

MINNESOTA LEADERSHIPPLENTY® Evaluation Summary

October 31, 2007

Donna Rae Scheffert, Principal Investigator, Horizons

The overall Horizons program is designed to build community capacity to reduce poverty. Horizons evaluations will identify strengths and weaknesses of the program and help sharpen future efforts to mobilize community leadership for poverty reduction.

The LeadershipPlenty® program (LP) was implemented by University of Minnesota Extension in May, June and July, 2007. Pre and post surveys were used to gather information from community members (including youth, age 18 and younger) who participated in LeadershipPlenty training sessions as part of the Horizons program.

LeadershipPlenty® was developed by the Pew Partnership for Civic Change. It is a 30 hour curriculum taught by peer trainers who have completed a train-the-trainer session. The program is held within the local community. A pre-post evaluation instrument asked participants to indicate their degree of agreement with statements about their leadership abilities, at two time points (before and after participating in the LeadershipPlenty® training).

Questions included topics relevant to the leadership curriculum, including: a) ability to identify community assets; b) managing groups and effective meetings; c) managing conflict; d) building strategic partnerships; e) mobilizing communities and communicating for change; f) facing the challenge of racism and race relations. Data analysis was done by Becky Kroll, Calabash, an evaluator for the Northwest Area Foundation.

Ten communities implemented Leadership Plenty including: Chisholm, Elmore, Eveleth, Fertile, Floodwood, Hokah, Mountain Lake, New York Mills, St. James & Wabasha. These towns are 5,000 or below population and have at least a 10% poverty rate (range is 10% - 19.4%). The total population in the ten communities is 22,104 people. In these communities 2,861 individuals fall below the federal poverty guidelines.

AVERAGE RATINGS OF SKILLS BEFORE AND AFTER LEADERSHIPLENTY® TRAINING

Participants were asked to indicate their degree of agreement with statements about their skills, on a scale of 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree. They were asked to provide these ratings on the pre survey, and their ratings for BEFORE and AFTER on the post survey.

The lowest rated skills coming into the program were *knowing the community action process* and *planning and implementing community change projects*. After the program, these skills saw among the largest changes. After the program, the skills with the lowest measures were *managing conflict in group work*, *discussing race relations in a non-threatening way* and *planning and implementing community change projects*.

The following were the questions/skills:

Skills n=244	Before	After	Change
I know the community action process.	2.94	4.05	38%
I am able to identify the stages of group development	3.09	4.17	35%
I know how to plan and implement community change projects	2.96	3.97	34%
I know how to approach community development problems	3.05	4.01	31%
I know how to assess the value of group problem-solving efforts	3.18	4.11	29%
I know how partnerships influence community problem solving	3.45	4.37	27%
I recognize the relationship between getting involved and civic leadership	3.47	4.34	25%
I am able to guide discussions among diverse groups of people	3.26	4.05	24%
I know how conflict and tension influence group work	3.51	4.34	24%
I know how to share information with diverse audiences	3.37	4.14	23%
I am able to work with the leadership in my organization and/or greater community	3.51	4.26	21%
I am able to manage conflict in group work	3.26	3.93	21%
I am able to recognize leadership skills in others	3.62	4.36	20%
I am able to lead productive meetings	3.42	4.06	20%
I know the value of bringing citizens together to talk about issues	3.74	4.5	20%
I know how to discuss race relations in a non-threatening way.	3.25	3.91	20%

AVERAGE RATINGS OF BEHAVIOR CHANGES AFTER LEADERSHIPPLENTY® TRAINING

Using post surveys

After the training the participants reported the most *increase in leadership skills*, and were most likely *to involve more people in community decision making* and to *bring attention to issues of poverty*. The range of responses was wide amongst participants, likely because of differing incoming knowledge and commitment to issues of poverty.

LEADERSHIP SKILLS		POVERTY INTENTIONS		LEADERSHIP INTENTION TO USE SKILLS		
% Increased Leadership Skills	Average (mean) % of know/understanding attributable to LP	% To bring attention to issues of poverty	% To work on poverty reduction	% To involve more in community decision making	% To recruit others for leadership in community	% To expand local leadership training
61.5%	55.8%	55.3%	54.5%	61.9%	45.9%	38.1%
Range 33-80% Mean=65	Range 40-70% Mean=65	Range 17-75% Mean=52	Range 38-71% Mean=56	Range 42-84% Mean=63	Range 23-8% Mean=42	Range 17-60% Mean=33

AVERAGE RATINGS OF COMMUNITY CHANGES AFTER LEADERSHIPPLENTY® TRAINING

Using post surveys=244

After the training, participants were most likely to *discuss poverty and what to do it about it* and had not yet *taken concrete steps to address poverty*. Follow-up should be done 6 months or later after the training to see if participants moved to action.

More people are aware of poverty in the community	More people are stepping up to assist those in poverty	We are discussing poverty and what to do about it	We are working to create changes in public policy	More people are getting help to get out of poverty	We are taking very concrete steps to address poverty
66.0%	48.8%	71.3%	48.0%	31.1%	23.4%
Range 48-80% Mean=68	Range 22-67% Mean=46	Range 60-87% Mean=71	Range 30-68% Mean=46	Range 8-44% Mean=33	Range 9-42% Mean=25

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS

This process could be used for many issues. Another sell was the leadership training and/or the leadership potential for our community. That was probably one of the bigger sells through the Horizons Program ... such as the Study Circle leadership training ... the Leadership Plenty® training that would be offered to members of our community. That they, in turn, could come back and we could keep making this process work over and over again. It has been noted that this process ... although in this context we're studying poverty ... the actual process could be reused for a number of different things in communities.

A chance to level the playing field. Well, I'll tell you ... even to bring them to the table ... meaning at a level playing field, all of us, for this process as been a big step. Because I think they get the sense ... and I don't mean it to be we and they ... that's not the way it is ... but it kind of is. But that's what we're trying to eliminate. But I think they've always felt like they've been on the outside. They haven't been given a voice. They haven't been given an opportunity. And I think that now, with this particular process, they're maybe feeling like this is a chance to level the playing field.

Horizons is helping us find young leaders. This is a community with a lot of volunteers ... very strong volunteers. But it always seems that like the same people are doing a lot of the stuff. And we're always concerned that we don't have any young leaders stepping up. And that's come up many, many times and Horizons has really addressed that too. So it's quite lovely

Old leaders inspire new leaders. I know that through this process one of the goals is to inspire those new leaders and find those new leaders. But it's difficult to get those leaders to come up to the plate unless there's existing leaders already participating.

Community leader participation lends credibility. We have the Mayor, we have a couple City Council people, we have a City Manager, County Commissioners. They're all involved. I think that also lends some credibility.

Seeing impacts in a successful Phase One Horizons community. Well, volunteerism is up about sixty percent. And it's not just because we had the Horizons Program ... but because the Horizons Program has opened peoples' eyes to the possibilities that a community can do. And that everyone has gifts and talents and if you start asking people that aren't traditionally asked to be leaders all of a sudden you have all these new people who are interested in participating in their community and in community events. And so by using Horizons and other parallel programs, in process, in [a Horizons I community] it has opened just many, many, many new doors. And also the people who went through the Leadership Plenty program and the Study Circles program ... have continued to be leaders in addition to the traditional leaders. And have actually forged partnerships.

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS IN LEADERSHIPLENTY® TRAINING

Each of the ten communities were encouraged to enroll 25 or more people in Leadership Plenty, with a focus to enroll low-income individuals. Communities did involve 33% or 79 low-income people. The majority of participants were white women.

Program Participation -MN Leadership Plenty	# Unduplicated Surveys	# Resurveys	# Adults In Presurvey	# Post surveys	Matched Surveys
Survey Respondents	321	270	239	244	193

Participation and Poverty Rates - MN <i>Using pre surveys, adults only</i>	Adults in Presurvey	LP 100% Federal Poverty Guidelines	LP 150% Federal Poverty Guidelines	LP 200% Federal Poverty Guidelines	% info missing
Survey Respondents	239	12.6%	22.2%	33.1%	6.3%

RACE AND ETHNICITY, MINNESOTA					
# LP Pre Surveys	African or African American	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	White	Latino/ Hispanic
270	0.4%	3.0%	1.5%	93.0%	4.8%

AGE, MINNESOTA					
18 and <	19 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	51 to 60	Over 60
11.1% N=30	15.6% N=42	14.8% N=41	20.7% N=57	21.1% N=57	15.9% N=43

GENDER, MINNESOTA				
# LP Pre Surveys	Female		Male	
	#	%	#	%
270	205	75.9%	58	21.5%