al., 1995; Gabriel, 2000).

Besides the ability to collaborate and evaluate comprehensively, there is another impact that may emerge from capacity factors. It is termed coalition sustainability. This concept has been defined as the “the process of ensuring an adaptive prevention system and a sustainable innovation that can be integrated into ongoing operations to benefit diverse stakeholders” (Johnson et al., 2004, p. 137). An enduring collaborative effort is probable when evaluative results show that it, over time, meets the needs of a target population. Evaluation directly affects sustainability, since it demonstrates to funders and sponsors that resources are being used wisely (CSAP, 2006).

Evidence of sustainability is partially observed in formative and summative outcomes. Process evaluation determines progress toward goals and is focused on program integrity, degree of exposure among target groups, and receptivity to coalition messages. Summative, or impact, evaluation is employed for assessing the merit of a program or initiative. Together these two types of evaluation assist in understanding program processes, short term effects, and whether intended objectives were met and long term change occurred (Herman et al., 1987).
Evaluation Efficacy In Coalitions

Even when capacity factors are present, alliances are still prone to poor evaluation planning and, subsequently, weak outcomes (Berkowitz, 2001; Gabriel, 2000). One reason may be the requirement of specialized knowledge in methodology and analysis, skills that many representatives serving on community coalitions do not possess. Other reasons may be attributable to social processes operating within these fragile unions.

Bandura’s social cognitive theory is pertinent in this regard and may explain low confidence related to evaluation tasks. It recognizes that subjectively perceived knowledge and skills are central “guides and motivators…rooted in the core belief that one has the power to produce desired effects; otherwise one has little incentive to act or to persevere in the face of difficulties” (Bandura & Locke, 2003, p. 87). Evaluation could suffer because of a perceived lack of expertise among coalition members. Beyond that, there may be limited time to plan and conduct evaluations. Low efficacy as a result of these deficiencies would produce incomplete evaluation planning and problems in demonstrating outcomes.

Several coalition studies offer support for the self efficacy construct. A 1997 Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) national survey of coalition practitioners revealed that they often did not review relevant literature because of time constraints and had difficulty in locating and understanding research (Morrissey et al., 1997). Similarly, Sambrano, Springer, and Hermann (1987) found that early grantees of CSAP’s High Risk Youth Demonstration Program used eclectic and untested approaches to intervention without being aware of how strategies interacted to produce effects.
From these investigations, it does not seem that program knowledge and evaluation scope changed much over 10 years of federally-funded coalition endeavors. In fact, the 1997 CSAP study posited that minimal, if any, improvement had taken place since the late 1980s in planning, implementing, and evaluating programs. Practitioners and evaluators identified weaknesses such as poor program-environment fit (programs did not match local needs) and a lack of attention to varied levels (individual, home, neighborhood) of a targeted community. Barriers stressed by respondents were differences in orientation between evaluators and stakeholders, resources targeted for short term rather than long term results, time constraints, and the inability to acquire sufficient knowledge about particular interventions. Analogously, health promotion specialists working with community networks noted that evaluations suffer from low funding and a lack of credibility (Wimbush, 1999). This weak condition may arise from two sources - not prioritizing measurement of pertinent variables and coalition practitioners having insufficient knowledge, resources, or time for this type of activity.

On the other hand, members of community alliances may complete a task like monitoring of interim indicators with modest to little expertise (Rossi & Freeman, 1993; Chinman, Imm, & Wandersmann, 2004). For example, they often submit formative reports detailing the number of training sessions conducted or products delivered (process indicators) to funders. As skills are developed, data collection of combined process, intermediate, and possibly some impact indicators through observational checklists, surveys and public records review may be accomplished by a core group of members. Through such efforts, practitioners engaged in evaluation tasks could detect low levels of
program implementation and weak exposure among targeted groups, which in turn can help to explain unachieved outcomes.

Coalitions may ultimately require training and assistance in more complicated activities associated with outcome evaluation since they often do not appear to have essential prerequisite skills (South & Tilford, 2000). Enhanced skills can be acquired through attendance at professional development conferences, training in the language and practice of evaluation, and direct technical assistance (Florin, Mitchell, & Stevenson, 1993). In addition, there are a number of published and on-line resources to assist stakeholders with documenting effectiveness (Chinman et al., 2001; Kreuter, Lezin, & Young, 2000; CSAP, 2006).

Practitioner Evaluation Resources

Given the need for practitioners to increase their evaluation efficacy and to demonstrate the strength of community projects, several products have been developed for use in prevention assessment (Chinman et al., 2001; Kreuter et al., 2000; Chinman et al., 2004). “Getting to Outcomes (GTO) 2004: Promoting Accountability through Methods and Tools for Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation” is a downloadable framework that provides practical advice for coalition members with regard to costs, data collection methods (records review, observations, surveys), data sources (public health archives and public law enforcement records), and design planning (e.g., non-equivalent control group). GTO stresses the utility of process and outcome assessment in accord with prevention frameworks (Hawkins et. al., 1992; DeJong, 1998) germane to community coalition practice (Chinman et. al., 2004).
Step-by-step sequences are given to assist practitioners in conducting their own process and outcome evaluations. Differences between the two are highlighted. The authors demonstrate how the quality of program execution is determined from process indicators and linked to negative or positive outcomes at the summative level (Chinman et al., 2001).

Underscoring misunderstood concepts held by practitioners is of particular importance. In this vein, stress would be given to the idea that formative indicators (outputs such as the number of attendees or products delivered) are not the same as outcomes (actual behavioral changes among targeted groups such as youth). A concrete example would be that customer satisfaction surveys and documentation of deliverables are necessary but inadequate measures of program viability.

Another tool, the CSAP Formative Evaluation, Consultation, and Systems Technique (FORECAST), was developed for community partnerships based on the premises of the Hawkins et al. (1992) risk and protection framework. It is driven by ecological principles directed toward preventing or reducing dysfunctional environmental influences (high alcohol availability and/or advertising). These would tend to exacerbate risky behaviors (high risk drinking among college students) (Goodman & Wandersman, 1994). FORECAST’s procedures for process evaluation include pinpointing data collection intervals that correspond to sequential program activities (Kreuter et al., 2000) which enable practitioners to conduct systematic evaluations in an ongoing fashion.

Similarly, CSAP’s Statewide Initiative grantees (2006) are required to monitor interim indicators in addition to measuring outcomes. CSAP provides the web-based,
Prevention Platform and Prevention Pathways to assist public health practitioners in the generation of customized evaluation planning documents. A series of questions prompts practitioners to indicate the number of planned interventions, sample size, and random assignment to experimental comparison/control groups, if relevant. Additional queries are related to expected participation rates, the assessment of implementation integrity, and measuring anticipated knowledge and attitudinal change. The website contains some ready-made instruments for ascertaining community-level alcohol and drug use, an outcome indicator. These materials help in completing pre- (baseline), during-, and post-intervention evaluation and follow-up procedures.

The Framework for Evaluating and Improving Community Partnerships to Prevent Cardiovascular Disease, developed at The University of Kansas, likewise advocates the use of logs to record actions and changes over time associated with immediate indicators, e.g., the number of vendor training meetings or sales to minors (Kreuter et al., 2000). The logs would be used in interim and outcome evaluation to demonstrate how changes in retailing practices influence underage drinking. This overall package shows how formative data can be integrated into final results (behavioral change among underage youth); thus, it helps to establish ties between relevant proximal and distal effects.

Relationship Between Planning and Evaluation

The above resources have been developed for coalition members to connect types of evaluation to their efforts. They seek to bridge the gap between science and practice, to place planning and evaluation principles in the hands of community alliances for the complex and time-consuming work of environmental change. Planning, a process
necessary for specifying goals, objectives, and ways to accomplish them, occurs early in the life of a coalition. This pre-implementation period is when primary objectives and related strategies are identified (Roussos & Fawcett, 2000). During this time, coalitions select logic models and evidence-based programs while being mindful of objectives, required resources and anticipated respondent receptivity (CSAP, 2006).

According to CSAP (2006), planned goals and strategies should be aligned with community substance abuse prevention needs. Inadequate planning may lead to a poor fit between community dynamics and the selected intervention. Weak plans may be related to incomplete needs assessment, resulting in efforts being misaligned with the characteristics of targeted groups (parents or adolescents).

CSAP’s web resources (2006) assist with creating blueprints comprised of mission and vision statements, selected programs linked with group and community features and evaluation methods to determine whether chosen activities worked to reduce substance use. Planning and evaluation are two domains of CSAP’s Strategic Prevention Framework (CSAP, 2006), along with assessment, capacity and implementation. This framework unites planning and evaluation, key components of a coalition’s endeavors (CSAP, 2006; Chinman et al., 2005; Butterfoss, 2002). Evaluation results should assist coalitions in recognizing successes and areas for improvement and influence future plans as strategies are reviewed and revised.

Planning and evaluation are components that are not mutually exclusive (Rossi & Freeman, 1993), but are integral parts of a partnership’s overall attack on a societal problem. A summative evaluation might seek to answer, for example, whether the new
anti-bullying curriculum is better than the standard one. The evaluation plan would typically include notions of cause and effect for expected results, and specify target groups, type of data collection, timelines, and modes of data analysis.

For a particular project, activities with timelines, responsibilities for service providers and potential barriers to implementation would be specified in a standard action plan (Epstein, 2001) which is the coalition’s primary guiding document. As an example, teachers may need to meet periodically to learn a new prevention curriculum by a specified timeframe or assist in related pilot-testing situations. These activities could interrupt the flow of typical classroom instruction. The related evaluation plan would then provide a means to look at selected classrooms to see how well the training was implemented, its degree of success, and how it was perceived by teachers.

In addition, random assignment to experimental and control conditions may be suggested as part of the evaluation. If funding and environmental limitations prohibit randomization of classes or students (which is fundamental for summative evaluation) then answering questions on how the program works (through formative inquiry) may provide very useful information. Partners may decide that outcome-oriented questions be answered at a later time when organizational parameters are more conducive for summative designs that utilize randomized controls.

When the above situation occurs, action and evaluation plans should reflect the revised logistics (e.g., timing, targeted groups, and activities) for obtaining summative data. Both should consider barriers (associated with measuring a targeted group’s reactions and organizational constraints) to measuring impact and should be continually updated as conditions warrant.
Accounting for Context in Coalition Evaluations

Blueprints for change begin with the idea that prevention coalitions are affected by their ecological systems and prevailing political forces (Jakes & Brookins, 2004). Practitioners should have knowledge of the environmental milieu as they go about their work (Mitchell, Stone-Wiggins, Stevenson, & Florin, 2004; CSAP, 2006), since environmental components may be either barriers or facilitators to progress.

In this vein, Lewin (1933) perceived behaviors as complex interactions between person and environment; Kelly (1999) expanded this thinking by considering the nature of contexts and interdependent components of social networks; and Bronfenbrenner (1979) developed an ecological model that views individual development as a function of concentric circles (home, school, civic institutions, dominant culture) of a larger social system.

When applied to coalitions, these concepts focus on the at-risk behaviors of targeted groups (students, young adults) being a product of micro- and macro-layers operating within the environment- hence, these sub-systems and their inhabitants should become receivers of environmentally-based initiatives. In college settings, environmental management calls for comprehensive approaches (similar to those discussed above) to reduce binge drinking. They would address the physical, social, economic and legal environment in which students exist (DeJong et. al., 1998), an endeavor which would require multiple partners at the coalition’s table.

As Jakes and Brookins (2004) pointed out (p. 7), social ecological theory recognizes the importance of “multiple methods to address multiple levels of analysis,” a
notion adapted extensively among federally funded coalitions (CSAP, 2006). In a related manner, the assessment portion of CSAP’s prevention framework presents a checklist for the identification of risk and protective factors within individual, family, school and community settings.

Another strategy pertinent here is that of Hawkins et al. (1992) for reducing risk and enhancing protective factors. It delineates contextual factors for evaluating substance abuse prevention programs. For instance, a coalition may wish to address whether the high availability of alcohol through lax retailing practices (not checking IDs) is a detriment to a high school prevention curriculum. Undocumented variables in the surrounding environment such as alcohol outlet density, dysfunctional family dynamics and peer rejection could seriously impair the ability of a partnership to demonstrate effectiveness.

Risk factors (family conflict, parental attitudes toward drug use, and school commitment to change) may either be contextual or directly programmatic in nature (Hawkins et al., 1992). Parental attitudes about supplying alcohol to underage houseguests, as an illustration, may be the focus of a media campaign (where parents are the targeted group) or serve as an interacting variable that blocks student receptivity to a classroom-based prevention curriculum admonishing underage alcohol use at house parties.

Analogously, sociological studies in domestic violence have documented contextual factors in evaluations. Fleury-Steiner, Bybee, Sullivan, Belknap, & Melton (2006) found that for victims of domestic violence, the intent to reutilize local law
enforcement in the future depended on employment status and whether a violent incident occurred before court proceedings ended. Understanding such competing variables would be crucial for developing and refining interventions with this particular group.

Related to these concepts, Butterfoss (2002) proposes a theory of action that focuses on projects with interacting levels of influence. A fit between program and environment is dependent upon accounting for the contextual influences surrounding interventions. In the previous example, a prevention curriculum is lacking strength if students can obtain alcohol easily from parents. Coalitions are successful to the extent that their activities are congruent with the multi-system context in which they exist. Not dealing with contextual features is likely to lead to failure in producing evidence of effectiveness (Butterfoss, 2002; Berkowitz, 2001; Hawkins et al., 1992). From an evaluation perspective, working with interactive, concentric layers necessitates a review of competing variables such as parental or neighborhood influences that may cloud the interpretation of formative (process and intermediate) and summative (impact) results.

If effects of these variables can be determined, the explanatory power of an evaluation design should increase (Stevens, 2002). Coalition evaluations, when they do not take contextual variables into consideration, are particularly vulnerable to non-significance or Type II error i.e., showing weak effects due to extraneous variables coming from multiple systems. Blocking, ex post facto comparisons on longitudinal designs (repeated measures), or various forms of multivariate analysis would be especially useful for increasing the sensitivity of statistical tests employed with evaluation data.
As another case in point, smoking may be a behavior that is acquired within the microcosm of the family home (Harakeh, Scholte, Vermulst, de Vries, & Engels, 2004). A plan to measure the effectiveness of a middle school smoking prevention program could produce high rates of unexplained variation and the inevitable loss of power if it fails to look at parental smoking and its impact on a child’s smoking habits. Blocking of parental smoking (presence vs. absence or low, moderate, high) may resolve this problem statistically. Blocking of a variable (parental smoking rates) conceptually related to a study’s dependent variable (child’s smoking habits) reduces within-group (program or control) variability, thus increasing power (Stevens, 2002).

Methodological and Planning Issues

Coalition evaluations are prone to weak demonstrations of success (Berkowitz, 2001; Morrissey et. al., 1997; Butterfoss, 2002) due to not accounting for context as described above and not documenting program integrity. In addition to Type II error, evaluation projects may demonstrate Type III error which results from poor execution (Goodman & Wandersman, 1994; Morrissey et al., 1997).

Such error is indicative of the need for formative evaluation to determine the actual level of exposure among targeted groups, program fidelity, and consistency. Process and intermediate information is collected to see if the audience is receiving and understanding the messages that are being delivered. Variables might include the number of distributed campaign messages and self reports of perceptions among high school students attending an educational session on alcohol use and its consequences. Summative concerns could be addressed later by measuring behavioral change for
targeted groups over time. Preliminary formative evaluation would help to explain non-significant summative findings when they are observed.

If process evaluation indicates low program fidelity or weak implementation when summative results are positive, respondents have likely changed on their own because of other influences (Chinman et al., 2004). Suppose formative evaluation of process or intermediate indicators showed both low attendance and increase in knowledge while the summative evaluation demonstrated success. Participant change does not seem to be linked to program characteristics, but may come from media messages, changes in home or school environment, etc. On the other hand, if strong attendance and knowledge change are observed from process evaluation but there is limited long term impact, the intervention may be unsuitable for the target group or competing with external contextual variables such as alternative programs, parental involvement, or school climate.

As mentioned previously, community partnerships require assessments of both proximal and distal indicators through formative and summative evaluation. Coalition evaluators need short-term, formative results to review the adequacy of implemented activities across sites and to better understand the strengths and weaknesses of summative outcomes. When longer term impact data falls short of expectations, interim data may indicate weaknesses in a project or not enough exposure for targeted groups. Conversely, positive, final results should not automatically be linked to a coalition’s effort, or the independent variable, when formative findings show weak program integrity.
Formative evaluations serve as intermediate benchmarks (Guskey, 2000) from which to refine ongoing activities should they appear to fall short. Coalition evaluators must be engaged with program staff, providing them with interim reporting (Gabriel, 2000). Results should be presented on a repeated, informal basis to practitioners, funders, board members and other stakeholders in order to detect progress toward goals or to deal with implementation issues.

Coalition evaluators can facilitate practitioner understanding of evaluation processes and products through “empowerment evaluation” (Gabriel, 2000, p. 340). Gabriel recommends that evaluators “must move progressively away from traditional skills in evaluation and research methodology, and toward increased interaction…with prevention practitioners” (Gabriel, 2000, p. 340) and further, that coalition evaluators interact with stakeholders, “feeding them formative evaluation to guide and improve the program’s operation” (Gabriel, 2000, p. 348).

The scope of evaluation is limited without formative measures being employed (Gabriel, 2000). “The direct outcomes of (coalition) activities are such things as increased awareness, improved coordination, changed attitudes, etc. which are hypothesized to ultimately effect the intended bottom line impacts of these efforts” (Gabriel, p. 345). Gabriel (2000) describes a prevention scenario that consists of a resistance skills curriculum, a parent training program and an annual drug-free week in school districts. He suggests that actual prevalence rates (an outcome indicator) of alcohol, tobacco and other drug use among neighborhood youth would possibly remain constant, since small-scale interventions tend to affect only a subset of the community. Studying the program formatively, measuring the intermediate effects of exposure
through attitudinal and awareness surveys prior to and immediately following the start of a project, would provide credible evidence of the possible potential to reduce at-risk behaviors.

Coalition planners need to weigh the costs and benefits of evaluation approaches, as they seek to demonstrate effectiveness. When there is little time for data collection, they are encouraged to at least employ formation evaluation due to its immediate usefulness (Kreuter et al., 2000) and leave summative or outcome evaluation to paid external evaluators. They may choose process or intermediate indicators over outcome or distal ones due to financial and time constraints. Not focusing on intermediate results may preclude a coalition from being unable to explain non-significant findings at the summative level.

In addition to linkage problems between formative and summative indicators, many problems observed in quantitative designs can be attributed to weak sampling, inadequate controls (lack of random assignment of communities or groups to coalition versus non-coalition conditions), failure to account for extraneous variables, and delayed effects of coalition work. The last concern has been cited as troublesome in several studies (Roussos & Fawcett, 2000; Kreuter et al., 2000; Gabriel, 2000) Outcomes may not be detectable until long after the life of many prevention endeavors. In fact, several cycles of programming may be necessary to realize results (Sambrano et al., 1997).

Rogers (1995) suggests that delayed effects can be explained through diffusion of innovation theory. Successful community absorption of an innovation, such as a social norms campaign, depends upon its compatibility with an existing social system. Extending this point, diverse coalition partners from within the targeted environment
enhance the probability of identifying champions, individuals who will devote their time and influence to encourage adoption of an innovation in a public sphere. Other relevant factors would be the nature of the innovation itself, the degree of program-environment fit, the expected time required for the intervention to take hold, and the inhabitants’ readiness to adopt or respond.

Based upon the tenets of this theory which emphasizes time as a facilitator of implementation, it is likely that a premature, one-time assessment early in the life of a coalition may produce non-significant findings. Thus, evaluation that contains baseline and continuous measurement may improve the probability of demonstrating effectiveness. In CSAP’s cross-site evaluations from 1994-1995, Sambrano et al. (1997) employed a multiple regression technique to review outcome indicators at several points, with data collection on groups at baseline, exit, and 6-month to 18-month follow-up.

Classic literature on time series designs indicates that simple pre- and post-assessment is not appropriate for single group studies (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). For a campus-community coalition evaluation, a plan to expose one group of college students who live in the residence halls to a directed social norms campaign would benefit from a time series analysis (with alcohol infractions as a tracked indicator). Repeated measures over time strengthen the argument for effectiveness in the absence of equivalent comparison groups.

With time series designs, repeated baseline observations precede the intervention (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). This procedure has the advantage of showing data trends prior to implementation. If increases or decreases in an intermediate or outcome indicator occur prior to a planned activity, the value of coalition work determined at a
later time may be suspect. In such cases, the coalition would ultimately be less confident in claiming effectiveness (or lack of) due to the intervention. Additionally, repeated follow-up measures are needed to demonstrate the continued utility of alliances in producing results, e.g., maintaining decreases in underage drinking within a college setting.

**Suggested Models for Coalition Processes**

Many models in the literature refer to coalition capacity, in particular representation from multiple sectors, positive relational processes among members, (communication and collaborative decision-making), and adequate financial resources in facilitating ongoing assessment practices (Chinman et al., 2005; Johnson et al., 2004, Fawcett et al., 1995). These probably are reciprocal in nature as they affect the planning and implementation of evaluation procedures.

Just as strong decision making processes (a relational factor) may lead to well thought out plans, comprehensive plans that require community sector involvement may facilitate more positive working relationships between coalition members. Moreover, inclusive evaluation plans may rely upon data from various stakeholder groups, producing a reciprocal situation between the breadth of member recruitment and evaluation planning. In other words, assessment activities themselves may serve as a bonding and recruiting tool for coalition members through data collection and coordination of same. In this sense, an increase in member commitment and expansion of coalition representation may occur as a byproduct of evaluation processes.

Fawcett et al. (1995) observed these types of relationships and defined coalition capacity as a composite of member participation, satisfaction with coalition processes,
planning documents and financial resources. Similarly, CSAP views capacity as human, material, and funding resources. For this federal agency, strategizing, project accomplishment and evaluation are inter-related areas within which coalitions operate (CSAP, 2006). Federally supported coalitions must show efficacy in both capacity and planning processes to gain and maintain their funding.

The literature offers various perspectives on how aspects of coalition functioning relate to each other. Johnson et al. (2004) posited a model whereby financial resources are linked with member and stakeholder relationships, implementation quality and demonstrations of effectiveness. Butterfoss (2002) presented a similar perspective, in which resources and member engagement are reciprocal to each other. Relational patterns lead to increased resource procurement with the resources so obtained influencing continued member commitment and communication.

From another and quite distinct standpoint, Florin, Mitchell, Stevenson, and Klein (2000) proposed an organizational systems view based upon a linear series of inputs (funding), throughputs (sectors, member satisfaction and commitment) and outputs (planning processes that include the development of goals, selection of strategies and project execution). In their viewpoint, capacity building factors are limited to member knowledge, skills and abilities, attitudes (satisfaction and commitment), and inter-organizational linkages. Their approach connects funding and sectors in a linear manner, with funding preceding capacity factors and evaluation and planning processes.

Given the subtlety of coalition processes, it is reasonable to envision situations where a high capacity factor such as member ability in grant writing could also increase
funding in a reciprocal manner. In this regard, throughputs such as sector representation and member commitment could also occur as products of planning and implementation.

In another study (Jasuja et al., 2005), the authors reviewed the relationship between collaborative decision making (shared funding) and sectoral representation (combination of grassroots and professional) with coalition progress (planning evidence-based prevention practices). Both factors were surmised to influence a coalition’s prevention planning.

Beyond planning and evaluation processes, coalition capacity has been thought of as directly impacting the attitudes and behaviors of targeted groups and possibly, subsequent behavioral changes (Fawcett et al., 1995). Broad-based sector participation, funding and member satisfaction may have an effect on intermediate outcomes (attitudinal ratings) and, in turn, distal behavioral outcomes (actual tobacco use).

Coalition Capacity Factor: Multiple Sectors

An assumption of many prevention-based alliances is that the sharing of resources and planning through joint sector representation is an effective method for achieving short and long term change across systems (Kegler, Steckler, Malek, & McLeroy, 1998; Jasuja et al., 2005). A primary tenet of coalition building is the belief that “bringing multiple community sectors together to share resources and planning can generate widespread support for action and also provide a vehicle for solving problems that may be are too complex to be solved in a single agency” (Kegler et. al., 1998, p. 173). Membership from multiple sectors enhances a coalition’s ability to gather financial, personnel and physical resources for planned activities.
Butterfoss (2002) observes that effective coalitions (as distinguished by successful planning and execution) are characterized by broad representation from diverse agencies and community segments. To encourage neighborhood support and receptivity of interventions, it has been suggested that coalitions recruit residents as members for planning, implementation and evaluation purposes (Foster-Fishman, Berkowitz, Lounsbury, Jacobson, & Allen, 2001). CSAP’s prevention projects require that grantees coordinate with health, criminal justice, and education sectors, among others, to plan for and disseminate comprehensive prevention messages (CSAP, 2006; Sambrano et al., 1997). Along similar lines, Kreuter et al. (2000) observed that broader planning goals may result from increased collaboration and funding via diverse civic involvement.

Joint sector planning leads to the adoption of multiple strategies to produce community change (Hawkins, Catalano, & Miller, 1992). Coalitions that target groups with perceived risk (children with high violence exposure, college students in alcohol-rich environments) require multi-faceted planning due to the complicated nature of variables affecting youth and young adults across societal sub-systems.

The engagement of varied community members possessing a range of expertise is important for comprehensive, research-based prevention plans. It allows coalitions to expand their planning scope (Goodman & Wandersman, 1994; Hays et al., 2000). The number of unique sectors has been found to correlate with the coalition’s ability to influence policy, implement programs and produce a comprehensive, research based substance abuse prevention plan (Hays et al., 2000; Crowley, Yu, & Kaftarian, 2000).
Coalition efforts are generally initiated on the basis of local needs assessment data provided through varied stakeholders such as residents and elected officials (Himmelman, 2001). Once the priorities have been determined, the coalition recruits pertinent representatives from civic sectors for partnering. Groups that are “more rooted in the community would be able to conduct needs assessments that eventually lead to better goals and objectives and choice of appropriate evidence-based interventions (prevention practices)” (Chinman et al., p. 152).

The number of partners attending meetings (a proxy for the number of sectors), has been significantly linked (r=.41, p<.05, n=35) to the quality of action plans (Florin, Mitchell, Stevenson, & Klein, 2000). This might equally be necessary for evaluation planning. Furthermore, member knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) and the quality of inter-organizational linkages have been related to the adequacy of program execution (r=.50, p<.01 and r=.48, p<.01, respectively; n=35) (Florin et. al., 2000).

Broad sector representation would most likely enhance the ability of a coalition to monitor program implementation across relevant settings and to gain data from agencies and groups. Generic evaluation models reinforce this point by calling for broad-based stakeholder input as an aspect of both formative and summative evaluation. Metfessel and Michael’s Evaluation Model calls for community constituents (parents, teachers and counselors) to serve as facilitators for the evaluation process (Metfessel & Michael, 1967; Guskey, 2000). Embedded in this thinking is the idea of clear communication.. Informal and formal reporting should be done in ways that can be understood by all stakeholders. Moreover, interim data should be collected from those closest to a program; hence, the
evaluator must work intimately with community partners, program staff and service recipients, as previously suggested.

**Coalition Capacity Factor: Relations**

A coalition with diverse community representation and adequate relational patterns is poised for comprehensive planning and resource sharing. This is not an easy task, given that coalitions often involve members who might “share a history of conflict, misunderstandings, benign neglect, or have little experience working collaboratively with others” (Foster-Fishman et al., 2001, p. 251).

Relational capacity has been defined as a positive working climate that is cohesive, cooperative, trusting, open and participatory (Foster-Fishman et al., 2001). Aspects of this capacity as adapted from The Wilder Factors Inventory (Mattessich et al., 2001) are provided in Table 2.1. The importance of shared decision-making, working together, and participating is captured primarily through the categories of Member Characteristics, Process and Structure, Communication, and Purpose.

These factors are viewed as important for research, evaluation, and long term sustainability (Mattessich et al., 2001). Informal and formal communications among members facilitate greater responsiveness to changing conditions, an aspect of sustainability. These working relationships allow for the conduct of ongoing activities that meaningfully tap into community dynamics.

KSAs (knowledge, skills, attitudes) required for building coalition capacity, some of which are reflected in Table 2.1, include cooperation, respect for others, and conflict resolution, program planning, and evaluation skills (Foster-Fishman et al., 2001). Open and frequent communication has been shown to increase the success of a collaborative
research project in which partners designed and evaluated a domestic abuse prevention program (Mattessich et al., 2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History of collaboration or cooperation with the community</th>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative group seen as legitimate leader in the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable political and social climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutual respect, understanding and trust</th>
<th>Membership Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate cross section of members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members see collaboration as in their self interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to compromise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members share a stake in process and outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple layers of participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of clear roles and policy guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate pace of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open and frequent communication</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established informal relationships and communication links</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concrete, attainable goals and objectives</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sufficient funds, staff, materials, time</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skilled leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1. Factors of successful coalitions as identified through meta-analysis (Wilder Factors Inventory, 2001)

Feinberg et al. (2004) posits similar connections between member relational patterns and plan quality. Internal (relational) processes are distinct from external (community readiness) ones and likely affect the fidelity of project completion (and planning) to a great extent. Resource sharing, facilitated through adequate working relations, has been seen as a factor that influences the adoption of evidence-based drug prevention programs (Jasuja et al., 2005).
Conflict between sectors and individuals can create a divisive coalition (Kreuter et al., 2000; Feinberg et al., 2004), compromising internal working relations that underlie planning. Coalitions succeed “by bringing people together and facilitating the building of relationships among them” (Wolff, 2001, p. 186). If communication patterns break down, planning and evaluation may falter.

Despite what was cited previously, evidence is inconclusive that relational patterns are directly correlated with plan quality or evaluation planning. Butterfoss, Goodman, and Wandersman (1993) found that member satisfaction was not directly correlated with quality. These intrinsic processes could even be positive when project plans were not of high quality. Likewise, Hays et al. (2000) did not observe a significant correlation between member participation (commitment and cohesiveness of members) and comprehensive planning. These findings reflect that strong goal commitment and adequate communication patterns across partners may coexist alongside inadequate evaluation and planning skills.

**Coalition Capacity Factor: Finances**

A coalition’s ability to harness, enlarge, diversify, and utilize resources (Stokols, 1992) is as important as the other two capacity factors. The coalition should represent the community through sector diversity, use communications and decision making strategies to make coalition meetings productive, and by so doing procure financial resources for goal attainment.

Funding by itself does not guarantee success. There are lesser-funded alliances that have produced significant results and highly funded ones that have shown stagnation (Wolff, 2001). It is possible that when funding originates from a combination of local,
state and national sources rather than from a single source, such broad-based support is a stronger predictor of effectiveness than funding level per se (Rog et al., 2004; Himmelmann, 2001).

Obtaining combined resources may be an indicator of varied sector relationships. A large amount of funding from a single source, which is likely to be the initiator of the coalition, may lead to collaborative betterment rather than empowerment (Himmelmann, 2001). Coalitions funded this way are not typically engaged with a wide range of sectors, since dollars are often channeled through one agency that dictates planning scope. In collaborative betterment coalitions, the recruitment of particular sectors over others may be required in accord with funding mandates (law enforcement rather than mental health, schools rather than residents, etc.)

Conversely, an empowered alliance has recruited members from an array of private and public entities (whose representatives participate to improve the community rather than enhance their own community status) prior to receiving any external funding. Recruiting stakeholders in these instances is inherently a bottom up and grassroots rather than a top down process. Coalitions that operate in this manner may be more receptive to ongoing evaluation which provides the opportunity to engage directly with pertinent sectors in the monitoring of processes and outcomes.

Funding is thought to produce successful outcomes (Mattessich et al., 2001) and is associated with comprehensive planning (Chinman et al., 2005) for interim and final results. Evaluation activities (needs assessment, repeated measures, documenting the influence of contextual variables, gaining stakeholder involvement and buy-in) require time and expertise that more often comes from a paid evaluator instead of from the
coalition members themselves. Higher funding affords the means for hiring an external evaluator.

A coalition may need to engage outside evaluators, since these endeavors are complex. A funding level that accommodates the contracting of evaluators may be a contributing factor to the comprehensiveness of evaluation plans. It is recommended that evaluators work interactively with practitioners from needs assessment to final summative work (Reinert, Carver & Range, 2005) to develop appropriate designs aligned with the real world parameters in which the programs are operating. These activities are time consuming and require resources.

Coalition blueprints should hypothesize links between short-term interventions, strategies, and long term outcomes. This type of complete planning is seen most often in coalitions with sufficient resources for paid staff (Kreutner et al., 2004; Florin et al., 1993). Similarly, Florin et al. (2000) found that annual funding had an effect on overall plan quality and paid staff hours were significantly related to same (r=.35, p<.05).

In a study of 51 Ohio prevention coalitions (Manchester, 2005), differences in perceived use of evaluation to determine effectiveness were noted for coalitions receiving less and those receiving more than $50,000 per year. Those with the higher funding were more likely to utilize paid staff, evaluation procedures to determine impact, and data and research to plan activities.

Conclusion

Further study of relationships between the discussed capacity factors and evaluation planning is warranted given the literature review. The guiding research questions include “What is the relationship between specific elements of capacity
(community representation, relational processes, funding) and specific prevention practices (planning the scope of evaluation)? How strong are these relationships?” A gap exists in understanding coalitions, particularly in regard to capacity and its relation to evaluation (Chinman et al., 2005; Morrissey et al., 1997).

Inquiry into the current state of coalition processes (including planning and evaluation) and what evaluators should do is clearly indicated and has been recommended (Morrissey et al., 1997; Gabriel, 2000). The importance of coalitions performing formative to summative evaluations of their projects has been stressed (Kreuter et al., 2000; Roussos & Fawcett, 2000, Berkowitz, 2001, Gabriel, 2000; Chinman, 2004). This adds further credence to exploring and characterizing the relationship between the scope (formative to summative) of evaluation plans and how they are affected by capacity factors (see Figure 2.1). This framework depicts capacity factors as influencing a coalition’s formative to summative evaluation processes (scope) as well as indicating potential relationships among variables. For example, it is possible that relational patterns or multiple sectors may be affecting evaluation scope even when finances have either a low relationship or are not related to the dependent variable. This would indicate that people can be committed to goals and planning while resources are tight.
In regard to the dependent variable, coalitions that measure combinations of indicators over time would be classified as higher in evaluation scope than those measuring fewer indicators on a limited basis. Because little is known about the dependent variable of evaluation scope and how capacity influences it, exploratory inquiry rather than a priori predictions is indicated. Multiple regression and descriptive analysis will be employed to examine the variables and relationships among them.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In this mixed method study, the relationship between three predictor variables (relational patterns, multiple sector relationships and financial resources – collectively capacity) and a criterion variable (evaluation scope) is examined. The design is based upon literature that links the predictor variables (which are collectively thought of as aspects of coalition capacity) with planning and evaluation processes within prevention coalitions (Florin et al., 2000; Jasuja et al., 2005; Johnson et al., 2004, Fawcett et al., 1995). The statistical approach is multiple regression through which the relationship of capacity is explored in regard to its effect on a coalition’s propensity to evaluate their efforts comprehensively, i.e., repeatedly using a combination of process, intermediate and outcome indicators. An on-line questionnaire serves as the quantitative aspect of the study, while follow up interviews with evaluators clarifying perceptions on the dependent variable are a qualitative component.

Population and Sample

The target population is community-based prevention coalitions in the State of Ohio. These groups are comprised of representatives from multiple sectors which are engaged in planning and implementing prevention activities and programs. The premise of their efforts is that community change may be accomplished through targeting
environmental factors associated with high risk behaviors. Many of these alliances were created in response to available grant funding opportunities, while others are grassroots in orientation. Some are newly created whereas others are well established in their communities. Their degree of multiple sector involvement, working internal relations, and financial resources are expected to vary. The actual size of the population is unknown, since no database exists that integrates information about prevention coalitions based upon the characteristics noted above and defined in the literature.

A convenience sample, with the coalition as the unit of analysis, was identified as the sampling frame. This original frame of 136 coalition contacts (with deleted duplicates across sources), comes from four directories listing known coalition names and representatives in Ohio: (a) Ohio Federal Grantees (2006) receiving SAMSHA-CSAP funding, (b) Ohio State Grantees (2006) receiving ODADAS funding, (c) campus-community coalitions, listed with the Ohio College Initiative to Reduce High Risk Drinking, and (d) coalition contacts listed as members of the Statewide Prevention Coalition Association (SPCA). The directories were made available through a program manager at the Drug Free Action Alliance. All items contained a name and e-mail address and often included an office address and fax number. The director specified that the list was thought to be complete, but that completeness was based upon members coming forward with address changes, etc. when periodically queried.

Utilizing the entire sampling frame proved to be impossible for three reasons: (a) contacts were no longer in their positions and therefore unreachable, (b) some e-mails were invalid and could not be determined through calls to listed phone numbers or (c)
indicated personnel did not actually serve on any coalition. In the latter case, the SPCA directory listing represented a member who was not involved in coalition work, but perhaps worked for a community agency. Thus, the final sampling frame is 84 coalitions.

**Instrumentation**

**On-Line Questionnaire**

The on-line, self report instrument was developed to measure attitudes and perceptions related to internal, working relations among members, types of sectors involved in coalitions, sources and amounts of financial resources, and level of perceived evaluation planning for the 2006-2007 fiscal year. The scaling and composition of items pertaining to the study’s main variables (see below) are amenable to being treated as being continuous for use in regression analysis. A copy of the instrument is included in Appendix A.

The instrument was extensively revised by the researcher and her adviser and then pilot-tested with a selected sample of coalition leaders (n=10) in Ohio. These individuals led established coalitions (>5 years in existence) and had greater than 3 years of involvement in leadership roles. Seven of the 10 responded to the pilot. From their responses, changes were made to the instrument to enhance readability and clarity items for the typical coalition member.

**Reliability**

Reliability, the degree to which a test measures its constructs consistently, is determined quantitatively (Gay & Airasian, 2003). There are various forms of reliability related to stability (test-retest), equivalence (multiple forms or inter-judge), and internal
consistency (Cronbach’s $\alpha$ or Kuder-Richardson). The overarching goal is to gather evidence to support the test’s fidelity if it were repeatedly administered.

Since multiple domains are included on this instrument, reliability would pertain to sections of the instrument rather than as an overall index for it. Unique scaling was created for coalition members to operationally define evaluation scope. Considerations must therefore be made when deciding which forms of reliability are most likely obtainable for this variable, particularly since portions of the data have been recoded from its original state.

Although the Yes/No dichotomous scales of evaluation scope allow for recoding into the aforementioned 14-point scale (Chapter 2), this essentially collapses scales related to process, intermediate and impact indicators (as presented to respondents) into combinations that are inferred by the researcher and placed in the resulting schema depicted in Table 3.2. This extracted measure of evaluation scope would provide no meaningful information concerning internal consistency. So an indication of reliability was obtained by having a sampling of responses independently coded by another graduate student in an M.B.A. program (inter-judge reliability).

For the actual responses to an item, inter-judge consistency between coalition members were assessed through member agreement (percentages) on evaluation scope. This was possible because respondents individually indicated whether they were measuring process, intermediate or outcome indicators.

Relational patterns were already suitable for internal consistency determination using Cronbach’s $\alpha$. Financial resources data (ordinal) was coded in a “0”/“1” fashion to ascertain inter-judge reliability. The multiple sectors variable was a checklist of items in
which the categories of schools, law enforcement, etc. did not necessarily relate to each
other but are commonly recruited groups among coalitions. Given the variability in size
and age of the participating coalitions, inter-correlations were not necessarily expected
between items. As with financial resources, inter-judge reliability rather than internal
consistency was examined since members from the same coalition specified relevant
sectors.

Validity

Where reliability concerns the consistency and accuracy of an instrument, validity
deals with whether it measures what it purports to, whether it satisfies the function for
which it is intended (Hopkins, 1998). A pilot-test with a panel of experts was conducted
to enhance face and content validity. Face validity refers to the degree to which the test
appears to measure what it claims (Gay & Airasian, 2003). The researcher and her
advisor developed the instrument based upon experience and literature review related to
the topic area. The items appear to define the four variables appropriately.

Content validity was further determined through the same expert panel during
pilot-testing. The members indicated whether the items clearly and inclusively
represented the domains of Multiple Sectors, Finances, Relational Patterns and
Evaluation Scope. The instrument was revised after the expert panel review for the
purposes of enhancing content validity. For example, the Multiple Sectors list was
lengthened to include community segments pertinent to campus-community coalitions,
since they were also part of the sampling frame. Content validity is determined primarily
through expert judgment and is not computed statistically (Gay & Airasian, 2003), as is
the case here.
Concurrent validity is the degree to which results on one measure corroborate with results on another, related measure (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Comparing quantitative, evaluation scope results with qualitative, evaluator interview data may provide some evidence for concurrent validity on the dependent variable. Evaluators would be closer to the content of the evaluation plans than coalition members. As such, there may be discrepancies between evaluator and respondent data.

Differences could suggest the scale is invalid or otherwise not suitable for coalition members. On the other hand, coalition members engaged in action planning to some degree as part of their duties and would have likely discussed evaluation, leading to concurrence between respondent and evaluator perceptions. This finding would enhance the argument for the scale’s validity with prevention coalition members.

**Measurement of Variables**

**Predictor Variable 1: Multiple Sectors**

Respondents indicated level of community representation by checking off 20 options related to sector involvement (e.g., schools, parents, law enforcement). The number of community sectors was used in multiple regression. Frequency data on common and less common representation was measured descriptively across and per individual coalition.

**Predictor Variable 2: Finances**

Estimated financial resources were reported as ordinal data (<$30,000, $30,000 to <$50,000, $50,000 to <$100,000, $100,000 to <$200,000, $200,000 or more), with a Don’t Know option, to a question inquiring about funding levels from federal, state and
local sources. A separate, short-answer prompt asked respondents to estimate the amount of in-kind contributions. The combined assets were entered as a variable for multiple regression analysis. The range of amounts and types of indicated funding are described.

**Predictor Variable 3: Relational Patterns**

Fourteen items on the survey dealt with Relational Patterns. The domain is scaled in a Likert–type format, 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) format, with a “Don’t Know” category included for members without sufficient knowledge. The average level of relational patterns per coalition was considered in the multiple regression analysis. The items measured task participation, level of compromise, commitment to goals, presence of rotational leadership, efficacy toward accomplishing goals, member understanding and involvement, and informal and formal communication processes.

A version of this section used in a previous instrument was tested for reliability with 51 coalition members from Ohio attending a professional development conference. It yielded a Cronbach’s coefficient alpha ($\alpha = .877$).

**Dependent Variable: Evaluation Scope**

This variable was ascertained through a rather unique scale developed expressly for this study. Respondents indicated the scope of evaluation in their coalitions through three sets of questions pertaining to process, intermediate (short term), and outcome (long term) indicators and their frequency of measurement. A scenario was provided for each set to clarify the subtle nature of differences among them. This was necessary because pilot test participants experienced confusion with the use of evaluation terms and how each was distinct from the other.
The instructions also specified that pre and post-testing is considered a one-time assessment of one indicator. In the case of multiple measures, respondents were asked to describe them (number of people attending) and indicate their frequency (four times per year) of measurement. Although nominal (Yes/No) in scale, the questions for evaluation scope were conducive to being recoded onto a fourteen point continuum, discussed earlier in Table 1.2 and referred to again in the following examples for Coalition 1 (Table 3.1). These areas were recoded from nominal to continuous data based upon agreement of the majority of respondents from a coalition. Coalition 1 (referred to in Table 3.1) would be recoded as a 7 based upon the schema originally displayed in Table 1.2 (reshown again as Table 3.2).

In Table 3.1, the majority of Coalition 1’s members agree that they measure a combination of process, intermediate and impact indicators at one time rather than repeatedly throughout the year. These findings placed them at Level 7 of the schematic (Table 3.2). In Table 3.2, lower levels of evaluation scope are reflected by one-time assessments or combinations of process and intermediate rather than the inclusion of outcome indicators to determine community-level behavioral change. Higher levels of evaluation scope would be indicated by combinations of process, intermediate and outcome assessment at repeated points throughout the year.
### Table 3.1: Sample Coalition Data (Coalition 1) with Related Questionnaire Items for Evaluation Scope (n=6 members, with some missing data indicated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On-Line Questionnaire Content</th>
<th>Number of Coalition Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plans include a one-time assessment of short-term result</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plans include the assessment of coalition activities or services across multiple time periods such as twice per year, quarterly, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plans include the one-time assessment of a short term result</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plans include the assessment of short term results across multiple time periods such as twice per year, quarterly, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plans include the one-time assessment of a long term result</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plans include the assessment of long term results across multiple time periods such as twice per year, quarterly, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scaling permitted the researcher to divide the coalitions into those high or low on the basis of an *a priori* cut point (7 and below or 8 and above) or one that comes from naturally occurring breaks in the data. Additional survey questions related to the use of external evaluators, the measurement of contextual variables and establishing linkages between short and long term effects (i.e., proximal and distal indicators). These were factored into the data analysis and interpretation of results.
| Formative | 1. Planned/actual measurement of process indicators related to program implementation at one time. |
| Formative | 2. Planned/actual measurement of intermediate indicators at one time. |
| Summative | 3. Planned/actual measurement of impact indicators at one time. |
| Formative | 4. Planned/actual measurement of process and intermediate indicators combined at one time. |
| Formative and Summative | 5. Planned/actual measurement of process and impact indicators at one time. |
| Formative and Summative | 6. Planned/actual measurement of intermediate and impact indicators at one time. |
| Formative and Summative | 7. Planned/actual combination of process, intermediate and impact indicators at one time. |
| Formative | 8. Planned/actual measurement of process indicators at two or more points in time. |
| Formative | 9. Planned/actual measurement of intermediate indicators at two or more points in time. |
| Summative | 10. Planned/actual measurement of impact indicators at two or more points in time. |
| Formative | 11. Planned/actual measurement of process and intermediate indicators combined at two or more points in time. |
| Formative and Summative | 12. Planned/actual measurement of process and impact indicators at two or more points in time. |
| Formative and Summative | 13. Planned/actual measurement of intermediate and impact indicators at two or more points in time. |
| Formative and Summative | 14. Planned/actual measurement of process, intermediate and impact over two or more points in time. |

Table 3.2: Formative and Summative Levels Pertaining to Evaluation Scope
On-Line Data Collection

An initial survey link was sent via e-mail to the directory contact. Coalition member names and e-mails were not available, so responding individuals were asked to assist with the data collection process. They were requested to distribute the link to their membership. In other words, a gatekeeper mechanism was employed. They were given pertinent information about who was conducting the survey and how to reach them, expected time for completion, the main areas of inquiry in the questionnaire, and their involvement in distributing the link to members by e-mail.

Phone calls and e-mail reminders were conducted over the course of three months. In a few cases, updated names and e-mail addresses were given for the coalition, as the original person listed was no longer participating. Two incentives ($75 gift certificates to an office supplies store) were offered in an e-mail announcing a random drawing of responding coalitions with multiple members.

As noted before, the sampling frame (a convenience sample) consisted of 84 coalitions. In all, 40 coalitions responded to the on-line questionnaire, a return rate of 48% (with the coalition as the unit of analysis). From these coalitions, a total n= 121 responses are interpretable with the individual respondent as the unit of analysis. Although this represents an average of less than 2 respondents per coalition, it should be noted that a moderate range was observed in the number of respondents per coalition. Coalitions do vary in their size and the range of respondents from coalitions went from 1 to 8.
Key Informant Interviews

The reported use of external evaluators (paid or unpaid) was reviewed and followed up with a key informant interview (see Appendix B). The two relevant survey questions, those that identify the use of evaluators occur in the last section of the instrument. Twenty-two of the responding coalitions indicated that they worked with an external evaluator to determine effectiveness. These coalitions were sent e-mails requesting contact information for those individuals.

These follow-up interviews were utilized to confirm respondent perceptions regarding Evaluation Scope. It was expected that some survey respondents would have incomplete knowledge regarding evaluation plans and the use of multiple indicators, linkages between proximal and distal effects and the influence of contextual variables.

Evaluators were asked to describe (open-ended response): (a) a program or activity they evaluated during 2006-2007, (b) how data are collected, evaluation procedures, frequency of measurements, etc., (c) common data collection sources, (d) groups measured, (e) the use of process indicators, short term and long term outcomes, (f) barriers to measuring long term outcomes, and (g) the use of contextual variables. The interviews took anywhere from 15 to 30 minutes to complete. Evaluators answered questions over the phone after establishing a pre-arranged interview time.

Missing Data

Missing data in survey research results is random (ignorable) or systematic (non-ignorable) (Stevens, 2002). There is no one solution to the problem, as options include
sample mean or mode substitution, case deletion, variable deletion and maximum
likelihood estimates through statistical packages. Given the small sample size, case
deletion was not used. Variable (item) deletion was to be used if 20% or fewer of
respondents legitimately answered the question (≤ 24 coalition members). With n=121,
at least 80% of respondents (≥ 97) would have to have skipped the question or indicated
“Don’t Know”. The pattern of missing values is important, where a moderate amount of
it may be centered upon a few variables (Stevens, 2002).

For relational patterns, the interval data was treated through imputation of item
means with estimated values as determined by SPSS, Version 14. The program uses a
function that estimates means for empty cells. On the nominal and ordinal data items
(essentially the remainder of the questionnaire), missing data was recoded based upon
respondent agreement for multiple regression purposes. In other words, there were cases
in which some members from a coalition know information about finances while others
do not. Majority agreement on finances, evaluation scope and multiple sectors was taken
into account when creating the multiple regression data set, with the coalition as the unit
of analysis. Missing data in evaluation scope and finances was anticipated, since some
respondents (not frequently involved in evaluation, grant writing or budget reviews) may
not have understood or taken the time to answer these types of questions. Descriptive
tables demonstrated the level of the non-response patterns per section of the instrument.

Non-Respondent Bias

When respondents are similar to non-respondents on the study’s variables, the
findings become more applicable to the rest of the sampling frame and perhaps the target
population (Gay & Airasian, 2003). To determine whether respondents are similar to those within the total sampling frame, a randomly selected sample of 5 non-respondent coalitions was contacted for a phone interview. Respondent data was compared to that of non-respondents for similarity. No significant differences were found from t-testing; as such, the groups were ultimately combined for multiple regression purposes.

Data Analysis

Quantitative Data

The results from the coalition member responses are presented in descriptive tables. Percentages, frequency counts, means, standard deviations, and so forth are provided for quantitative variables. Typical community sectors, level of financial resources, and the degree of adequate working relationships within the coalitions are explored descriptively using individual respondent data. For evaluation scope, descriptive tables assist in shedding light on the types of indicators used, forms of data collection, the frequency of related measures, and the presence of external evaluators.

Analogously for the interviews, summary tables of emergent themes for the dependent variable are presented qualitatively. The tables illustrate frequent and less frequent evaluator responses.

In addition to describing the data, multiple regression concerning sector involvement (number of indicated sectors), financial levels (amounts from combined sources), relational patterns (Strongly Disagree-1 to Strongly Agree-5) and evaluation scope (low to high on a 14-point scale) was conducted. The method was chosen due to its utility in examining relationships between a single dependent (criterion) variable
(Evaluation Scope) and a set of independent (predictor) variables (Relational Patterns, Multiple Sectors, Financial Resources).

The degree of variance in the dependent variable attributable to the independent variables is assessed through beta-weights (Hair et al., 2000). The aggregated contribution of the set of predictors to the criterion is then considered. The statistical regression model for the multivariate portion of the study is \( Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Multiple Sectors}) + \beta_2(\text{Relational Patterns}) + \beta_3(\text{Finances}) + \epsilon \). Relationships between the independent variables and with the dependent variable were also reviewed.

With three predictor variables, a suggested sample size is \( n=45 \) coalitions (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 2000), or a ratio of 15 observations per independent variable. This study meets this ratio with a general rule being that the number of observations to independent variables should never fall below 5 to 1 to avoid over-fitting the model. That criterion was met in that there are at least 5 observations (coalitions) per independent variable.

**Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Measures**

This mixed method study is primarily quantitative, where numerically scaled questions drive the content areas of qualitative inquiry (which in this case focuses on the dependent variable). It was expected that the qualitative interviews with evaluators would further validate and assist with interpreting the quantitative scaling related to evaluation scope. The data from the two sources were compared and contrasted in order to determine areas in which they corroborated each other or disagreed.
Summary

The methodology of the study sought to address whether capacity factors were related to evaluation processes in coalitions. Multiple regression, commonly used to explain and predict relationships among variables, served this purpose. The correlations between the capacity variables were examined to see what patterns existed. Descriptive analysis characterizes these factors (commonly recruited sectors, typical financial levels and sources, range of relational patterns, and modes of measurement in evaluations). Evidence for inter-judge and internal consistency reliability and concurrent validity on the study’s on-line assessment was sought both quantitatively and qualitatively.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

This section contains the data and analyses for the capacity factors of multiple sector involvement, relational patterns, and estimated finances as reported by coalition members. The implied relationships between these predictors and the dependent variable of evaluation scope are examined descriptively and through exploratory multiple regression. A priori hypotheses concerning the value of one predictor over another have not been previously stated.

In accord with the objectives of the study (listed in Chapter 1), the narrative seeks to answers the previously stated research questions:

1. Do relational patterns, multiple sectors and finances influence the levels of evaluation scope?

2. Do coalitions measure multiple indicators over time to support linkages between proximal (short term) and distal (long term) effects? What are the common indicators used by coalitions and how often are they being measured?

3. What is the nature of evaluation planning among the sampled coalitions? Are they relying upon their own members or external consultants for evaluation? Does evaluation planning account for contextual variables? Do evaluation plans...
appear to vary as a function of coalition profile (such as dominant sector representation, local vs. federal funding, or reliance upon in kind donations?)

Sample Characteristics

One hundred and twenty one (121) members from 40 prevention coalitions in Ohio responded to an on-line questionnaire. One individual requested to be deleted from the data pool, stating they had not been able to give well-thought out responses and did not want to provide “bad” data. Thus, the final number of responses is 120. Statistics are presented with either the coalition grouping (n=40) or the individual member (n=120) as the unit of analysis.

In Table 4.1 the groupings that comprise the respondent sample are displayed. All of the responding coalitions, with the exception of the campus-community coalitions (6 out of 40), are members of the Statewide Prevention Coalition Association (SPCA). This association provides professional development and networking opportunities for its members who are representatives from prevention coalitions. These groups may be operating within a school, where some portion of the district budget provides prevention resources. They could be citizen-based entities within small communities working at specific times during the year (e.g., reducing underage drinking during high school prom season).

The campus-community coalitions are members of The Ohio College Initiative to Reduce High Risk Drinking. They consist of college representatives that include faculty, alcohol prevention specialists, residence life officials or judiciary personnel. Planned
activities center upon the prevention of binge drinking and other at risk behaviors among students. Very often their funding is inconsistent and based upon the university’s current prioritization of alcohol and drug prevention as a problem requiring an infrastructure (office and meeting space).

SPCA coalitions receiving federal and/or state grants (19) have been separately noted as such. The remainder (15) has been placed in the SPCA –Miscellaneous category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coalition Categories</th>
<th>Number of responding coalitions</th>
<th>% of sample (n=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAMHSA-CSAP Federal Grantees (2006-2007)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODADAS State Grantees (2006-2007)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of Federal and State (2006-2007)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Prevention Coalitions (SPCA)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-Community Coalitions (OCI)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Categories of the Coalition Sample

Equal numbers of SPCA coalitions are either federally funded (15/ 40) or receive no funding from known state or federal resources (15/ 40). The federal grantees get their monies from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration- Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (SAMHSA-CSAP) and must evaluate pre-determined process and intermediate indicators related to programs and activities. Results of their evaluations are sent to the federal reporting agency for compliance with grant requirements.

The least represented groupings are state grantees (2/ 40) and coalitions who have a combination of federal and state sources (2/ 40). State grantees are underwritten by the
Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services (ODADAS) for alcohol and drug prevention efforts in their communities. ODADAS-funded coalitions submit quarterly milestone reports that document progress (e.g., number of trainings conducted, number of students in attendance) toward goals.

Systematic Response Bias

It should be noted that portions of the questionnaire appear to have produced systematically low response rates from coalition representatives. Less than half of them (43%) chose to indicate the level of finances, which suggests they were not willing or able to estimate resources. They simply may not have enough budgetary awareness to have offered an answer. Similarly, the items related to evaluation scope produced the lowest response rates (31%), perhaps due to a lack of knowledge about plans. Conversely, multiple sectors and relational patterns produced the highest (100% and 95%, respectively) (see Table 4.2.) Representatives appeared to be better equipped to answer the items about types of members recruited and how they communicate and make decisions.

A notable response discrepancy exists between evaluation scope (31%) and miscellaneous evaluation items (44%). It may be that individuals did not have access to information on the indicators measured and the frequency of their use (components of evaluation scope), yet they speculated about the presence of an external evaluator, plans to link short and long term effects, or the assessment of contextual variables (miscellaneous items).
Since each variable contained different forms of scaling, reliability and validity are not considered in the same manner across them. As mentioned in Chapter 3, all items were carefully reviewed and then pilot-tested with a panel of experts to enhance face and content validity and reliability.

### Multiple Sectors

Inter-rater reliability for multiple sectors was examined through the agreement of coalition members. The number of coalitions with >70% individual agreement are depicted in Table 4.3 for the top three sectors (>50% of respondents indicating involvement). As shown, a high level of consistency between members was obtained for 14 to 17 responding coalitions out of the total set of 40.

Schools and law enforcement were the sectors with the highest number of coalitions in agreement (17 and 16, respectively). Schools, law enforcement and civic groups likely produced these rates due to their inclusion in prevention coalition plans. Community groups often disseminate alcohol and drug prevention training in schools while utilizing law enforcement to assist with school-based efforts (e.g., School Resource Officer programs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>% of sample (n=120)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Sectors</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Patterns</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Scope</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Items</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Proportion of Total Sample Responding to Each Questionnaire Domain

Reliability and Validity

Since each variable contained different forms of scaling, reliability and validity are not considered in the same manner across them. As mentioned in Chapter 3, all items were carefully reviewed and then pilot-tested with a panel of experts to enhance face and content validity and reliability.
Sectors | # of coalitions with >.70 inter-rater consistency (n=40)
--- | ---
Schools | 17
Law Enforcement | 16
Civic and Volunteer Groups | 14

Table 4.3: The Number of Coalitions with High Internal Agreement on Top-Rated Sectors

Except for these 3 sectors (out of a possible 20), the overall scale appears to have low reliability in terms of inter-rater agreement. It is possible that for these volunteer respondents, the true sector composition of the coalition is unknown. In addition, some members may not be privy to plans that would specify activities for particular sectors. Thus the lack of reliability does not seem to be due to a misunderstanding of the question, since all 120 respondents indicated some degree of sector involvement.

Relational Patterns

An internal consistency measure, Cronbach’s $\alpha$, was employed for the 14 questions pertaining to relational patterns. Cronbach’s $\alpha$ represents the proportion of true variance (results of true differences among respondents) to observed variance (Stevens, 2002). When $\alpha > .80$, there is an underlying construct being measured within the items.

After imputing each item’s mean (n=27 empty cells) with the individual respondent data set (n=120), Relational Patterns was reviewed for sampling adequacy (the items represent a high proportion of true variance rather than error). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure had sampling adequacy among the items (KMO=.899), with a high proportion of true variance (> .70) being caused by underlying factors.
According to Stevens (2002), <.50 indicates a high degree of error and a low amount of actual variance explained.

To determine whether the correlations among the items form an identity matrix of unrelated variables (1.00 on the diagonal and 0 in the off-diagonal), Bartlett’s test was conducted and the Chi-Square statistic, 935.81, was rejected at p<.05. This means that the correlations among the items do not represent an identity matrix. The computed reliability index, Cronbach’s $\alpha$, was .918, underscoring a high degree of internal consistency among the 14 items.

**Finances**

Reliability concerning type of finances was viewed from the standpoint of consistency in responses between community partners, similar to the schema applied to sectors. For all categories of federal, state, local and in-kind donations, 6 out of 40 coalitions showed respondent agreement (> .70) on the funding being received. In other words, 70% or more of a coalition’s members agreed upon the level of federal, state and local funding.

In most of the cases, however, only a small number (1-2 individuals) provided financial information for the entire coalition. It may be that some community partners are not be privy to or otherwise not willing to report budgetary information, which makes the scale somewhat unreliable (especially for these types of respondents).

**Evaluation Scope**

As with financial resources, the scale of evaluation scope produced infrequent responses with 1-2 coalition members giving such data for the entire coalition. As
explained in Chapter 3, these partial responses were recoded into a 1-14 schema (per coalition) for use in multiple regression. Gaining levels of agreement for purposes of inter-judge inconsistency at the individual level was discarded as futile because of the low response rate.

To enhance inter-rater reliability in the recoding process to the 14-point schema, an independent coder (a graduate student in an M.B.A. program) was provided a random sample of 10 coalition questionnaires printed from the electronic data base. The researcher and independent coder agreed in 9 out of the 10 cases. Reviewing the decision rules listed in Chapter 3, it was decided to change the researcher’s response concerning 1 coalition to match the coder’s.

The key informant interviews served as markers for concurrent validity on the evaluation scope items. As will be shown later in this chapter, the average evaluation scope is nearer the level of one-time assessment, even with combinations of process, intermediate, and less frequent outcome measures. Interviewed evaluators confirmed this pattern.

Variable Characteristics

Predictor Variable: Multiple Sectors

The multiple sectors variable was defined by the 120 respondents checking off a list of 20 possible community sectors. From Table 4.4, the most common sectors chosen were schools (85%), law enforcement (67%), civic and volunteer groups (64%), health services/medical (59%), mental health/wellness (59%), social services (58%) and parents (52%).
The least common sectors (residence life, Greek system) come from campus-community coalitions that were only 12.5% of the sample. Less than 20% of the sample completed the “Other” category, citing alcohol and drug prevention specialists, other anti-drug coalitions, parks and recreation, parent-serving organizations, alumni, disabled individuals, and university professionals.

Phi coefficients between the sectors were derived to ascertain the propensity of including one sector with another. The Phi coefficient is essentially a Pearson r correlation between 2 dichotomous variables (Gravetter & Wallneau, 2004). Hence, it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>(% of sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic and Volunteer Groups</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services/ Medical</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health/ Wellness</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Based</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/ Retail</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial System</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected/ Appointed Officials</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Youth</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>&lt;20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Officials</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek System</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Level of Community Sector Involvement (n=120)
represents the strength of the relationship between these variables (.50 indicates a moderate correlation). Just as with Pearson, an \( r^2 \) value may be derived to report the proportion of variance in one variable attributable to the influence of the other.

Checking off a community sector such as Schools or Parents would be considered a “yes” response to inclusion in the coalition. Each sector was treated as an either a 0 (no) or 1 (yes) variable. Table 4.5 provides a Phi coefficient table produced between Parents and Schools as an example (see Table 4.6 for the complete set of significant Phi coefficients, p<.05).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi (\( \Phi \)) = .248, p=.007  n=120

Table 4.5: Sample Phi Table for Dichotomously-Coded Multiple Sectors

The above table indicates that when 58 coalition members stated parental involvement, they also indicated schools. There were 44 members who did not choose parents as a sector but indicated schools, and so forth. The Phi coefficient, of .248 and \( r^2 = .06 \), suggests a rather small correlation between schools and parents with 6% of the variance being explained. This appears to be only somewhat reflective of the field, since coalition sponsored prevention programs in schools would be expected to have a higher relationship between these two variables.
Notable relationships also exist between law enforcement, business (retail) and parents. Law enforcement liaisons may be part of a coalition’s membership via increased patrols (DUI stops) in a geographical area or when coalitions provide vendor/server training in an area, officers will go undercover to perform compliance checks to ascertain whether IDs are checked. This last example helps to explain the moderate correlation, $\Phi = .325$, $p=.000$, between law enforcement and retail (Table 4.6). The relationship between parents and law enforcement is also particularly interesting ($\Phi = .483$, $p=.000$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Phi-coefficient</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools/ Law Enforcement</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/ Judicial</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/ Elected Officials</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/ Parents</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/ Law Enforcement</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/ Residence Life</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/ Elected</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/ Community Youth</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/ Law Enforcement</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/ Residents</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/ Students</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/ Athletic Officials</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/ Community Youth</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media/ Law Enforcement</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media/ Community Youth</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based/ Community Youth</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/ Law Enforcement</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/ Students</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/ Social Services</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Phi-Coefficients Between Sectors (n=120)
Nearly 23% of the variance in law enforcement may be attributable to the inclusion of parents, and vice versa. This may be due to coalitions that disseminate media messages aimed at reducing the number of parents who host underage drinking parties around prom time and athletic events. Law enforcement is often involved in increasing local patrols related to this problem, being alert to this activity among adolescents, and preventing or stopping it through citations and/or arrests.

Coalitions that include schools tend to work with law enforcement, the judiciary (probation officers) and elected officials (mayors), as shown in the table. Both residents and business/retail were less frequently mentioned by respondents; but they do occur together in the same coalition ($\Phi = .374, p=.000$).

Community groups that associate with civic organizations are not apt to do so with residence life ($\Phi = -.210, p=.021$). This is indicative of campus-based coalitions that often seek involvement from freshmen and sophomore dormitory staff; however, they appear self-contained and may not seek civic support as much as community-based coalitions.

The correlations appear to provide additional evidence for the content validity of the multiple sectors section. They reflect known composition and activity among prevention-based entities, enhancing the argument that the certain sectors broadly represent specific types of coalitions.

Predictor Variable: Relational Patterns

Coalition members (average of 114 per question, or 95% of sample) answered a Likert-type scale from Strongly Disagree- 1 to Strongly Agree- 5 for each of the items
that collectively define the scale of relational patterns. The means and standard deviations (S.D.) for each item are presented in Table 4.7.

Respondents rated highly (≥4 out of 5) 64% of the questions regarding compromise in planning, commitment to goals, and a belief that the coalition can impact the community. The members reported positively on democratic operational processes, including informal communications outside meetings and keeping members inside the
information loop. They were less sure about equal distribution of tasks within the
collegation (mean = 3.24, s.d., =1.14) and sharing of leadership (mean = 3.26, s.d. = 1.17).
This implies that a core group of individuals takes ownership and completes most of the
work, whereas others may fill in gaps or complete special projects based upon expertise
as needed. Similarly, the finding suggests that membership is stable, changing
infrequently or possibly only when there is a revision in priorities.

**Predictor Variable: Finances**

Less than half (43%) of the sample reported any level of local/civic, federal, or
state funding (see Table 4.8). The majority of responding members (38/61) noted civic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Sample Responding (n=120)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 to &lt;50,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 to &lt;100,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to &lt;200,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 to &lt;50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 to &lt;100,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to &lt;200,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 to &lt;50,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 to &lt;100,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to &lt;200,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Number of Civic, State and Federal Financial Sources Reported
funding of less than $30,000 per year. This was not the case for state funding, where nearly an equal number of respondents (17 to 19 out of 51) indicated the funding levels of <$30,000 and $50,000 to <$100,000, respectively. The majority of federally funded respondents (31/45) receive less than $30,000 per year. A very small number of either civic, state or federal recipients went above $200,000 or more per category.

Participants were asked to estimate the level of in-kind support (donated meeting space, supplies, etc.) for fiscal year 2006-2007 through open-ended response. Less than half of the sample (55/120) responded to this question. The resulting distribution of charitable donations is positively skewed (skewness = 3.24), with most responses on the lower end of the continuum. Wide variability exists with this item (minimum = $250, maximum = $100,000). The mode of the distribution was $5,000; the median, $19,200.

When financial information was given, it was used at the coalition level for the multiple regression analysis. For example, the level of federal funding with the highest rate of consistency (e.g., 2/3 respondents, or 67%, indicating <$30,000) was the measure of the federal financial level for that coalition.

Financial levels based upon majority agreement were averaged per coalition. Each coalition was ultimately coded from 1 (<$30,000) to 5 (>=$200,000) on an ordinal scale. Thus if the federal funding was between $30,000 and <$50,000 (majority agreement), a coalition was coded with a “2” and if the majority <$30,000 for state funding, a scale value of “1” was assigned. If no civic sources were cited, its value was “0” and the final coalition score for funding was “1.5” for multiple regression purposes. In-kind donations were excluded since they were not a consistent and tangible funding source (in actual monies) for planning, implementation, and evaluation processes.
Using the coalition as the unit of analysis, 24 had annual funds of <$50,000 per year with 16 having >$50,000 per year. Table 4.9 contains the distribution of funding levels. The maximum level achieved an average ranking of 3.94 (between $50,000 and <$100,000 and $100,000 to <$200,000)). In some cases, coalition members indicated <$30,000 across all levels of funding (average = 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: Distribution of Coalition Finances (n=40)

Miscellaneous Items Related to Evaluation Planning

Five miscellaneous items were at the end of the questionnaire to assist with interpreting evaluation activity. Table 4.10 includes the frequency of affirmative responses to questions related to the presence of a paid or unpaid evaluator, reliance upon members for evaluation, measurement of context variables not specific to program or activity outcomes, and the establishment of linkages between short and long term effects.

Very few respondents, 14, reported working with an external evaluator on a volunteer basis (Table 4.10). In fact, 30 members reported their coalitions paid for evaluation services. A total of 22 coalitions had at least one member reporting either a paid or unpaid evaluator.
Table 4.10: Frequency of Affirmative Responses Related to Miscellaneous Items  
* Numbers reflect “yes” responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency (# of respondents)</th>
<th>% of sample responding (n=120)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pays external evaluator</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works with unpaid, external evaluator</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance upon membership for evaluation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement of context variables</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans link short terms and long term</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents to these items indicated that their plans link short term and long term effects (51/59), measure context variables (42/55), and that they pay for an external evaluator (30/52). Less than half (26/53), stated they depend upon members for evaluation activities.

Dependent Variable: Evaluation Scope

Evaluation scope had the fewest responses (previously noted in Table 4.2) with the question regarding intermediate, one time assessment (the 3rd item in the categorization below) receiving the most responses (40% answering either a “yes” or “no”, Table 4.11). Less numbers of individuals indicated any intermediate or impact, multiple assessments. The remainder answered “Don’t Know” or skipped the question. Whether some members viewed these questions as “no’s” and therefore chose to not respond isn’t clear. However, a suspicion is that this may be the case.
Phi coefficients were also calculated on the indicators selected by coalition members based on yes or no responses that could be examined for patterns. The use of one-time process indicators was highly correlated with one-time intermediate ($\Phi = .614$, $p=.001$) and one-time outcome ($\Phi = .525$, $p=.007$) ones. Repeated process indicators were highly associated with repeated intermediate ($\Phi = .391$, $p=.035$) and repeated outcomes ($\Phi = .497$, $p=.010$).

There were no correlations between one-time and multiple assessment levels. Thirty five members checked off the measurement of process indicators at one time, but only 17 indicated them at multiple points in time (Table 4.11). Similar trends are apparent for intermediate and impact indicators.

The dependent variable of evaluation scope was recoded from the individual respondent data based upon the schematic in Chapter 3. Fourteen (14) of the 40 responding groups originally did not report any evaluation activity; hence, their value on the variable was 0. From follow-up phone calls with 6 of them, three cases were on the upper end (8-14, the upper part of the range for evaluation scope) and two at the lower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Scope Item</th>
<th>Frequency (# of members)*</th>
<th>% of Sample Responding (n=120)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process/ one time</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/ multiple</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate/ one time</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate/ multiple</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact/ one time</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact/multiple</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11: Frequency of Affirmative Responses to Evaluation Scope Items
* Numbers reflect “yes” responses
end (1-7). In one instance, the zero value was verbally confirmed over the phone. That coalition had no grant or agency funding that necessitated reporting of process or intermediate findings on either a single or repeated basis. Similarly, one respondent to the on-line questionnaire noted that their coalition did not evaluate its activity. As a result of what was learned in the follow-up process, it was decided to retain the 0 when a different evaluation scope value could not be determined. Imputing means would be based upon an assumption that evaluation activity existed for a coalition group, which may not be realistic.

The final data for the 0-14 scale is in Table 4.12. The majority (63%) of coalitions fell in the lower end of the continuum, with most evaluating one time during 2006-2007. The remainder (37%) appears to be evaluating at multiple points during the period. Seven out of 15 coalitions using multiple assessments (as shown in the modal category for the last half of the continuum) report a combination of process, intermediate and impact indicators in their plans.

An uneven distribution is apparent in Table 4.12; a normal distribution would show the majority of cases around a central mean. Coalitions are concentrated at the 3 main points of 0 (n = 9), process, intermediate, and impact at one time (8), and process, intermediate, and impact at multiple times (7).

The distribution for evaluation scope is shown in Table 4.13. With a mean of 6.28, the coalitions, on average, fell onto the lower end of the continuum, with 8 on a scale of 14 being the beginning point for multiple assessments. The slightly positive skew in the table is evidence of the fact that the majority (25/40) of coalitions
Table 4.12: Frequency of Levels Associated with Evaluation Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency (# of coalitions)</th>
<th>% of sample (n=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/ one time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate/ one time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact/ one time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/ intermediate one time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/ impact one time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate/ impact one time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/ intermediate/ impact one time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/ multiple</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate/ multiple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact/ multiple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/ intermediate/ multiple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/ impact/ multiple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate/ impact/ multiple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/ intermediate/ impact/ multiple</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13: Statistical Characteristics of Evaluation Scope (n=40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of Indicators

Participants were asked to list actual process, intermediate or outcome indicators and the frequency of their measurement during the year. Members from 14 coalitions
(out of 15 indicating repeated measures) responded to the prompt. Attendance rates and the number of training sessions are modal categories for the process level (Table 4.14) and self-reported substance use and related attitudes are frequently mentioned in the intermediate range.

Few coalitions (3) listed examples of impact (Table 4.14). This low response rate does not fully coincide with the quantitative portion of the survey (see Table 4.12) that had 7 groups using combinations of process, intermediate, and impact assessment at multiple points in time. It seems that impact assessment was perceived among individuals from the 7 coalitions, but they could not or were not willing to articulate the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators measured &gt; once per year</th>
<th># of coalitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in attendance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of activities (training sessions/ events)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of surveys</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance checks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parent resources</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen board presentations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parent groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self report substance use</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward alcohol use</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge pre and post (e.g., vendor trainings, effects of alcohol)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug related youth arrests</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of citizens wearing seat belts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of underage alcohol violations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14: Cited Process, Intermediate and Outcome Indicators (n=14 coalitions)
actual indicators qualitatively. For example, in 4 coalitions, at least one member checked “yes” for outcome assessment at multiple times but neglected to provide the actual impact variables and their frequency of measurement.

Other inconsistencies were observed for the evaluation variable. Occasionally, process indicators (number of trainings) were listed as intermediate by the respondent and re-categorized by the researcher, based upon definitions in the questionnaire. Either respondents misunderstood terms or entered the information haphazardly.

**Key Informants**

When coalitions reported working with an evaluator, they were contacted with a request to provide evaluator phone and/or e-mail information. Nine out of 22 responded and seven evaluators agreed to provide interview data (see Appendix B for phone interview protocol). The evaluation scope of these 7 coalitions averages 10.57 with a standard deviation of 3.36. This is a higher evaluation scope than the overall sample (mean = 5.60) and is on the higher end of the 14 point continuum, i.e., a propensity for process and intermediate assessment at multiple times.

Evaluator responses are depicted in Tables 4.15-4.17 for questions regarding the use of process, intermediate and impact/ outcome assessment. The key informant data is parallel to the indicator data in Table 4.14. As with those responses, evaluators frequently cited the number of activities and attendance rates as process indicators.
Evaluators, however, mentioned process evaluation directly related to program integrity (nature of sessions) while on-line respondents focused more on deliverables (number of sessions). Both groups reported perception and attitudinal surveys as primary intermediate examples with few outcome measures at the community level (public arrest records for underage violations).

The informants also described commonly evaluated activities and data collection methods (Table 4.16). The most frequent comments dealt with community campaigns aimed to reduce a problematic behavior such as underage drinking. Most evaluators noted the use of classroom-based surveys to collect data. Public records that could be used for impact assessment occurred much less frequently.

### Table 4.15: Key Themes from Evaluator Interviews on Types of Indicators Used in Evaluation Plans (n=7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplars from key informant interviews</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of classrooms, number of participants, length/nature of sessions, fidelity data</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of activities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved sectors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self reported substance use (30-day)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived substance use among peers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of risk</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental disapproval toward use</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of onset</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward academic performance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and decision making processes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug (ATOD) Incident Data</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.16: Key Themes from Evaluator Interviews on Programs, Data Collection, and Measured Groups (n=7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplars from key informant interviews</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programs/ Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-drug media campaign</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School substance abuse prevention curriculum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition functioning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom–based awareness surveys</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom-based reported substance use surveys</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student focus groups</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone interviews (parents)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community forums</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public records (juvenile and adult arrests)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone and personal interviews (coalition members)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field monitoring</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measured Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students, parents and community members comprised the groups measured most often. Community forums were cited as ways to both collect and provide results to communities for clarification of issues and “next steps”.

Perceived barriers to evaluation and the measurement of contextual variables are depicted in Table 4.17. The barriers aligned with themes in the literature related to
Table 4.17: Key Themes from Evaluator Interviews on Use of Contextual Variables and Barriers to Evaluation (n=7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception among school personnel that evaluation is not important</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances for survey administration and analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No on-going evaluation during the year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to identify comparison groups in communities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of data is speculative (self report)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really any barriers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveying empirical language to groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context and Non-Program Specific Variables</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status (SES)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of parental conversation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to college-age peers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental education level</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17: Key Themes from Evaluator Interviews on Use of Contextual Variables and Barriers to Evaluation (n=7)

evaluation processes (inability to systematically collect data collection or to employ comparison groups). Low finances and a lack of support from school personnel were additionally cited.

The most frequent contextual variable was socioeconomic status. More than one evaluator mentioned parental communication, peer assessment, and parental educational level as other influential variables.

Relationship between miscellaneous items and evaluation scope

The responses of participants who chose options about the use vs. non-use of an evaluator (paid or unpaid) were investigated in relation to the measurement of context, reliance upon members, and the establishment of linkages (all dichotomous variables amenable to Phi coefficient calculations). Moreover, a point-biserial was determined for the use of an evaluator (0, no or 1, yes) and evaluation scope (see Table 4.18).
Reliance upon members for evaluation or assistance with it was not related significantly to any other variables in this section (Table 4.18). Reliance upon members for evaluation is slightly and negatively correlated with the use of an evaluator ($r = -0.091$). This inverse relationship, although weak and non-significant, suggests that when members collect data and accomplish their own reporting, an evaluator is not often consulted. When reliance upon members is reported, it is not significantly related to evaluation scope ($r = 0.211$), the establishment of linkages ($r = 0.182$) or the measurement of context ($r = 0.182$).

If coalitions do utilize an evaluator, they have a stronger evaluation scope ($r = 0.611$, $p < 0.01$), establish links between short and long term results ($r = 0.649$, $p < 0.01$), and measure contextual variables ($r = 0.441$, $p < 0.01$). The coefficients of determination ($r^2$) for these relationships (not in the table) indicate that the use of an evaluator predicts 37% of the variance in evaluation scope, 42% of it in the establishment of links and 19% in the measurement of context. The use of an evaluator has a stronger association with the first

![Table 4.18: Point-biserial ($r_{pb}$) Correlations and Phi ($\Phi$) Coefficients Between Use of Evaluator, Evaluation Scope, and Miscellaneous Variables (n=40)](table_image)

**Correlation significant $p<.01$ (2-tailed)

*Correlation significant $p<.05$ (2-tailed)
two variables than the latter. Further, when links are established between short and long term effects, contextual variables are measured in a notable way ($r=\.787, p<.01$). The coalitions with higher evaluation scope have a tendency to establish linkages ($r=\.497, p<.01$) and measure context ($r=\.404, p<.01$).

Relationships between evaluation scope and type of sector

The composition of reported multiple sectors (schools, businesses) was reviewed at the respondent level as a potential influence on evaluation scope. Phi coefficients were calculated on sectors with more than 50% of respondents so indicating (schools, civic groups, law enforcement). Those indicating school participation (85% of sample) were significantly more likely to utilize process ($\Phi=\.606, p=.00$) measurement at one point during the year. Thus, 36% of the variance in process measurement at one point in time can be explained through the recruitment of schools. Process indicators might be numbers of printed resources or trainings with students or parents.

Relationship between evaluation items and categories of funding

The miscellaneous items and components of evaluation scope were examined in terms of funding sources (local, state, federal or in-kind donations). Federal and state funding usually comes with the requirement that evaluation data be turned into a coordinating department or agency on a systematic basis.

Although most analyses were non-significant at the individual level, receipt of federal funding and use of intermediate measures (self reported substance use) was significant ($\Phi=\.834, p=.011$) from 16 respondents to both questions ($n=16$). This coincides with federal grantees needing to report intermediate indicators as part of grants.
To further understand the association between finances and evaluation planning, a point-biserial correlation was computed for coalitions receiving less than $50,000 and those receiving more than $50,000. Evaluation scope was significantly different for those receiving <$50,000 and those receiving more than 50,000 (mean = 4.75 and 8.56, and \( r_{pb} = .373, p=.018 \)). This highlights the apparently strong association between finances and evaluation scope.

**Non-Responding Coalitions**

Five non-responding coalitions were followed up via telephone interviews to determine if they varied from 5 randomly selected responding ones (Table 4.19). Although higher evaluation scope exists on non-responding coalitions than on responding ones, in all cases t-testing of mean differences (Table 4.19) was non-significant at \( \alpha = .05 \). As a result of small differences, data from the 5 coalitions were added to the total sample for multiple regression analysis (see revised distribution, n=45, in Table 4.20).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Responding Mean</th>
<th>Non-Responding Mean</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Scope (DV)</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Sectors</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Patterns</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19: Differences on Key Variables Between Responding and Non-responding Coalitions (n=10)
Multiple Regression

Multiple regression was used to study the main questions of this investigation. The data were checked for the assumptions of independence, normality, linearity of the predictor variables with the dependent variable, multi-collinearity, and homogeneity of variance (through a review of the residuals). The coalition was the unit of analysis with each responding independently; hence, the independence assumption is met.

Descriptive statistics on pertinent variables are in Table 4.20. A Shapiro-Wilk (S-W) test was conducted for each variable and only relational patterns was normally distributed (p>.05). The slightly positive skew of evaluation scope indicates that more cases fall within the lower end of the 14-point continuum than the upper end, leaving the distribution imbalanced. The reverse is true for multiple sectors, with 27 of the 45 coalitions (60%) with more than 11 sectors. The slight negative skew of relational patterns suggests that for the majority of respondents are generally positive for this variable. For finances, the positive skew reveals that lower levels of funding predominate, with 26 of the 45 coalitions at or below $50,000 per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>S-W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Scope (DV)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.886*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Sectors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.944*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Patterns</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.812*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20: Descriptive Statistics for Predictor and Criterion Variables (n=45)
*p<.05
Even in studies with small or moderate sample sizes and deviations from multivariate normality, there is a limited effect on Type I error (Stevens, 2002). The same is true for skewness. Moreover, the central limit theorem states that independent observations approaches normality as $n$ increases. This progression toward normality may begin at as few as 10 to 20 observations.

Evidence for linearity between each of the predictor variables and the criterion was reviewed through bivariate scatterplots. In each case, there was a subtle clustering of data points from left to right in an ascending fashion, as shown in Figure 4.1 (presented here as an example). Figure 4.1 as multiple sectors increases, so does evaluation scope in a positive, linear direction. The nine cases with 0 evaluation scope are reflected on the bottom row in a horizontal fashion, likely reducing the correlation and decreasing the linearity somewhat.

Figure 4.1: Bivariate Scatterplot Between Multiple Sectors and Evaluation Scope
An optimal scenario is that predictor variables correlate with the dependent variable and not with each other (Stevens, 2002), a pattern seen in Table 4.21. Predictors should be measuring different constructs and be able to explain/predict separate portions of the variance in the dependent variable. Multicollinearity does not appear to be the case since all correlations between the predictors are non-significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Scope</th>
<th>Multiple Sectors</th>
<th>Relational Patterns</th>
<th>Finances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Scope (DV)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Sectors</td>
<td>.388*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Patterns</td>
<td>.299*</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>.441**</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.21: Pearson r Values Between Predictor and Criterion Variables (n=45)  
*p<.01**  *p<.05*

The level of finances (r=.441, p<.01) and multiple sector involvement (r=.388, p<.05) increase with evaluation scope (Table 4.21). Evaluation varies less, but still significantly, as a function of relational patterns (r=.299, p<.05). Finances predicts 20% ($r^2$ based on the zero order correlation) of the variance in evaluation scope while multiple sectors is able to predict 15% of the variance.

Partial correlations between the variables (Table 4.22) were generated to determine the relative contribution made by each predictor variable to evaluation scope while controlling for the effect of finances. For sectors and relational patterns, the correlation with evaluation scope drops (by .051 and .094, respectively) when finances is partialled out (held constant). The partial correlation between evaluation scope and sectors is .337, p<.05; which represents a decrease from the .388, p<.01 (Table 4.21). The link between relational patterns and evaluation scope drops off even more. Multiple
sectors still appears to be a possible predictor of note for evaluation scope (partial correlation = .337), when accounting for finances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Scope</th>
<th>Multiple Sectors</th>
<th>Relational Patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Scope (DV)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Sectors</td>
<td>.337*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Patterns</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22: Partial Correlations between Predictor and Criterion Variables with Finances Held Constant (n=45)
*p<.05

After reviewing the bivariate and partial correlations, five regression models were postulated and examined (Table 4.23). In the first, finances is entered sequentially based upon bivariate correlations (Table 4.21) followed by the remaining predictors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Statistical Models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M1</strong> Evaluation Scope = β₀ + β₁ (Finances) + ε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2</strong> Evaluation Scope = β₀ + β₁ (Finances) + β₂ (Multiple Sectors) + ε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M3</strong> Evaluation Scope = β₀ + β₁ (Finances) + β₂ (Multiple Sectors) + β₃ (Relational Patterns) + ε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M4</strong> Evaluation Scope = β₀ + β₁ (Finances) + β₂ (Multiple Sectors) + β₃ (Relational Patterns) + β₄ (Finances * Multiple Sectors) + ε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M5</strong> Evaluation Scope = β₀ + β₁ (Finances) + β₂ (Multiple Sectors) + β₃ (Relational Patterns) + β₄ (Finances * Multiple Sectors) + β₅ (Finances * Relational Patterns) + ε.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23: Proposed Statistical Regression Models Between the Predictors, Interaction Terms, and Criterion

Interaction terms were created for two additional models (Models 4 and 5) combining finances with multiple sectors and finances with relational patterns.

The results of the models are in Table 4.24. When terms significantly contribute to a dependent variable, explained regression units can be compared with residual error.
(ε) shown by the F-statistic (\( \text{MS}_{\text{regression}} / \text{MS}_{\text{residual}} \)) (Stevens, 2002). Although the value of the F-statistic decreases from Models 1 through 5, statistical significance is retained.

Related to the explanatory ability of a regression model is the standard error of the estimate (SE), or Root Mean Square Error (RMSE). This is extracted from SPSS Output Version 14 by taking the square root of \( \text{MS}_{\text{residual}} \) per regression model. The five RMSE indices in Table 4.24 are a measure of how accurately each model predicts variance in evaluation scope by estimating the standard deviation of prediction errors (Hair et al., 1998). The RMSE decreases between Models 1 and 2. This error increases from Models 3-5 with the addition of relational patterns and the interaction terms failing to influence evaluation scope in a discernible or meaningful way.

The SE for each unstandardized beta (\( \beta_1 \)) per model and constant term (\( \beta_0 \)) are also presented to indicate their respective prediction errors. These slope coefficients and constant terms become less reliable as relational patterns and the interaction terms are added into the picture. Increased SE and decreased unstandardized betas are conditions occurring in Models 3-5 due to explanations offered later.

Taking each model sequentially, Model 1 illustrates the predictive ability of finances as referred to previously from simple correlations. The \( R^2 \) of .20 is significant at \( p<.01 \) with finances predicting 20% of the variance in evaluation scope. Every 1-unit increase in finances, on average, produces 2.09 units of change in evaluation scope. The RMSE is appropriately small at 4.59.
In Model 2, Multiple Sectors is added to see its contribution to explaining the variance of the dependent measure, over and above the contribution of finances. $R^2$ of .29 is significant at $p<.01$ and the two variables together now predict 29% of the variance in evaluation scope. The inclusion of the second variable explains 9% more of the variance, over and above that explained by finances. Every 1-unit increase in finances produces 1.79 units of change in evaluation scope when controlling for sectors, significant at $p<.01$. The addition of 1 community sector produces .31 units (nearly ½ a unit) of change in evaluation scope when controlling for finances, significant at $p<.05$.

The unstandardized slope parameters of 1.79 and .31 cannot be directly compared

### Table 4.24: Estimated Slope Coefficients (Unstandardized) with Standard Error for the Regression Models Predicting Evaluation Scope by Finances, Multiple Sectors, and Relational Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>M5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept ($β_0$)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-4.41</td>
<td>-3.61</td>
<td>-2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Standard Error-SE)</td>
<td>(1.47)</td>
<td>(1.84)</td>
<td>(4.48)</td>
<td>(4.91)</td>
<td>(10.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances ($β_1$)</td>
<td>2.09**</td>
<td>1.79**</td>
<td>1.63*</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SE)</td>
<td>(.65)</td>
<td>(.63 )</td>
<td>(.65 )</td>
<td>(1.75)</td>
<td>(6.34 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Sectors (MS) ($β_2$)</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SE)</td>
<td>(.14)</td>
<td>(.14 )</td>
<td>(.27 )</td>
<td>(.28 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Patterns (RP) ($β_3$)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SE)</td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td>(1.22)</td>
<td>(2.57)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances * MS ($β_4$)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SE)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances * RP ($β_5$)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SE)</td>
<td>(1.47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $R^2$  | .20   | .29   | .30   | .31   | .31   |
| F      | 10.40** | 8.42** | 5.92** | 4.40** | 3.43* |
| (df1, df2) | (1.43)| (2.42)| (3.41)| (4.40)| (5.39)|

| Standard Error (SE) of the Estimate (RMSE) | 4.59 | 4.37 | 4.38 | 4.42 | 4.48 |

*p<.05  **p<.01  

Table 4.24: Estimated Slope Coefficients (Unstandardized) with Standard Error for the Regression Models Predicting Evaluation Scope by Finances, Multiple Sectors, and Relational Patterns
(e.g., subtracted), since they were not generated from the same scale. In other words, .31 cannot be said to be less meaningful than 1.79 simply because of its seemingly lower value. The RMSE decreases between the first 2 models, to 4.37.

Model 3 includes Relational Patterns. Here, 30% of the variance in evaluation scope is now explained. Although based on this model, a 1-unit increase in Relational Patterns, on average, produces 1.17 units of change in evaluation scope after controlling for finances and multi sectors, the effect of Relational Patterns is statistically non-significant. Given that only 1% of variance is added and the relative contribution of Relational Patterns is not significant, the model including all three predictors does not appear to be the most statistically sound for estimating evaluation scope. Model 3 further highlights the utility of finances and multiple sectors, since both unstandardized beta-weights remain significant.

When the two interaction terms are included (Models 4 and 5), the relative contributions of finances and multiple sectors are lost as denoted by their non-significant betas. The interaction terms do not contribute to explaining evaluation scope as evidenced through the slight 1% increase in R². The predictors in Models 4 and 5 are essentially competing to explain variance in the dependent variable. This implies that a multicollinearity problem (associations between 3 or more independent variables) arose when the interaction terms were tested along with the single predictors.

Given the above results, it seems clear that Model 1 is superior to Models 2-5. Although the combination of finances and multiple sectors produces nearly 1/3 of the explanation in scope variance, finances accounts for 20% on its own. The 9% through
multiple sectors should not be discounted because it produces a decrease in RMSE and 9% could be considered significant in such a small sample.

It is not surprising that a model violation appears to exist in the residual histogram between standardized residuals and predicted y values (see Figure 4.2) for Model 1. Both evaluation scope and finances had more cases at the lower end of their respective scales. Standardized residuals should be normally distributed, with most measures congregating about the mean of 0. Here, many residuals congregate in the lower end of the continuum between 2 and 0.

![Histogram of the Standardized Residuals Between Finances and Evaluation Scope (Model 1)](image)

Figure 4.2: Histogram of the Standardized Residuals Between Finances and Evaluation Scope (Model 1)

A review of the bivariate plot between standardized residuals and predicted values of evaluation scope displayed constant variance, however more cases cluster toward the left half of the X-axis continuum. Although the pattern suggests homoscedasticity
(Figure 4.3), Model 1 does not consistently estimate evaluation scope since fewer coalitions utilized multiple assessments or showed high degrees of funding.

![Bivariate Scatterplot Between Standardized Predicted Y and Standardized Residual (Model 1)](image)

Figure 4.3: Bivariate Scatterplot Between Standardized Predicted Y and Standardized Residual (Model 1)

With the violations of normality, caution is advocated before accepting the first model. The level of finances predicts a significant proportion of the variance in evaluation scope of coalitions, but does so for less active than for more active ones. Again, this may be due to the apparent dominance of one-time assessment in this data set.

The skewness of evaluation scope has affected the ability to present a multiple regression model that fully meets the assumptions of normality. Given the low response rates for the dependent variable of evaluation scope, the coding of several as 0 skewed the distribution to the extent that normality is not present. To reiterate, a 0 was given instead of imputing the scale mean, since evaluation scope cannot be assumed for each coalition.
Low response rates on the dependent variable may have occurred from a lack of interest or understanding concerning evaluation plans. It is possible that information gleaned primarily from coalition leaders and evaluators through key informant interviews would be more complete, thus improving the integrity of the data and the subsequent multiple regression analysis.

Apparently most prevention coalitions are on the lower end of financial resources and evaluation, which may be why 1/5 of the variance in evaluation scope is attributable to finances. Funding is inconsistent or weak, providing few resources for comprehensive evaluation scope (multiple assessment of formative to summative indicators). Inclusive community representation appears to be a secondary influence on evaluation scope given the smaller contribution of this variable.

**Summary of Data Results**

Although limitations are cited for the multiple regression, the quantitative and qualitative results are informative. Finances affect evaluation scope more than multiple sectors and relational patterns. Evaluation scope was higher for coalitions receiving greater than $50,000 per year than for those receiving lower resources.

For coalitions, their level of evaluation on the 14-point continuum varied as a function of whether they worked with an evaluation expert. When individuals cited internal dependence upon other members for evaluation, connecting indicators and measuring context did not occur at the same rate as when external evaluators were mentioned.

Given the responses on outcome indicators from the on-line survey and the interview results with evaluators, summative evaluation may be the exception rather than
the rule. Interviewees noted inability to conduct comparison studies, a component of summative evaluation, as a barrier to developing comprehensive plans. From both quantitative and qualitative responses, there appears to be a lack of focus toward the collection of community-level impact measures necessary for summative projects.

Rather, coalitions appear to be measuring formatively- they utilize a preponderance of process and intermediate indicators on an annual basis. Most coalitions (nearly 80%) do not report measuring process, intermediate and impact indicators frequently during the year (higher evaluation scope). Multiple assessment is important for linking short and long term effects to detect progress toward community change. It serves to ascertain trends throughout the year, assisting with making connections between process or intermediate areas (number of delivered services, self report substance use rates) and later outcomes (underage alcohol violations).

Conversely, most respondents did note that their plans link short and long term effects in the miscellaneous items section. These seemingly opposing ideas require further inquiry, perhaps along the lines of revising the evaluation scope items or the data collection method (on-line vs. interview). The argument for both of these courses of action is supported by the low response rates on evaluation questions.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

From the results it is apparent that utilizing external evaluators and having appropriate finances are critical factors for measuring the work of coalitions. Monetary resources improve the ability to hire consultants, which in turn appears to enhance evaluation planning. Dependence upon internal coalition membership rather than outside assistance leads to less comprehensive assessment.

Even with expert involvement, coalitions are focusing nearly exclusively on formative levels of evaluation. This is a problem in that the commonly reported, once per year documentations of program implementation and perceptions toward substance use do not fully constitute effectiveness. The coalitions in this study are simply not in a position to connect proximal with distal effects.

Major Conclusions

Ten major conclusions regarding capacity factors and practitioner propensities are posited. Generally, evaluation planning seems to be a function of funding rather than sector representation and the internal working relations among members. The conclusions support some ideas found in the literature, namely that coalitions are prone to poor planning and demonstrating weak outcomes (Gabriel, 2000; Berkowitz, 2001).
Conclusion 1: Coalitions appear to be fragile entities operating with inconsistent budget streams.

The majority of coalitions fell on the lower end of the financial continuum (<$50,000 per year) and operate with limited resources. Few groups appear to be in a position to pay for consulting or any costs beyond planned activities. Some of them no doubt have a paid staff person or two (although this was not a question asked), which might tend to limit the money available for evaluation purposes.

It is assumed that budgeted funds are probably devoted to speakers, copies, planning and implementing meetings, communication and so forth. Besides this, more than half of the sampled coalitions had no state or federal revenue, just ad hoc support from local sources.

Such conditions affect organizational characteristics, possibly producing reactive, sporadic planning, e.g., new projects suddenly make it to the agenda as donations are received. Only a few practitioners reported in-kind contributions, mostly around the $5,000 range. In this context, a dominance of low level evaluation was not surprising.

Conclusion 2: The true number of coalitions is difficult to determine due to their transitory nature.

Related to the prior conclusion is that coalitions are prone to staff turnover or dissolution, especially when finances aren’t there. This was clear from the supplied sampling frame of agencies, organizations and coalitions as compared to the actual number of groups that could be surveyed i.e., there was a 42% attrition rate.

In some cases, an individual was listed as a SPCA member with an organization for which they were no longer working. New contact information had not been provided
to SPCA, making it impossible to locate the person and inquire about their coalition. This speaks to turnover within educational and social services fields (areas of with which most contacts are affiliated) and/or the individual’s lack of connection to the prevention group itself.

Occasionally, an alternative person could be identified over the phone when one was no longer involved for a listed coalition or had stepped down. In other instances, a contact was with an agency rather than a coalition which led to difficulties in getting surveys distributed or completed. Lastly, six community groups receiving university funding had disbanded due to grants ending since the most recent directory update.

All of these examples may be indicators of the more temporary nature of coalitions and their membership. Although one reason for the sampling problem was not having maintained an appropriate directory, a lack of finances to sustain efforts was also at play.

**Conclusion 3:** Evaluation is driven by funding with few coalitions being able to measure longer term effectiveness.

Most coalitions are on the lower end of both the financial (<$50,000) and evaluation spectra. Multiple regression showed that finances better predicted a formative level of evaluation (checks on program implementation and attitudinal measures) rather than outcome oriented behavioral indicators. The coalitions are for the most part unable to answer questions concerning their impact on community-level change.

The study lends support to Johnson’s statement (2004) that finances influence formative evaluation. Part of this may stem from the fact that summative indicators are
not stressed by some federal and state grants (received by a fair portion of the sample).
Similarly, Gabriel (2000) observed that relying solely upon outcomes in the absence of
measuring awareness or improved coordination (formative indicators) is a futile effort,
since behavioral change cannot then be connected to short term efforts. This position
could lead some evaluators to prioritize lower level indicators.

Once a year assessment of behavior in a specific locale (underage drinking arrests
in a school district) and measuring a few process and intermediate measures do not
provide enough evidence to determine if a program (or coalition, for that matter) is worth
continuing. Whether the dominance of formative evaluation is a result of grant proposal
requirements or a lack of resources is difficult to say without further inquiry.

**Conclusion 4:** Less comprehensive assessment of a one-time nature appears to be the
norm, especially for prevention coalitions engaged with schools.

The bulk of the coalitions in this study implement prevention curricula or
community campaigns through schools. They tend to assess low-level process measures
such as once per year counts of the number of classrooms or students exposed to training
and/or delivered resources. Repeated assessment does occur, but to a much lower degree.

A minority of coalitions reported twice per year collections of data, mostly of the
short term variety. Without multiple assessments on both proximal and distal factors, one
cannot be sure that current programming is leading to anticipated impact (Chinman et. al.,
2001; Gabriel, 2000). This is further exacerbated when comparisons (communities or
groups) are difficult to obtain, which was cited as a barrier to evaluation. So in the
absence of trend data, it is surmised that the coalitions inadequately practice evaluation.
The lower rate of repeated assessment could be a result of partnering with schools. These are test-rich environments where teachers may be unwilling or otherwise not motivated to facilitate routine data collection on a number of levels for a project perceived to be on the periphery of instructional activities. It could also be from the inability of these particular types of coalitions to either gather expertise from internal members or hire evaluators to produce more comprehensive blueprints.

Conclusion 5: The use of external evaluators improves evaluation.

The strong, positive relationship between hiring consultants and evaluation scope (measuring context and connections between short and long term effects) suggests that external assistance makes a difference. The finding that both finances and contracting with evaluators was specifically related to scope says that money allows surveys to be purchased or developed and data analysis to be conducted by individuals with some expertise over and above what is usually seen among volunteer coalition members.

Conclusion 6: Reliance upon members for evaluation may limit scope.

As an outgrowth of the prior conclusion, evaluation activity solely by members may be limited. Internally driven evaluations were not statistically related to scope or miscellaneous items and as result the evaluations seem to be compromised. Reasons for why this might be occurring (knowledge, interest, time) were not examined in this study, but a more comprehensive evaluation is evident when a consultant is present.

Conclusion 7: Members have superficial knowledge of evaluation plans.

The two previous conclusions deal with practitioners neither being fully aware nor vested in evaluation. Volunteer members may be more giving of their time to
implementation rather than data collection and analysis (Morrissey et. al., 1997; Reinert et al., 2005). A related idea is that practitioners view evaluation as a chore, perhaps to a degree disconnected from general coalition activities. This point has also been made in the literature (Morrissey at al., 1997; Wimbush, 1999).

Another factor entering into the picture is that sector representatives are often on loan from organizations that pay them as employees. The small amount of time spent on the coalition may have been approved by a private or non-profit entity interested in showing community involvement. These individuals could be attending meetings infrequently due to job commitments. This could result in curtailed time devoted to coalition activities and even less to understanding and conducting evaluations.

Possibly because of these conditions, some confusing results were observed. Coalition members overestimated connections being made between short and long term effects and the measurement of context. These activities were not indicated to much of an extent by evaluators in the interviews. Such linkages require repeated, rather than one-time assessments, which do not appear to be routinely taking place.

Respondents cited all 3 indicator levels (process, intermediate, and distal) in nearly the same proportion, but key informants did not verify that impact assessment, in particular, was conducted at the same rate as the others. Members may assume that the coalition is showing outcomes when they are just dealing with short-term progress. These findings, combined with more in-depth plans occurring when evaluators are hired, point toward practitioners only having a surface understanding of evaluation.
Conclusion 8: Coalitions pattern themselves, in some ways, as top-down rather than fully collaborative entities.

The responses to the relational patterns domain showed that informal communications exist within an environment of unilateral, top-down decision making. A core group makes decisions and takes responsibility for more of the work. This may explain the seemingly low level of interest in evaluation among general members, in that only 1-2 of them from each coalition completed the pertinent sections of the questionnaire. If everyone is not engaged or only selectively involved, only a few would be privy to assessments of progress.

This is corroborated by Himmelman’s (2001) argument that collaborative betterment coalitions run by agencies and grant mandates rather than sector representatives from the grassroots level foster bureaucratic planning processes. Some federal and state grants might inhibit both sector recruitment and relational processes when only the “right” people can be recruited. Both certain sectors and required tasks are based upon governmental priorities rather than local community ones. This would seem to place a constraint on democratic planning and evaluation. As a byproduct of limited representation, there could also be reduced access to target groups for data collection. If included, they may have provided additional resources for evaluation processes; however, they may be alienated by not being part of the funder’s agenda.
Conclusion 9: Member composition and communications do not affect evaluation plans as much as the coalition’s ability to procure resources.

Community inclusiveness is important, but less so than resources in terms of its influence on evaluation. When this variable was combined with finances, explained variance in scope increased somewhat. Therefore, multiple sector representation is salient, although less influential for evaluation practices. While the engagement of sectors has been shown to advance general prevention plans (Hays et al., 2000) and broader participation may expand the knowledge base of the coalition (Kreuter et al., 2000), having funds to hire consultants is more pertinent to evaluation.

Related to this, positive meeting patterns and evaluation scope were significantly correlated (to a smaller degree than multiple sectors) but this relationship did not affect the regression analysis in any noticeable way. In the vein of Butterfoss, Goodman & Wandersman (1993), the findings suggest that internal communications and how well people coordinate have little to do with the quality of their planning. They do not support other claims that adequate member relations facilitate plans which better position community groups to display their viability (Mattessich at. al., 2000; Wolff, 2001).

Conclusion 10: The studied capacity factors may affect implementation plans differently than they do evaluation.

The weaker connections between multiple sectors and relational patterns with scope do not coincide with some aspects of the literature that view them as strongly influencing planning processes. It is possible that evaluation functions are not embraced
by practitioners in the same manner as is the general prevention thinking necessary for
the development of action or strategic plans.

Perhaps the level of sector representation and whether those members
communicate adequately are more important for planning implementation-related
components e.g. choosing activities and assigning personnel, locations with timelines,
than for related evaluations. This is further supported by the previously stated
conclusions concerning the dominance of formative aspects like program delivery, and
the minimal attention paid to actual assessment when consultants are not present.

Recommendations

Recommendations are offered for data collection and additional variables to be
studied. An example of the latter would be confidence toward evaluation and its
influence on future practice.

Recommendation 1: Add phone interviews and records review to enhance the accuracy
of the financial and evaluation data.

Missing responses from the domains of finances and evaluation (and their
systematic nature) suggest inadequate knowledge, interest, or a weak data collection
mechanism. Supplementing the on-line survey with phone interviews of main contacts
(chairpersons) and records review (planning documents) would have improved the
quality of the financial and evaluation data.

Although response rates from phone interviews have declined in the past few
years (Dillman, 2005), key contact interviews on the financial and evaluation-related
scales potentially could either show that the non-normal distributions on some variables
(evaluation scope) are accurate or that the data is much more normal in form. The fairly complete information obtained from the phone follow-ups with 6 responding coalitions and 5 non-responding ones provides support for this recommendation.

It is also likely that just as some evaluators agreed to comment on the phone, some would allow a review of their planning documents. Combined with the interviews, a review of documents for a sub-sample could have broadened the understanding of the dependent variable and enhanced the quality of interpretation.

In the interest of improving responses, the web questionnaire was designed so practitioners could see previous and future questions via scrolling. This decreases confusion and loss of context (Dillman, 2005). Yet even when three capacity factors (predictors) were placed on one screen together, equivalent response rates were not observed. This discrepancy emanated from the systematic skipping of finances, the last section presented.

Conversely, the highly answered multiple sectors and relational patterns sections at the very beginning of the survey were easy and straightforward. The effect of less difficult content coupled with what might be more common knowledge undoubtedly influenced the higher response rates for these items. Practitioners would not have been taxed or challenged by the questions, as multiple sectors could be answered by thinking about who attended meetings and where activities were targeted. Similarly, relational patterns come from easily recalled subjective experiences with other members. Neither of the domains required access to documents or specialized information. These two areas would not necessitate additional questioning as do finances and evaluation scope.
**Recommendation 2:** Pilot test with general members rather than just leaders.

Pilot testing should have been conducted with a mix of general practitioners rather than relying on a panel of experts. Although the leaders were helpful in identifying weaknesses (clarity, etc.), the lack of response to evaluation items and finances could have been anticipated if a smaller, representative group of members had reviewed the questions before dissemination to the entire sample. The examples used to stimulate thinking on the use of indicators may have been overlooked or confusing to those trying to quickly complete the questionnaire. This occurred despite the fact that all statements were reviewed for clarity and length during pilot testing.

**Recommendation 3:** Replicate the study and expand it to include coalitions from other states and associations.

The sampling frame was limited to members of two professional networking associations managed by the same alcohol and drug prevention agency in Ohio. It is unclear how sampling from this list may have affected the findings. Replication of the study beyond this convenience sample would be useful for drawing further conclusions.

Prevention coalition listings from federal and state grantor web-sites could be used to expand the study outside the state. It is uncertain how the combination of being an association member from Ohio influenced results for each coalition. For instance, a lack of emphasis on summative evaluation in trainings and resources that these state-funded associations provide could have biased the results. As referred to previously, less emphasis on the part of funding sources can skew evaluation (in this case, at the association level) which manifests in training content. Including coalitions outside Ohio
that are receiving grants and that are possibly members of other associations could improve the interpretation regarding capacity factors and evaluation scope.

Recommendation 4: Determine whether coalitions study outcomes at a later time.

Since the measurement of outcomes is rare in this sample and similarly likely in others (Gabriel, 2000; Berkowitz, 2001), it would be prudent to understand the conditions (e.g., age of the coalition) under which this is occurring. For example, it may be due to more long term planning for outcome assessment that is mindful of delayed program effects, community readiness, and/or other factors. Summative assessment may simply take place beyond a one-year period for the studied coalitions. Interim indicators gathered currently could then be part of a subsequent, 3-5 year assessment. A follow-up study of the same sample would shed light on which of the capacity factors appear most salient in predicting evaluation scope over time.

Recommendation 5: Study practitioner knowledge and confidence as influences on evaluation scope.

The self efficacy construct (Bandura & Locke, 2003) and evidence from the field in CSAP studies (Morrisey et al., 1997) imply that practitioners with confidence and appropriate skill sets will evaluate more comprehensively. The belief that one can successfully accomplish an evaluation task was not examined in this investigation. Enhanced efficacy toward data collection and analysis tasks as a result of specialized training may affect the prediction of the dependent variable.
Implications for Practice

Evaluation is required by federal and state funders and is handled on a less than comprehensive basis by coalitions charged with demonstrating results. Funding entities may be able to do more to assist their grantees in improving evaluation practice. Agencies could increase the size of grants for alcohol and drug prevention efforts and/or allow practitioners to allocate a greater proportion of that revenue to evaluation consultants.

On the other hand, the reality is that when all available dollars are probably used for implementation, members will be called upon for data collection and analysis if evaluators cannot be hired. Since an increase in federal and state funds for prevention is unlikely and evaluation tasks are still there, it seems imperative to increase training.

Along those lines, the agencies handling prevention dollars should offer more evaluation resources on their web-sites. Moreover, workshops could be mandated for new and continued funding. Attending individuals might be self selected for such training based upon interest or paid status.

Hands-on experiences like these would allow members to practice and gain feedback on how to relate implementation items e.g., contained in action plans, to repeated data collection on pertinent indicators. The end result would be a cadre of practitioners trained at the local, state, or federal level with more evaluation knowledge and skills.

As members gain evaluation efficacy, external evaluators can continue honing skills and expand interest through empowerment evaluation (Gabriel, 2000; Reinert et al.,
They can provide coalitions with interim reporting and facilitate the improvement of programs as part of formative evaluation. This could motivate the coalition toward systematic data collection activities, particularly if some members are gaining practical skills from seminars, conferences, and more involvement as just posited. An atmosphere geared toward continuous improvement could establish a climate for measurement and evaluation and lay the groundwork for true demonstrations of effectiveness.
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APPENDIX A

ON-LINE SURVEY
ON-LINE COALITION INVENTORY

Informed Consent

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
PROTOCOL #2006E0480

The following questions ask you to indicate your perceptions about relationships and decision-making patterns, multiple community sectors, funding levels and evaluation planning in your coalition. Your participation in this survey is voluntary and you may choose to not answer any question. You can withdraw from the survey process at any time without penalty.

Your individual confidentiality will be protected, as no respondent names will be published or reported in any form. Only aggregated results across coalitions will be presented. Coalition names will be kept confidential.

Feel free to direct any questions and inquiries to Dr. James W. Altschuld, Principal Investigator, Center on Education and Training for Employment, altschuld.1@osu.edu, 614-292-6541, or to Julianne Manchester, M.A., M.A., The Ohio State University, manchester.12@osu.edu, 614-989-9950.

We hope you will take the time to respond. The information will help in understanding Ohio coalitions and the nature of their evaluations. Before you begin, it would be helpful to have some general knowledge of your coalition's evaluation plan for the 2006-2007 fiscal year. The survey should take you less than 20 minutes to complete.

If you belong to more than one coalition, answer the questions in terms of the coalition identification indicated above. Click on your selected answer to place a “check” in the appropriate boxes. Do not leave any questions blank.

Coalition Processes

1. Representatives who are regularly engaged in coalition meetings and community activities come from which of the following groups or areas? (check all that apply):

- Schools-Administrators
- Civic and Volunteer
- Business/Retail
- Media
- Faith Based Organization
- Older Adults
- Health Services/Medical
- Mental Health/Wellness
- Athletic Officials
- Community Youth

- Parents
- Law Enforcement
- Residence Life
- Residents
  a. Faculty
  b. Judicial System
  c. Greek
- Students
- Social Services
- Elected/Appointed Officials
- Other
2. Indicate your level of agreement in regard to your coalition's communication and decision-making processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members compromise when making decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members have a high level of commitment toward accomplishing planned projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members are open to different options when making decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a clear sense of individual roles and responsibilities within the coalition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All coalition members have equal opportunities for input into action planning/goal setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The coalition shares or rotates its leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The coalition keeps all members informed on policies and activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members understand the goals of the coalition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members have equal opportunity to express ideas in meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members believe that the coalition can impact the campus and/or community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The coalition keeps up with the work necessary to accomplish its goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On occasion, I have conversations with other coalition members outside meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition members have a strong sense of &quot;ownership&quot; in decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tasks of the coalition are equally distributed among its members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Estimate the level of funding for your coalition.

I estimate current federal funding for my coalition to be (estimate for this fiscal year):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>&lt;$30,000</th>
<th>$30,000 to &lt;$50,000</th>
<th>$50,000 to &lt;$100,000</th>
<th>$100,000 to &lt;$200,000</th>
<th>$200,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I estimate current state funding for my coalition to be (estimate for this fiscal year):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>&lt;$30,000</th>
<th>$30,000 to &lt;$50,000</th>
<th>$50,000 to &lt;$100,000</th>
<th>$100,000 to &lt;$200,000</th>
<th>$200,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I estimate current civic/local monetary sources for my coalition to be (estimate for this fiscal year):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>&lt;$30,000</th>
<th>$30,000 to &lt;$50,000</th>
<th>$50,000 to &lt;$100,000</th>
<th>$100,000 to &lt;$200,000</th>
<th>$200,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I estimate current in-kind contributions such as donated meeting space, copying, materials and equipment to be (provide an amount for this fiscal year):

$ ______________________________

Coalition Evaluation

Scenario A: A coalition measures the number of parents who show up to an annual advocacy event. This is a ONE-TIME ASSESSMENT related to a coalition activity or service. Immediate measures of coalition efforts are determined by counting documents, services or people, such as (indicate when you've read an example by checking the circle):

- Number of trainings given to alcohol servers on ID checking, sales to minors
- Number of attendees at trainings or respondents to alcohol use questionnaires
- Number or amount of distributed resources to students, residents or parents

4. From July 2006 to June 2007, do the evaluation plans of your coalition include the one-time assessment of coalition activities or services? (Reminder: a single pre/post test is one assessment)

| Yes | No | Don't Know |

5. From July 2006 to June 2007, do the evaluation plans of your coalition include the assessment of coalition activities or services across multiple time periods such as twice per year, quarterly, etc.?

| Yes | No | Don't Know |
If you answered "Yes" to Question 5, list measurements related to activities or services and their frequency of measurement.

Example: "Number of Delivered Training Sessions" measured "4 times per year"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Measurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Measurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Measurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scenario B: A coalition administers a pre and post test in May on parental awareness of youth alcohol use for students exposed to an anti-underage drinking campaign. This is a ONE TIME ASSESSMENT of a short term result.

Short term results are attitudinal and/or behavioral changes among community stakeholders as measured by questionnaires, records and observations, such as (indicate when you've read an example by checking the circle):

- Increase in awareness of alcohol and/or drug issues among students or teachers
- Decline in alcohol advertisements or drink specials
- Increase in arrests among alcohol providers (parents hosting underage parties)

6. For the period from July 2006-June 2007, do the evaluation plans of your coalition include a one-time assessment of a short term result? (Reminder: a single pre/post test is one assessment)

| Yes | No | Don't Know |
7. For the period from July 2006-June 2007, do the evaluation plans of your coalition include the assessment of short term results across multiple time periods such as twice per year, quarterly? (Reminder: a single pre/post test is one assessment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you answered "Yes" to Question 7, list short term measures and their frequency of measurement.

Example: "Number of beer ads in campus newspaper" measured "Twice per year"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure #1</th>
<th>Frequency of Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure #2</td>
<td>Frequency of Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure #3</td>
<td>Frequency of Measurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scenario C: A coalition determines the number of students from the district with alcohol violations four times per year. This is a MULTIPLE ASSESSMENT of a long term result.

Long term results are reductions in at-risk behaviors among targeted groups following ongoing and longer term coalition efforts as measured by questionnaires, records and observations, such as (indicate when you've read an example by checking the circle):

- Decline in emergency room admissions for alcohol and other drug-related issues
- Decline in self reported (questionnaire, focus group) alcohol and other drug use
- Decline in number of students assaulting teachers

8. For July 2006-June 2007, do the evaluation plans of your coalition include a one-time assessment of a long term result? (Reminder: a single pre/post test is one assessment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
9. For the period from July 2006-June 2007, do the evaluation plans of your coalition include the assessment of long term results across multiple time periods such as twice per year, quarterly? (Reminder: a single pre/post test is one assessment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you answered “Yes” to Question 9, list long term measures and their frequency of measurement.

Example: “Number of underage drinking violations” measured “Quarterly”

Measure #1

Frequency of Measurement

Measure #2

Frequency of Measurement

Measure #3

Frequency of Measurement
## Coalition Evaluation – Other Considerations

*(Check the appropriate box for each question)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. My coalition pays an external evaluator for some or all evaluation planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My coalition works with an external evaluator who provides evaluation services without being monetarily compensated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My coalition relies totally upon its own members for evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. In addition to specific measures related to immediate, short and long term effects, the coalition measures other factors (parental involvement, Internet access, community readiness) not specific to planned programs or activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The coalition's evaluation plan links short term (numbers trained, increase in knowledge of addiction) with long term effects (reduction in alcohol use among targeted students).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Please add any comments in the box below regarding the evaluation plans of your coalition.

THANK YOU for completing this survey.
APPENDIX B

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW
COALITION EVALUATION INTERVIEW
Respondents: Coalition Evaluators
Delivery Method: Phone

This interview contains seven questions related to the evaluation plans of your coalition. Along with responses from the web survey, your answers help us to better understand evaluation in your coalition. Provide as much detail as possible and to ask your own questions for clarification.

Your participation is voluntary and you may choose to not answer any question. You can withdraw from the interview at any time without penalty.

1. Describe an example of a program or activity that the coalition is currently evaluating or plans to evaluate in 2006-2007. It should represent what you perceive to be the most extensive evaluation effort of the coalition.

2. Briefly describe how data is or will be collected, the procedures of the evaluation, frequency of measurements, etc.
3. In addition to what you’ve just described, what other activities for collecting data (surveys, focus groups, public records) does the coalition commonly use or plan to use?

4. What groups are being measured as part of the overall plan?

In prevention evaluation we refer to three parts of an evaluation:

Process - number of events (training sessions, counseling sessions) staged by the coalition, how many people were served, how many resources were distributed, monitoring training or delivery of services, etc.

Short term outcomes - attitudinal, learning, and/or behavioral changes following coalition efforts as measured by gains in knowledge after training, changes in attitude on surveys, etc.

Long term outcomes - actual reductions in at-risk behaviors among targeted youth or adults determined through questionnaires, records, and observations about declines in bullying, emergency room admissions for blood poisoning, lessening of neighborhood vandalism, etc.

5. What do the coalition’s evaluation plans contain in regard to these three parts of evaluation?
6. In terms of measuring the long term outcomes of coalition projects, are there any barriers that come to mind? If so, what are they?

7. If aspects of your evaluation plan deal with variables outside the control of the coalition (parental involvement, Internet/media access, academic achievement), please describe them.