# NNAAP Training and Technical Assistance Evaluation: 2004-05

**Presented to:**
Reverend Wilbert D. Talley
Executive Director
National Network of Adoption Advocacy Programs
February 27, 2006
Revised: April 4, 2006


By
Vanessa McKendall-Stephens
Face Valu Evaluation Consulting, Inc.
*3507 Emerson Avenue North*
*Phone: 612 588-2204*
*Email: facevaluevaluation@hotmail.com*

# Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

For over 25 years, One Church, One Child (OCOC) as a model for culturally specific adoption, has worked with networks in the faith-based community that develop partnerships with state, local adoption agencies and communities to increase the number of African American children who are adopted while also providing support to adoptive families.

One Church, One Child is a national program founded by Father George Clements, pastor of the Holy Angels Catholic Church in Chicago. In 1981, Father Clements became the first priest to adopt a child and subsequently adopted three additional children. The program focuses on finding adoptive homes for African American children. The model was adopted in a partnership between the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services and African American ministers in the state who were responding to the overwhelming disproportionate number of African American children in the public welfare system. Their success resulted in the majority of waiting African American children in Illinois being adopted with in a year; receipt of a federal grant to disseminate the model; and establishment of OCOC programs in 26 states.

Elements of the OCOC model include:

□ Facilitate churches as they identify potential adoptive or foster care parents who are willing to care for at least one child;

□ Focus on a particular cultural group, usually African American;

□ Train churches, parents, adoption/foster care workers and others;

□ Partner with placement agencies, both state and private, to accelerate the process and placement. Also requires working formally or informally with many other organizations;

□ Provide support for adoptive/foster care parents and children.

Over the years, changing conditions and organizational capacity challenged the economic stability of African American churches, thus also impacting their ability to sustain their adoption work. In response, through a collaborative partnership including the leadership of One Church One Child programs in Virginia, Oklahoma, and Illinois NNAAP emerged. The partnership also included other adoption programs across the country. NNAAP was funded in October 2003 by the Children's Bureau, part of the Federal Department of Health and Human Services in part to support the OCOC family of programs in their efforts to make progress toward recruiting families for primarily African American children and extending the concept to other cultural communities. NNAAP is dedicated to:

1. Supporting and enhancing the collaborative effectiveness of new and existing adoption advocacy programs modeled after the OCOC concept of "faith-based" partnering ;

2. Developing programs in diverse cultural communities that utilize the OCOC concept.[1]

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

NNAAP asked Vanessa M. Stephens, Ph.D. of Face Valu Evaluation Consulting, Inc. to conduct an evaluation of the impact of the training and technical assistance activities it provided for Year 2 mini-grantees who received funding in October 2004.  This evaluation was a participatory, formative process designed to collect information about NNAAP's work and grantee experiences as well as to contribute to further development of NNAAP's program and internal evaluation process.   Baseline data was collected this year.

NNAAP, now in its third year of implementation, wanted to learn more about:

- the effectiveness of NNAAP's capacity building programs;

- the nature of the developing network among adoption advocacy programs;

- evidence of progress toward stated outcomes.

NNAAP will use the information to:

- learn what works and what can be improved about its training and technical assistance efforts;

- refine its advocacy model for OCOC programs and its evaluation process;

- share learning's with grantees and others interested in this work.

Key evaluation tasks included:

*Logic model and evaluation plan revisions.*  NNAAP staff worked with the evaluator to adjust the logic model and evaluation plan developed in 2004.  The revised logic model included the following process and participant outcomes.  This evaluation studies outcomes 2, 3, 4 and 5 (see Appendix 1 for logic model and evaluation plan).

## NNAAP Program Outcomes

---

*Process*
1. Project management and governance are in place.

2. Capacity building using evidenced-based training/TA is available through-out the network including:
   - mini-grants;
   - Peer-to-Peer resources;
   - assistance for technology improvement

*Participant*
3. Participants capacity to do their work increased as a result of NNAAP training and technical assistance.

4. The number and capacity of participants using the Peer-to-Peer program increases resulting in strengthening programs' targeted areas.

5. Participant increase capacity to use technology to support their work; increased participant use of technology.

*Longer Term*
6. Evidenced-based material, practices, and programs to support replication of OCOC model provided.

7. Networks as well as local OCOC organizations are stable and self-sufficient.

## Data Collection

### Interviews and conference calls with NNAAP leadership and staff

The evaluator met with two staff members, the executive director and a Steering Committee member on October 17, 2005 to conduct an initial staff interview and continue evaluation planning. Conference calls and email correspondence supported the planning and data gathering processes.

- *Telephone interviews (13)* with eight representatives from the six grantees conducted October to November, 2005 and with seven representatives from the Advisory Board or Steering Committee conducted January to February 2006.

- *Focus group (1)* with three grantees September 27, 2005 at Peer-to Peer meeting (see Appendix 2 for interview and focus group questions)

- *Document review* of grantee reports

Data collected were analyzed using a series of matrices and content analysis techniques to discover emerging themes. A list of overall findings on progress toward outcomes appears in the next section followed by these report sections:

- Grantee Characteristics

- Progress toward Outcomes

- What Worked Well

- Challenges and Opportunities

- Suggestions for Improvement

- Recommendations

- Lessons Learned and Next Steps

Limitations: Findings are not generalizable to all participants. They represent unique organizations although they work toward a common mission. At least two grantees interviewed had not participated in NNAAP training. Not all grantees were present for the focus group; in addition, time for discussion at the Peer-to-Peer meeting was limited given the meeting agenda. Finally, detailed information was not available for all outcomes.

## OVERALL FINDINGS ON PROGRESS

- NNAAP contributes to grantee progress. Evidence of beginning impact of NNAAP training suggest that grantees are:

    o Building skill in parent and partner recruitment;
    o Understanding and building relationships, collaborations and partnerships to support their work;
    o Understanding required organizational development, especially board development;
    o Increasing knowledge of and understanding how to apply the OCOC model in culturally diverse communities;
    o Increasing use of technology to support their work.

- NNAAP includes a network of individuals and organizations with many years of experience with extensive OCOC experience as well as those who are just learning the OCOC model.

- NNAAP made substantial progress in its programmatic development and added training and learning opportunities that grantees considered useful.

Implementation this year resulted in six site visits, four trainings and a Peer-to-Peer networking meeting as well as formal and informal training and consultation.

- NNAAP worked diligently to listen to, learn from and respond to grantee experiences, hopes and challenges.

- NNAAP's staff and leadership are recognized as experienced, knowledgeable and supportive.

- The emerging network can bridge divides and build capacity among all participants.

## GRANTEE CHARACTERISTICS

After a competitive process that included a steering committee grant review of 38 applicants, NNAAP awarded a total of six grant for Year 2; four new for Year 2 and two continuing from the previous year. Grants were divided among the following three areas:

1. strengthening    the existing organization;

2. extend the OCOC model to new programs; or

3. build an OCOC program guided by unique leadership.

Grantees represent five states and include three OCOC programs, a state social service department, and two adoption agencies. Grantees, the focus areas and their grant focus are listed in Table 1.

*Table 1: NNAAP Grant Focus and Focus Areas*

| Focus Area | Grantee | Grant Focus |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | **OCOC Los Angeles** <br> Los Angeles, CA | Build the program's capacity by increasing the ministry's volunteer base in Los Angeles. |
| | **OCOC Oklahoma City** <br> Oklahoma City, Oklahoma | Build the program's capacity to develop a post-placement support service component within its current services. |
| | **OCOC Southeast Texas** <br> Beaumont, Texas | Build the capacity of the staff and operations to sustain the program's ability to recruit, train, and support foster/adoptive families in Southeast Texas. |
| 2 | **Aid to Adoption of Special Kids (AASK)** <br> Phoenix , Arizona | Assist a start-up program utilizing the OCOC concept in a culturally diverse community in Phoenix, Arizona |
| | **Southern California Foster Family** | Support the utilization of the OCOC model |

| | & Adoption Agency<br>Los Angeles , California | to recruit adoptive families in culturally diverse communities in the Los Angeles area. |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | **Washoe County Department of Social Services**<br>Reno , Nevada | Designed to support the development of an OCOC program with a board of directors or leadership that represents three to four cultures that reflect the diverse cultures of children awaiting permanency within Washoe County. |

## PROGRESS TOWARD OUTCOMES

As mentioned earlier, this report explores evidence of progress toward NNAAP outcomes 2, 3, 4, and 5. Table 2 lists outcomes and progress indicators and summarizes available evidence of progress toward each outcome. Outcomes and available evidence are discussed in the next section.

*Table 2: Progress toward Outcomes 2, 3, 4, and 5*

| Outcomes | Progress Indicators | Evidence of progress |
|---|---|---|
| 2 Capacity building using evidenced- based training/TA is available through-out the network including:<br>▫ mini-grants<br>▫ Peer-to-Peer resources<br>▫ assistance for technology improvement | 2.1 Dates and overviews of formal and informal training/TA provided by NNAAP for participants.[2]<br><br>(See Training/TA List Table 4) | 2.1 6 mini grants awarded totaling $90,000<br>2.2 1.5 day grantee orientation meeting<br>2.3 6 sites visits<br>  o SFFAA-October 11, 2004<br>  o OCOC of LA-October 11, 2004<br>  o Washoe County of DSS-October 12, 2004<br>  o AASK – October 13, 2004<br>  o OCOC of Southeast Texas-October 14, 2005<br>  o OCOC of Oklahoma-May |

| Outcomes | Progress Indicators | Evidence of progress |
|---|---|---|
| | | 18, 2005 |
| | | 2.4  Formal consultation with three sites |
| | | 2.5  Evaluation training with 10 participants from three organizations |
| | | 2.6  Peer-to-Peer meeting with 23 participants include grantees, OCOCs and other advocacy organizations |
| | | 2.7  Numerous instances of informal training |
| | | 2.8  Mini-grant information available on web site |
| <u>Participant</u> | | |
| 3   NNAAP participants' capacity to do their work as a result of NNAAP training and TA. | 3.1  Increase in number of participants in NNAAP training/TA | 3.1  This year is baseline. |
| | 3.2  Feedback from participants indicates that the training/TA met the intended goals | 3.2  All grantees report that NNAAP training and TA was accessible and useful to them in their work. |
| | 3.3  Mini-grant participants and others use NNAAP mini-grants, training and TA to build their capacity to do their work | 3.3  Evidence indicates that grantees are building skill in recruitment, collaboration, organizational development, and leveraging resources as a result of NNAAP's formal and informal training and TA |
| | 3.4  Increase in the number of programs that utilize the OCOC recruitment and support model | |
| | 3.5  Increase in the number of programs that utilize the OCOC recruitment and support model in culturally diverse communities | 3.4  Three grantees were familiar with model |

| Outcomes | Progress Indicators | Evidence of progress |
|---|---|---|
| | | before the grant and work to improve its application in their contexts. Three grantees are new to the model and discovering how to modify it model to achieve results. <br><br> 3.5 All six grantees are using some aspect of the OCOC model in culturally communities. |
| 4 Increase in the number and capacity of participants using the Peer-to-Peer program resulting in strengthening programs' targeted areas | 4.1 Increase in the number of professionals providing support programs; # of orgs assisted by NNAAP in Peer-to-Peer program <br><br> 4.2 Participants report increased use of OCOC model | 4.1 Two grantees have consistently been resources to other grantees: Maryland OCOC and OCOC of OK. At least five OCOC programs received assistance through the Peer to Peer program: Illinois OCOC, Pennsylvania OCOC, Georgia OCOC, Cumberland NC, OCOC, and Los Angeles OCOC. <br><br> 4.2 All grantees reported increased use of some aspect of the model, especially recruitment and training with pastors, congregations and supportive agencies or groups as well as collaboration approaches. |

| Outcomes | Progress Indicators | Evidence of progress |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| 5 Increased participant capacity to use technology to support their work; increased participant use of technology. | 5.1 # of **NNAAP** assisted website developments<br><br>5.2 More use of technology to support work | 5.1 NNAAP provided direct assistance with web-site development and implementation for two grantees (Nevada OCOC and Dunbar OCOC) websites and provided web-site assistance for two additional grantees (Maryland OCOC and Iowa OCOC).<br><br>5.2 NNAAP provided support for computer upgrades and technology for four programs (OCOC Texas, UJIMA, OCOC of Washington, OCOC VA, OCOC GA). Three grantees report increased use of computers, mostly through experiences with the reporting system. |

### OUTCOME DISCUSSION

*Outcome 2: Capacity building using evidenced-based training and technical assistance is available through-out the network.*

**NNAAP** used four key strategies to build grantee capacity through training and technical assistance. They include:

- *Mini-grant Program* - Grants to support capacity building to better serve adoptive families;

- *Training* – Training specifically designed to offer current best practice to strengthen recruitment strategy and program operation[3]
- *Peer-to-Peer Program* – Training or coaching by a peer professional to gain strength in performing the tasks or functions of their specific roles;
- *Technical Assistance & Support* to enhance the expertise of faith-based adoption advocates.

NNAAP substantially increased the variety, frequency and depth of training, consultation and technical assistance. Strategy choice was informed by the extensive experience of NNAAP staff and leaders; data from a member survey administered in April 2004[4]; and informal feedback from participants and partners. Not all grantees experienced the same type and level of support from NNAAP. While sites participated in the grantee orientation, not all participated in the formal training and informal consultations. Therefore, the number of respondents to specific evaluation questions varies. Year 2 capacity building and technical assistance strategies were both formal and informal. Mini-grants are discussed in the next section.

Accomplishments this year include:
- Six mini-grants awarded
- Mini-grant information available via web site
- Grantee orientation meeting
- Six sites visits
- Formal consultation with three sites
- Evaluation training with 10 participants from four organizations
- Peer-to-Peer meeting with 23 participants include grantees, OCOCs and other advocacy organizations
- Numerous instances of informal training
- Web-based outcome evaluation reporting process

## *Mini-grant Program*

In October 2004, NNAAP awarded four new grants after a competitive process that included a Steering Committee grant review process of 38 applicants (see Table 1 for list of mini-grant recipients). When grantees talked about the selection process and experience, they indicated that it was straightforward and they felt supported during in the process.

NNAAP provided an orientation/training and conducted site visits to support grantees as they began their work. All sites participated in the orientation and hosted site visits. The dates and participants are listed in Table 3

---

[3] *NNAAP website*

[4] *See National Network of Adoption Advocacy Programs Evaluation Report, 2004-2005 for details.*

*Table 3: Grantee Orientation and Site Visit Participation*

| Mini-Grants | Total Participants | Participants Categories |
|---|---|---|
| *Grantee orientation/meetings* **October 15, 2004** **June 2005** <br> ▪ General information for grantees <br> ▪ Networking | Participants from 6 sites | **All Year 2 grantees** |
| *Site visits* **October 2004- May 2005** <br> ▪ Initial meeting with Reverend Talley and Denise Wise to introduce grant, NNAAP and OCOC philosophy. <br> ▪ Some included specific consultation and participants from other local organizations**.** | 28 | **All Year 2 Grantees** <br> ▫ SFFAA-October 11, 2004 <br> ▫ OCOC of LA-October 11, 2004 <br> ▫ Washoe County of DSS-October 12, 2004 <br> ▫ AASK –October 13, 2004 <br> ▫ OCOC of Southeast Texas-October 14, 2005 <br> ▫ OCOC of Oklahoma-May 18, 2005 |

When asked on a focus group survey to rate the degree to which the orientation and site visits supported their work, the average for four grantees responding was 4.5 out of 5 for the grantee orientation and 4.75 out of 5 for site visits. All six sites offered their perspectives during the telephone interviews. In general, they indicated that the orientation provided a helpful overview of grant expectations, the OCOC model and provided advice from knowledgeable practitioners. Example quotes include:

> *It gave a very good explanation of how the program has worked nationally.*

> *They gave examples of things to do; gave concrete ideas about how to get where you wanted to go.*

> *It was beneficial. We had five other grantees there and talked about the program; we were able to go forward to work on the grant. We learned expectations NNAAP had. It was organized well.*

When asked what could be improved about the orientation, suggestions offered include adding another day and providing more handouts to take home to study and share with others.

Grantees were just as positive about the effectiveness of the site visits. Reverend Talley and Denise Wise personally visited each site and, in addition to learning about the contexts in which the site has worked, often provided on-site consultation. Grantees indicated that having NNAAP leaders come to learn more about their site was helpful, both leaders were personable and knowledgeable, and at some sites, their presence and discussions supported the site's ability to accomplish their work. Example comments include:

> *This meeting helped really gain support from social services administration.*
>
> *Meeting Denise and Reverend Talley put a face to the organization—it humanized what we were doing.*
>
> *Our site visit was very well attended by participants from the Board and child placement services. It was good for NNAAP to find out what they were doing.*

## OUTCOME 3: NNAAP PARTICIPANTS INCREASE CAPACITY TO DO THEIR WORK AS A RESULT OF NNAAP TRAINING AND TA.

### *Training and Consultation*

NNAAP offered both formal and informal support for grantees. Formal training included the grantee orientation/meeting and an evaluation workshop, which was attended by a total of 10 grantees and representatives from other OCOCs and organizations. NNAAP also conducted trainings in response to grantee requests for assistance. The topics included: recruitment and training; web site development; and fundraising. Over 25 participated in the four trainings. Participation in training and technical assistance is listed in Table 4. When asked to rate the degree to which the trainings supported their ability to do their work, two respondents rated both the website development and evaluation trainings 5 out of 5. One rated the fundraising training 5 out of 5. Example comments grantees shared about the trainings follow:

> *The Evaluation Workshop assisted us in looking at a more professional approach to evaluation and documentation.*
>
> *We are in the early stages; however, feel this website will really move us ahead.*

Interviewees also praised the often informal consultation NNAAP provided by phone, email, or in person on a variety of topics such as a hosting a ministerial dinner and board development challenges. Grantees also noted the accessibility and availability of Reverend Talley and Denise. One grantee said that they acted as "touchstones, sounding boards, critical thinkers and all helped." Another grantee said:

> *Being able to call the office has been personally very helpful. (NNAAP) is always pointing us in the direction of things we are not aware of and being an information broker.*

Grantees also appreciated the deep experience Reverend Tally has in faith-based work.
One grantee said.

> *He gave feedback from a faith perspective as opposed to a*
> *government agency and provided information on the role of*
> *OCOC across the country, which helps us to see where we*
> *can go.*

Grantees often considered the consultation part of the follow-along support NNAAP
provided.  One grantee said,

> *Ongoing training was a wonderful surprise and helped us*
> *stay focused on the program and continue to build it to a*
> *better program.   Everything was gravy—did not expect so*
> *much supportive training.*

When asked on the focus group survey about the effectiveness of the consultations two
grantees who received the consultations rated them 4.75 out of 5.   Two grantees
considered the web-based evaluation reporting part of the capacity building training
NNAAP offered and appreciated the required reflection on their progress.

*Table 4:  NNAAP Training and Consultation*

| Training/TA 2004-2005 | Date/Description | Total Participants | Participants Categories |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Consultation | ▫ Website Development Assistance | ▫ 4 | ▫ Washoe County of DSS<br>▫ Iowa OCOC<br>▫ Dunbar OCOC<br>▫ Maryland OCOC |
| | ▫ Recruitment and Training | ▫ 15 included three counties | ▫ LA OCOC |
| | ▫ Special Event (Fundraising) | ▫ one site | ▫ OCOC of SeTx |
| 2. Evaluation Training | July 20-21, 2005<br>▫ Skill building and practice using logic models as a way to document program theory and inform evaluation | 10 | Year 2 grantees<br>▫ OCOC of Oklahoma<br>▫ Washoe County of DSS<br>▫ AASK<br>Other OCOCs<br>▫ Georgia OCOC<br>Other organizations<br>▫ Dunbar Association, Inc. |

Grantees and stakeholders highlighted specific ways NNAAP training and consulting supported their ability to make progress toward their outcomes.[5]  This is not comprehensive discussion, but gives an overview of the types of progress grantees attributed to NNAAP training and technical assistance.

1. *Increasing knowledge of and understanding of how to apply the OCOC model in culturally diverse communities.*

Two grantees worked specifically to implement a program modeled on OCOC in Hispanic communities.  Grantees in established OCOC's noted that NNAAP training and networking increased their understanding of the need for the OCOC model in culturally diverse communities and ways to adapt it to specific contexts.

> *The new focus of diversity gives room in the Latino community to bring the concept.  It has been the great challenge of bringing adoption and foster care.*
>
> *14 churches are participating in the Una Iglesia program in Arizona.*
>
> *We actually have relationships with churches in, 10 faith based communities.  The pastor's involvement was huge (a board member).  He now can talk about adoption on a personal level and say this is what we need to do.*

Grantees continue to learn what works best in their contexts and how to modify the model to work best for them. One site said:

> *The use of collateral materials may not be an effective recruitment strategy for the Hispanic community. We are now utilizing a more grassroots approach to recruitment to reach the Hispanic churches.*

2. *Understanding and building relationships, collaborations and partnerships.*  All grantees spoke of learning more about how to be effective partners with communities and state/local organizations often in politicized contexts.   Three grantees indicated that NNAAP training, consultation and networking were primarily responsible for increasing their understanding about how to better invite partnerships and sustain it.  Grantees worked with the dynamics of state relationships where some states were moving toward privatization and reducing resources.  Example comments include:

> *NNAAP provided the opportunity to create the relationship. We have to adapt in working with the churches.  We bring expertise while working in the community.*

---

[5] *This discussion also included comments taken from grantee final reports.*

> *We had a ministerial dinner at the beginning of May and pulled together the board in January consisting of four members from three different cultures and worked on adding another Hispanic, Caucasian, African American, and Pacific Islander—representing the significant number of children in care from those cultures.*

> *We understand better how to have ministers work with us to reach the churches, something we were not able to do as a government agency.*

> *After funding approved through the county was challenged, we started contacting ministers who were also foster parents and would understand both sides.*

> *African American ministers are doing support work and training among a group of ministers.*

NNAAP used site visits to increase visibility and leverage support for adoption advocacy and, at times, invited others to participate in discussions or meetings.

> *The meeting was very well attended with participants from the Board and child placement services from Beaumont.*

> *Our discussions with NNAAP opened our eyes to collaborations to be formed in southern California with foster care agencies. We developed a collaboration to share information resources.*

> *NNAAP was extremely helpful with us. We at the state tried to engage families and churches, which had not been effective. The model looked promising because we did not know how to start it and do it in a multicultural way. NNAAP guided and validated us. From the first meeting when Reverend Tally spoke to administration, it helped us loose the fears of working with faith based organizations.*

3. *Understanding required organizational development, especially board development*

Some still struggle with effective ways to engage their boards and sustain participation as demonstrated in the following quotes:

> *NNAAP gave us directions for working with the board. The (Peer-to-Peer) meeting was an important experience for the board member who attended and gave him information he could take back. Board members need to have that direct experience.*

> *NNAAP helped us to diversify and change our outlook about how families can be recruited.*

> *We built a board, primarily African American ministers who are foster parents or connected with foster care.*

4. ***Building skill in parent and partner recruitment.*** Established OCOC's and organizations new to work in cultural communities, both talked about how the training and conversations with NNAAP helped them make progress in conceptualizing and implementing recruitment strategies. While some tried new ideas for the first time, others extended their current strategies to be more inclusive, engaging others in their work. They most often talked about relationships with the faith community and state/government agencies. Almost all grantees and stakeholders indicated that the information NNAAP provided on volunteering, churches, parent recruitment, and fundraising was valuable. Most indicated they learned "new ways of recruiting." Grantees also indicated that they increased the number of parent and partner meetings, often done in new ways with revised material and approaches. Examples they gave included recruiting nine *Advisory Committee/Volunteer (ACV)* members who also support community education and recruitment and one site ending the first year with 16 potential adoptive/foster parents waiting to complete parenting classes.

Example comments of how NNAAP supported grantees follow:

> *NNAAP and Board helped us identify a general approach in materials and outreach to churches.*

> *NNAAP provided insight into the overall picture of faith-based recruitment and engaging the faith based community.*

> *We used the information NNAAP provided to help us with recruitment. We got some of the churches to give out "child of the month" information with a short description and some churches do that on a monthly basis. We trained six new families, advertised and publicized in bulletins that feature a child of the month.*

> *Our program was more formal and we were presenting packets to pastors. We needed to have a more grassroots approach; needed to find people in the church. We presented it to the pastors and families who came to the training and asked them if they wanted to be involved in the church program.*

> *NNAAP helped us organize a ministerial dinner and we gained six churches as a result of the dinner.*

> *With time, we have seen more interest as a result of the OCOC outreach program.*

5. ***Fundraising, leveraging assets and building support for adoption advocacy.*** Grantees provided the following examples of how NNAAP supported their work:

- Producing an effective follow up letter to generate support; developing letters to demonstrate that the cause is good and worthy of financial support;

- Learning how to collaborate with local news media for widespread coverage of all fundraiser events;

- Sponsoring a major golf tournament for Juneteenth in Texas, which "was a huge success. NNAAP provided resources, suggestions and guidance. At least 15 people wanted more information about adoption at the event." The Juneteenth event raised more than $40,000.

6. ***Increasing use of technology to support their work.*** Grantees provided the following examples:

> *NNAAP played an important role this past year. We have continued our mission of building new families and making positive permanent changes in the lives of our children through foster care and adoption family recruitment.*
>
> *We now have a website. We can do the maintenance fee; we needed the initial resources to set it up.*
>
> *If it had not been for the mini grant—85% of what we have done we would not have been able to accomplish.*

---

**OUTCOME 4: INCREASE IN NUMBER AND CAPACITY OF PARTICIPANTS USING THE PEER-TO-PEER PROGRAM RESULTING IN STRENGTHENING PROGRAMS TARGET AREAS**

NNAAP's Peer-to-Peer program continues to evolve. Interviewees spoke most often about informal discussions or exchanges with grantees and others individuals experienced with the OCOC model. Opportunities through the Peer-to-Peer program emerged in large part because of NNAAP staff's relationships with many faith-based and adoption advocacy organizations. They build on their experience and networks to not only provide useful information for grantees, but to also identify potential resources who can offer specific areas of expertise to support grantee work. NNAAP Board and Advisory/Steering Committee members act as resources for grantees. At least three grantees indicated that they received support from other OCOC members with either implementation strategies or encouragement.

The Peer-to-Peer program supports development of the advocacy network. NNAAP has been diligent in opening their meetings and trainings to a broader array of adoption advocacy programs. For example, the September meeting included representatives from eight organizations and presenters who addressed evaluation, fund raising, and board

development. NNAAP planned an agenda that included best practice discussions, reflections on support and limitations, and updates from the National OCOC. The meeting offered opportunities for networking, learning and building relationships. Four of five interviewees who attended the Peer-to-Peer meeting rated the meeting 5 out of 5 in supporting their ability to network and make progress toward their goals. Attendees are listed in Table 5. One comment follows:

> *Bringing us together is an advantage. We (as OCOC programs) never came together. We have to be honest and share what works and what does not and we have an organization (like NNAAP) that can help us.*

*Table 5: Peer-to-Peer Meeting Participants*

| Peer-to-Peer meeting September 27-28, 2005 | Total Participants | Participants Categories |
|---|---|---|
| | 23 | **Year 2 grantees** □ AASK □ Oklahoma OCOC □ Nevada OCOC □ OCOC DFW □ Los Angeles OCOC **Other OCOCs** □ Virginia OCOC □ Maryland OCOC □ Illinois OCOC □ Georgia OCOC □ Pennsylvania OCOC □ Cumberland County DSS □ OCOC □ OCOC/UJIMA Community Services **Other Organizations** □ Rejoice, Inc. □ Dunbar Association, Inc. |

Most grantees identified NNAAP's convening and resource matching roles as key for their work. Stakeholders also noted that NNAAP plays an important role in creating networks where National OCOC has not. One stakeholder said

> *The Peer-to-Peer meeting was helpful—even though the meeting was not a National OCOC meeting, NNAAP, with its national structure and network, was able to hold meetings that even the national would not have been able to do.*

## *Outcome 5: Increased participant capacity to use technology to support their work*

As mentioned earlier grantees indicated that NNAAP's efforts to increase their technology capacity made a difference in their work, and most said they would not have been able to do it without NNAAP's support. An example comment follows:

> *We purchased an updated computer, printer and fax machine, which have allowed easy maintenance of data entry, reporting and graphics to enhance our professional documents. It also has allowed us to maintain communications with potential adoptive parents via cell phone.*

Members of the Steering Committee and Advisory Board reported that the meetings were vehicles for networking and learning more about what is being done across the states and they noted the unique role Reverend Talley plays. An example comment follows:

> *NNAAP acted as a bridge—Reverend Talley is able to open doors that we as a state could not do.*

Not all were aware of what NNAAP offered. One grantee said,

> *If I had known they provided that kind of training, I would have asked for help with the website.*

## *Outcome 6: Increased networking and partnering at regional and local levels*

Most interviewees spoke of networking as a chance to learn useful information, meet people and exchange ideas about their work. They indicated that the training, consulting, and networking with others doing this work was encouraging. In addition, they noted how NNAAP helped them leverage support and access with state departments and congregations. An example comment follows:

> *The training provided information that otherwise we would not have been privy to.*

> *(NNAAP) included the perspective that other ethnicities have the same challenges.*

Respondents did not indicate that they developed partnerships or collaborative activities with other grantees or organizations in the network. Most partnering was among organizations or individuals who already knew each other. Most expressed an interest but cited time, distance and newness to the work as deterrents to effective partnering with other organizations. Only one grantee spoke of actively pursuing relationships with other grantees.

> *We are learning from folks who come to the grantee meetings, especially executive directors, and go on their web sites; the Reverend from Maryland is inspiriting; Texas and Oklahoma folks are helpful. We have emailed Arizona because of their involvement in the Latino community.*

## WHAT WORKED WELL

Interviewees were asked what they thought worked well about NNAAP training and TA. They were overwhelmingly positive about the formal and informal training they experienced and noted especially: collegial learning; the OCOC model; emphasis on evidence-based practice; follow-along support; NNAAP as an adoption advocacy agency; and effective internal committee structure. Each is discussed below:

*Collegial, supportive environment for learning.* NNAAP personalities and practice contribute to an environment where participants feel free to ask questions and contribute their expertise. Stakeholders and grantees provided numerous examples of how beneficial this atmosphere was to their learning. One grantee said

> *This is the first time that we have done a grant like this and have the ability to learn in a supportive way how to document and provide feedback, rather than put you in a position that if you don't do it right, they cut you off at the legs. This will be the foundation on which we build our programs.*

*The OCOC model.* Grantees and stakeholders praised the OCOC model as an effective one to use when recruiting from cultural communities and some modified it to varying degrees to fit their contexts. Example comments follow:

> *The model has served as a trusting point between the community and the state.*

> *We can gear it and shape it to our community.*

*Emphasis on evidence-based practice.* Grantees noted that NNAAP's emphasis on gathering evidence related to practice was important. While some indicated that the evaluation process could be improved, all indicated that doing the quarterly reports was a good idea because they encouraged grantees to think about their progress (see grantee lessons learned in Appendix 3). One grantee said, "Reporting is helpful to make sure we are staying on top of goals."

Some interviewees noted NNAAP's willingness to self-improve based on what they are learning. Two comments follow:

> *Every time we meet, it has gotten better. NNAAP had a better handle on what they wanted and could say what they needed and how they needed it. The first time was vague.*

> *I appreciated the evolution of website and reporting process.*

**Follow-along support.** For grantees, it is not just what NNAAP does; it is also how they do it. Most appreciated having the opportunity to engage NNAAP in conversation as they worked on their projects and noted the positive tone NNAAP brought to all their work. One grantee said,

> *They are always caring and encouraging. They provide feedback when asked; they are interested in what is going on.*

Grantees also praised NNAAP's responsiveness to grantee questions and requests.

**NNAAP as national adoption advocacy agency.** Stakeholders noted that even though it is "hard to build an infrastructure to reach the need for African American churches and others to become involved"; NNAAP is making inroads and provides needed support. Documenting the work and progress is essential. One stakeholder said.

> *Being a national network of adoption advocacy programs provides a global look and keeps up knowledge of what is on the horizon such as new laws for foster care in diverse communities...*

One interviewee suggested that NNAAP could improve national networking by participating in more national conferences.

**Committed, experienced individuals who are willing to collaborate to support advocacy and adoption of waiting children.** Interviewees praised the collective wisdom of their peers in the network and the talented NNAAP staff.

**Effective internal committee structure.** Stakeholders interviewed indicated that the committee structure worked well, included quality people and that it benefited from Reverend Talley's leadership. Roles were clear and NNAAP communicated effectively with members, although two stakeholders noted that NNAAP could improve the frequency and depth the communication about program progress. Comments follow:

> *The Advisory Board is made up of individuals from every nook and cranny with a high caliber of expertise. Reverend Talley has the ability to work with the diversity of the Advisory Board. It is highly representative of adoption.*

> *The Steering Committee is involved in key tasks such as the mini-grant review. NNAAP respects the role of the Steering Committee. It can take some time to do this because they*

> *take their instructions from the committee; I feel valued and*
> *useful.*

However, one stakeholder suggested that NNAAP could make more effective use of the Steering Committee by "having them go out to work with grantees."

## CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

NNAAP is doing critical work and all interviewees recognize and respect it.   While generally very pleased with NNAAP's direction, interviewees also offered suggestions for strengthening NNAAP's efforts and potential impact.  Areas discussed most often included evaluation, sharing information /lessons learned communication, participation, training / TA clarity, and more clarity about NNAAP's roles and focus.  Each is discussed below.

*Evaluation process:*  While most interviewees thought the evaluation process was useful, they offered suggestions for improvement such as more clarity about the process, examination of the most useful reporting elements and process, improved structure in the web-based reporting process, and increased feedback to grantees on the format and usefulness of their reports.  One grantee commented:

> *It is challenging doing the quarterly reports; I do not know if*
> *it meets their expectations.  It would be helpful to receive*
> *more feedback.*

Specific comments about the web-based reporting follow:

> *Currently you log on and enter the report, and create it in a*
> *working document.  Would prefer a reporting form you can*
> *edit and then make changes and save--and to be able to do*
> *that online.*

> *NNAAP was not clear at first.  It would have been nice to*
> *have each objective ahead of time and have it be there when*
> *I log in.  Need to have more obstacles and objectives listed;*
> *clicking for additional objectives did not help.*

> *It would have been nice to access past reports when you log*
> *in.*

> *Sometimes it is a bit redundant.  We are now in the second*
> *year and we had to do the report the last quarter of first year*
> *and first quarter of second  There could be an  exception for*
> *people continuing so they would not have to write a fourth*
> *quarter report and a final report in the same time frame.*

Stakeholders wanted the evaluation to track long-term impact of the organizations and the degree to which they are able to sustain themselves after the grants.  Another concern was

grantee evaluation capacity building in evidence-based work. Suggestions included continuing the evaluation training because "people build skill over time" and making an evaluation consultation available to grantees to help them learn to tell their stories better. One person said,

> *Continue to help maintain the support that exists for OCOC programs, making sure they are evidence based practice. Have to continue to teach the concept.*

**Sharing information and lessons learned.** Some grantees and stakeholders emphasized the importance of sharing strategies and lessons learned more effectively and suggested a list serve, conference calls and increased networking. Their comments include:

> *Develop a way to exchange ideas among representatives, such as a list serve; that would not require traveling.*
>
> *Provide more opportunity for networking.*
>
> *NNAAP could have conference calls for each grantee to share a report.*

**Communication:** While most indicated that they were satisfied with communication experiences with NNAAP, at least three grantees noted specific glitches or ways communication could be improved. They highlighted limited advance notice of meetings and, especially in the beginning, unclear expectations for grantees. One suggestion was to improve communication through better use of technology. Example comments about communication follow:

> *The level of communication was not always the best; seemed ambiguous. They were not clear enough at first, but it got better over time.*
>
> *Advanced notice of meetings and training would be helpful.*
>
> *A quick email helps; it took a little longer to connect by phone.*

Stakeholders also indicated that communication could be improved concerning follow-up with those who attend the trainings and better sharing of what NNAAP is doing. Example comments follow:

> *Follow-up is needed to understand if we are meeting the need.*
>
> *The Steering Committee needs to know a little more. What is going on out there? Are we meeting people's needs?*
>
> *Develop a communication tool to put out there what NNAAP is doing. Maybe a one-pager to send to folks and announce what NNAAP is attempting to do.*

*Opportunities to participate.*  NNAAP is inclusive in its invitations which results in new faces at events.  This also presents the challenge of orienting new participants and not overlooking the comfort level many participants already have with each other.  That very comfort can be exclusionary if careful attention is not paid to supporting individual engagement in a variety of ways.

*Training and TA clarity.*  Several interviewees emphasized the importance continuing and enhancing the training and suggested that NNAAP say how training and TA are defined and be clear about what training and TA are offered.  They also noted that given their challenging work and schedules, getting to the training was sometimes difficult.

Suggestions for training topics included:
- Formal training on recruitment in churches;
- Becoming a non-profit organization, although at least two grantees indicated that they were not planning to go nonprofit;
- Evaluation

At least two stakeholders noted how changes in the contexts for adoption advocacy could potentially work, and suggested that NNAAP provide more advocacy and hands on support, which requires additional staff.  Their comments follow:

> *It seems as though NNAAP strategy is more dealing with advocacy than hands-on.  If NNAAP would become more specialized but diversified to have a team of folks with both advocacy and hands-on abilities, they could assist a larger number of organizations*

> *Consider how to have someone work with grantees for six months to assist with research and help find the funding— federal money will not always be there.  That would allow them to reach more organizations and have someone who is helping organizations with grant writing; use NNAAP funds to hire a consultant to strengthen their proposals.  It would create knowledge about understanding how to gain access to funds.*

*NNAAP roles and focus.*    Stakeholders commended NNAAP's current work and encouraged them to "continue to get funding" and continue the advocacy work".  One stakeholder said,

> *NNAAP needs to help with keeping the "hope alive" in terms of getting the message out to the broader public that OCOC is a viable concept; talk about its successes and visibility.*

Decreasing resources, changes in state approaches, and limited OCOC organizational capacity are part of the contexts within which NNAAP works.  Stakeholders indicated that:

> *We face resource scarcity and competition and the impact of state adoption departments moving toward privatization.*

> *The number one supporter in our county changed its policy and the grant was abruptly pulled.  We found ourselves with no support.*

Grantees and stakeholders differed in their perspectives about the <u>best focus for NNAAP and direction for OCOC</u>.  While philosophically, all agree that waiting children of color need homes, interviewees are influenced by different cultural and state contexts and their personal experiences with this work.  Some are concerned about having the culturally based, effective OCOC strategy diminished in visibility with reduced acknowledgement of its unique faith-based approach and cultural history.  Others contend that OCOC, as an overall strategy, should maintain the focus on African American children, especially in the face of dwindling resources. Stakeholders also addressed the need to modify the model to expand its use in different contexts.   One person suggested the importance of identifying how to extend NNAAP's work to the Native American community and said:

> *The Native American communities are underserved and under recognized; outreach tends to focus on the Hispanic community.*

One stakeholder suggested that their organization needs a new model in their contexts and shared:

> *We may have to look to another model; it was not the most effective model in our context.  We will have to move to a licensed child-placing agency and work along side other organizations.  It is imperative for us to embrace that.  At some point NNAAP will have to address the issue of becoming of a licensed child agency and have to understand the competitive nature of the adoption foster care.  The ones that can provide more services under one roof—those are the ones the state is looking to.*

Interviewees also noted the <u>dual challenging of "marketing" NNAAP support more and encouraging OCOC organizations to partner with them</u>.  NNAAP has worked to bridge divides among local OCOCs and with National OCOC to create a space to provide support that will ultimately reduce the number of waiting children.  Interviewees report that some OCOCs have kept their distance, which could be related to the short time NNAAP has been in existence.  Stakeholders ranged in their comments, some suggesting continued

and improved outreach to support to "existing or floundering" efforts and one stakeholder suggested that NNAAP work with those who "signed up". Example comments follow:

> *NNAAP needs to be marketed as a product—too many people still do not know what NNAAP is.*
>
> *NNAAP should be more recognized and understood so that others will feel more comfortable connecting with them.*
>
> *As long as we have the antagonistic relationship with National OCOC, I feel that there is divided loyalty—trying to get a clear distinction between OCOC and National has been detrimental. You may have to say we have to market NNAAP so people will have to take it or leave it—it is too valuable of an entity to keep extending the olive branch and have others keep shoving it in your face.*

At least four stakeholders addressed how <u>political contexts and uncertainties related to National OCOC's role impact NNAAP's work</u>. The distance between National and OCOCs is evident and current. It represents historical divides for those who have witnessed it and presents confusion for all, especially those who are new to the model. It contributes to an atmosphere of distrust, which is often hard for NNAAP staff to navigate, and sometimes gets in the way of developing deeper relationships among adoption advocates. Some express that they want direction from National OCOC, which has not yet materialized. Its silence creates a void, according to most stakeholders, and contributes to decreased African American influence related to national advocacy. A representative comment follows:

> *When I came into this work, there was not a supporting parent agency; there never was one that really provided the necessary guidance, leadership, pulling together, and a recruitment model for African Americans. People are confused; they do not know if they need to have allegiance to national, or embrace NNAAP.*

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1.  *Continue to refine and implement the NNAAP evaluation process.* Use the results of this evaluation and other opportunities to revise the logic model and evaluation plan. The logic model is most useful if it is collaboratively developed. Consider including key stakeholders and grantees in opportunities to review the drafts and offer insight on potential areas for improvement. Examine ways to decrease challenges with the reporting system.

2.  *Examine ways to provide clearer connections to and more discussion about the ultimate outcome of increased number of children adopted.* One way is to have programs clarify their own logic models and study more closely how they influence

foster care and adoption in their contexts. It includes tracking numbers of parents recruited, trained, and number of children adopted as a result of the work. It also includes tracking the quality, number and effectiveness of partnerships and other supportive relationships. While this work cannot be simply reduced to numbers, gauging program impact is essential.

3. *Share lessons learned more intentionally.* Interviewees expressed interest in continuing to learn about effective practices. Think about how quarterly reporting is used. Is there an opportunity to share lessons learned, progress, and challenges with grantees? While it might be uncomfortable for some, embedding it in the emerging trust will support additional collegial learning. In what ways can groups be encouraged to share not only what works, but also what does not—and how they used what they learned to improve their programs. Creating systematic expectations and opportunities for intentional sharing and learning will benefit all involved.

4. *Continue to explore best uses of the grantee reports.* Consistent requests for feedback on the report indicate not only the desire to do it correctly, but also the desire to know if the work they are doing is headed in the right direction. This is a great opportunity to collect and share lessons learned and "best practices" across the grantees. This exchange can further encourage them to share what is working well about their programs and what they think needs to improve. One grantee suggested that

> *NNAAP could have conference calls for each grantee to share a report; I am a stickler about sharing information. The point is adopting children...*

5. *Continue to improve communication.* Grantees noted the momentum NNAAP has gained since establishing the program and that both NNAAP and grantees were on learning curves in the beginning. They also noted increased communication clarity and effectiveness. Continue to create communication flows that provide timely information and effectively engage and inform grantees. Increasing the length of time for advanced notice of training, meetings or events may help grantees plan well in advance to participate.

6. *Continue to clarify TA and training.* All grantees consistently praise the quality of NNAAP TA and training. However, some were not aware of potential informal opportunities. Providing more information about the range of possible TA in addition to the list of scheduled trainings and meetings will be helpful.

7. *Clarify the Peer-to-Peer process and determine how to better track involvement.* Not all grantees fully understand how the Peer-to-Peer process works. Continue to identify components of the process and additional strategies to inform grantees and their peers and invite meaningful participation.

8.  *Consider how best to address issues with National OCOC.*  Continue to explore ways to bridge divides and encourage partnership.

9.  *Clarify what it means to be part of the network.*  Continue to examine the structural and functional possibilities of the network and how best to communicate the advantages of association and/or membership.

## CONCLUSION

NNAAP has successfully developed training and technical assistant strategies and approaches that contribute to grantee progress toward outcomes.  NNAAP made substantial progress in its program development and added training and learning opportunities that grantees considered useful.  The emerging network can bridge divides and build capacity among all participants to provide homes for waiting children.

# *APPENDICES*

*Appendix 1: Logic Mode and Evaluation Plan, Revised October 18, 2005*
National Network of Adoption Advocacy Programs (NNAAP)

| Who | CORE VALUES | Assumptions | IMPLEMENTATION/OBJECTIVES | ACTIVITIES | SHORT TERM OUTCOMES | LONG-TERM OUTCOMES | Lasing Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| How would describe participants? | We value. . . <br> ■ Children develop to their fullest potential in families. <br> ■ Churches and faith-communities have vital roles to play in the placement of children. <br> ■ Our faith tradition compels us to | ■ Working together, we have our greatest impact on the lives of vulnerable children. <br> ■ Persons must have the knowledge and competence to effectively work in cultural contexts | 1. Operate a national network, including collaboration and capacity building for programs. <br><br> 2. Identify diverse communities across the country needing programs that promote adoption in the network. <br><br><br> 3. Create and support programs in these locations which recruit and develop a pool of adoptive families, match them with children in foster care awaiting adoption, and provide post-adoption support to these families (OCOC model). | ■ Conduct strategic planning and capacity building. <br> ■ Organize regional and local networks. <br> ■ Start interactive webs tire. <br> ■ Redraft training manual. <br> ■ Disseminate PR to include in bilingual brochure. <br> ■ Ameri Corp, Mini-grant and peer-to- | Process <br> 1. Project management and governance are in place. <br><br> 2. Capacity building using evidenced-based training/TA is available through-out the network including <br> ■ mini-grants | Process <br> 7. Provide the evidenced based material, practices, and programs to support replication of OCOC model. <br><br> Participant <br> 8. Network as well as local OCOC organizat | Adoption barriers affecting minority and special needs populations are eliminated-lasting impact. |

| Who | CORE VALUES | Assumptions | IMPLEMENTATION/OBJECTIVES | ACTIVITIES | SHORT TERM OUTCOMES | LONG-TERM OUTCOMES | Lasing Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | advocate for vulnerable children.<br>▪ We value in relationships with those who share our common goals.<br>▪ We believe that waiting children of any race or circumstance deserve a home.<br><br>▪ Strong, skilled | to recruit for, provide support and advocate for waiting children.<br>▪ The OCOC model is an effective model for recruiting families for waiting children in the African American community. | | peer programs are being developed.<br>▪ Initiation of best Practices Competition<br>▪ Dissemination of information about OCOC organizations.<br><br>▪ TA/training to new organizations using evidenced based program models to include marriage support. | ▪ peer-to-peer resources<br>▪ assistance for technology improvement.<br><br>Participant<br>3. NNAAP participants increase their capacity to do their work as a result of NNAAP training/TA and other training. | ions are stable and self-sufficient. | |

| Who | CORE VALUES | Assumptions | IMPLEMENTATION/OBJECTIVES | ACTIVITIES | SHORT TERM OUTCOMES | LONG-TERM OUTCOMES | Lasing Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | faith-based culturally relevant organizations are effectively positioned to advocate for waiting children. | ▪ The core components of the model can also be effective in diverse cultural communities.<br><br>▪ Building capacity of faith-based adoption organizations supports their ability to become effective advocates for waiting | | | 4. Increase in the number and capacity of participants using the Peer-to-Peer program resulting in strengthened programs targeted areas.<br><br>5. Increased participant capacity to use and use of technology to | | |

| Who | CORE VALUES | Assumptions | IMPLEMENTATION/OBJECTIVES | ACTIVITIES | SHORT TERM OUTCOMES | LONG-TERM OUTCOMES | Lasing Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | children. | | | support their work. 6. Increased networking, regional, and local levels. | | |

**NNAAP EVALUATION PLAN-2005**

*REVISED: OCTOBER 18, 2005*

*DEFINITIONS:*

- *Evidence-based* is attempt to gather information before implementing activities; gathering information to use to plan and make decisions; i.e. identifying needs and concerns to be responsive.

- *Evaluation* is "the systematic collection of information about activities, characteristics, and outcomes of programs for use by specific people, organizations, or others working on similar issues to reduce uncertainties, improve effectiveness and make decisions with regard to what those programs are doing and affecting". *Adapted from Michael Quinn Patton, 199*

| OUTCOMES | PROGRESS INDICATORS | NEEDED INFORMATION | DATA COLLECTION METHOD | WHO | WHEN |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Short Term**<br><br>Process<br>1. Project management and governance are in place. | 1.1 NNAAP positions filled with appropriate job descriptions in place.<br>1.2 Policy and procedures in place.<br>1.3 Organizational structure/chart available.<br>1.4 Documents supporting relationships established are available. | ▪ List of positions<br>▪ Job descriptions<br>▪ Policy/procedure manual.<br>▪ Organizational chart<br>▪ List of contractors etc.<br>▪ Records and agreements.<br>▪ Meeting records | 1. Checklist of positions; job descriptions; policies completed; contractors; agreements; meeting summaries.<br><br>2. Document Review of checklists. | 1. Melissa, Rev. Talley<br><br><br><br>2. Evaluator | 1. Quarterly<br><br><br><br>2. Yearly |
| 2. Capacity building using evidenced- based training/ | 2.1 Dates and overviews of formal and informal training/TA provided by | ▪ List of training/TA, dates and participants<br>▪ Overview/ Summary of | 1. Record of training/TA<br><br>2. Document review of | 1. NNAAP Staff<br><br>2. Evaluator | 1. Quarterly<br><br>2. Yearly |

| Outcomes | Progress Indicators | Needed Information | Data Collection Method | Who | When |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TA is available. through-out the network including<br>• mini-grants<br>• peer-to-peer resources<br>• assistance for technology improvement | NNAAP for participants.[6] | training/TA | records | | |
| Participant<br>3. NNAAP participants increase their capacity to do their work as a result of NNAAP training/ TA and other training... | 3.1 Increase in number of participants in NNAAP training/TA<br><br>3.2 Feedback from participants indicates that the training/TA met the intended goals<br><br>3.3 Mini-grant participants and others use NNAAP mini-grants, training/TA and other | 3.1 Summary records of # of participants and programs<br><br>3.2 Perceptions of participants<br><br><br>3.3<br>a. Numbers of participants who participate in NNAAP and mini-grants<br><br>b. Participant perspectives of increased capacity; examples of use of NNAAP training/TA | 3.1 Document review<br><br><br>3.2<br>▪ Training evaluation survey<br>▪ Participant and staff telephone and face-to-face interviews<br><br>3.3-3.4. Document review of participation records training evaluations; grantee evaluation | 3.1<br>a. Staff<br><br>b. Evaluator<br>3.2<br>a. Staff<br>b. Evaluator<br><br><br><br>3.3-3.4 Evaluator | 3.1<br>a. Quarterly<br><br>b. Yearly<br>3.2<br>a. Summarize after each training/TA event<br>b. yearly<br><br>3.3-3.4 Yearly |

---

[6] *For 2006 evaluation plan, number of trainings etc should be included in the progress indicators.*

| OUTCOMES | PROGRESS INDICATORS | NEEDED INFORMATION | DATA COLLECTION METHOD | WHO | WHEN |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | training to build their capacity to do their work<br><br><br><br>3.4 Increase in the number of programs that utilize the OCOC recruitment and support model; Increase in the number of programs that utilize the OCOC recruitment and support model in culturally diverse communities | 3.4 # of programs using the OCOC mode | plans; interviews | | |
| 4. Increase in the number and capacity of participants using the Peer-to-Peer program resulting in strengthe | 4.1 Increase in the number of professionals providing support programs; # of orgs assisted by NNAAP in Peer-to-Peer program | 4.1  Evidence of utilization of OCOC recruitment and support model; numbers of programs that emerged<br><br>4.2  Participants reports of model use and | 4.1<br>a.  Document review of participant reports; document review of participation records | 4.1 Evaluator<br><br><br><br><br><br>4.2 Evaluator | 4.1 Yearly<br><br><br><br><br><br>4.2 Yearly |

| Outcomes | Progress Indicators | Needed Information | Data Collection Method | Who | When |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ned programs targeted areas | 4.2 Participants report increased use of model | impact on capacity | 4.2 Participant and staff telephone and face-to-face interviews | | |
| 5. Increased participant capacity to use and use of technology to support their work | 5.1 # of NNAAP assisted website developments<br><br>5.2 More use of technology to support work | 5.1 # of NNAAP trainings and web site support<br><br>5.2 Perceptions of the usefulness and NNAAP training to support technology development<br><br>5.3 Examples of how participants increased technology capacity | 5.1 Document review of list of trainings and support; websites developed<br><br>5.2<br>• Participant telephone and face-to-face interviews<br>• Document review of grantee reports ;training evaluations ; training survey<br><br>• Training evaluations<br><br>• Follow-up survey<br><br>5.3<br>• Staff and participant telephone and face-to-face | 5.1 Evaluator<br><br>5.2<br>• Evaluator<br><br><br>• Staff<br><br>• Staff<br><br>5.3<br> Evaluator<br><br><br><br><br>• Staff | 5.1 Yearly<br><br>5.2<br>• Yearly<br><br><br>• After each training<br><br>• 2x a year<br><br>5.3<br>• Yearly<br><br><br><br><br>• After each |

| OUTCOMES | PROGRESS INDICATORS | NEEDED INFORMATION | DATA COLLECTION METHOD | WHO | WHEN |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | interviews<br>• Document review of grantee reports; training evaluations; training survey<br>• Training evaluations<br>• Follow-up survey | • Staff | training<br>• 2x a year |
| 6. Increased networking and partnering at regional and local levels. | 6.1 OCOC groups buy into NNAAP network mission, goals, and objectives<br><br>6.2 Network membership increases<br><br>6.3 Increased collaboration at regional and local level | Needs to be completed | | | |
| **Long Term**<br>Process<br>7. Provide the evidenced based material, practices, and programs to support | 7.1 Evidenced-based material, practices are documented;<br><br>7.2 Increase in programs using OCOC model. | 7.1 List of material and practices<br><br>7.2 # of programs using OCOC model<br><br>7.3 Evidence of the impact of the programs on waiting children | 7.1 Document review of cataloged material and practices<br><br>7.2 Document review of number and focus of programs | 7.1 Staff<br><br>7.2 Staff; Evaluator<br><br>7.3 Program leaders; NNAAP leaders; | 7.1 Yearly<br><br>7.2 Yearly<br><br>7.3 Yearly |

| OUTCOMES | PROGRESS INDICATORS | NEEDED INFORMATION | DATA COLLECTION METHOD | WHO | WHEN |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| replication of OCOC model. | 7.3<br>• Programs make a difference for waiting children<br><br>• Programs produce credible evaluation and data that is generated based on evidenced based models- process | | 7.3 Document review of impact reported in program evaluations; NNAAP evaluations | evaluator | |
| Participant<br>8. Network as well as local OCOC organizations are stable and self-sufficient- part. | 8.1 Increase the number of faith-based programs that use the OCOC recruitment and support model<br><br>8.2 Increase in participants in NNAAP network<br><br>8.3 Increased stability of Network and OCOC organizations | These need to be completed. | | | |

### Appendix 2:  Focus Group Questions:  NNAAP Grantees

NNAAP wants to learn about the effectiveness of the capacity building training and support it provides to support your work.  The conversation does not focus on the results of your work, but on your perspectives of the effectiveness of the technical assistance, training and other support you received from NNAAP.  NNAAP will use the information to improve its programs.

Introduction
1. Please share your name and in three sentences, state the goal of your organization.

2. What is the focus area for your grant? What did you hope to accomplish as a result of the grant you received from **NNAAP**.

3. How would you describe **NNAAP**'s role with groups such as yours? *(Write the responses on poster paper)*

*One of NNAAP's goals is to "Support and enhance collaborative effectiveness of new and existing adoption advocacy programs modeled after the One Church One Child concept of faith based partnering". Let us talk about your perceptions of the extent to which they are achieving that goal.*

4. To what extent have you had more opportunity to network with other groups doing similar work since you received the mini-grant? In what ways did **NNAAP** facilitate that networking?

5. To what extent do you collaborate more with others to accomplish your work since receiving the mini-grant? To what extent did **NNAAP** support your ability to collaborate or increase your effectiveness?

*Another goal is to "Develop programs in diverse cultural communities that utilize the One Church One Child concept."*

6. To what extent have you developed programs in diverse communities since receiving the mini-grant?

7. To what extent did **NNAAP** assist you with that development?
- What worked well?
- What could have been improved?

8. Please review **NNAAP'S** mission, goals, and objectives. To what extent do you think these are appropriate for an organization such as **NNAAP**? Please explain.

9. Let us talk more about the technical assistance you received from **NNAAP**. Let us make a list of the TA or training you have received from **NNAAP**.

Which did you participate in? Training included:
1. 2004 Grantee Orientation
2. Site visits
3. Evaluation training
4. Website Development
5. Recruitment and Training
6. Special event
    a. Fundraising

| 5 | The TA or training effectively supported our ability to accomplish the grant work. |
|---|---|
| 4 | The TA or training somewhat supported out ability to accomplish the grant work. |
| 3 | The TA or training covered information or material I already knew. |
| 2 | The TA or training provided limited information to support our ability to accomplish the grant work. |
| 1 | The TA or training providing did not provide information we could use to support accomplishment of the grant work. |

Insert the specific technical training and assistance you received. Use the rating scale and circle the number that best represents the effectiveness of the training in supporting you and your work.

| NNAAP Technical Assistance or Training | Rating: Circle one |
|---|---|
| a. | 5  4  3  2  1 |
| b. | 5  4  3  2  1 |
| c. | 5  4  3  2  1 |
| d. | 5  4  3  2  1 |
| e. | 5  4  3  2  1 |

10. What did you hope would be the result of the NNAAP training?
    - To what extent were your expectations met?
    - What else could have been done to meet your expectations?

11. As a result of the NNAAP training, what specific knowledge did you gain or what skills did you learn?
    - How did you use what you learned to accomplish your grant work?
    - What about the training contributed to your ability to make a difference in your grant work?

12. What else can NNAAP do to support your ability to accomplish your grant work? In what ways could NNAAP improve its TA and training?

13. What suggestions would you offer to NNAAP as it continues to provide TA and training for adoption advocacy groups such as yours?

14. Is there anything else you would like to add that might assist NNAAP as it continues its work?

### Appendix 3: Grantee Lessons Learned

Grantees shared lessons learned during the interviews and focus groups that are expressed in the body of this report. Two themes grantees mentioned include building relationships and required time to make progress.

▪ Building relationships with special churches, pastors and congregations is essential. Spreading information across a broad array of organizations does not always support congregations' abilities to use the information consistently. Comments include:

> *We actually have relationships with churches, ten faith- based communities. The pastor's involvement was huge. He now he can talk about it on personal level—and say this is what we need to do.*

▪ This work takes time. It takes time to build trust, understanding and skill to recruit and train parents, work effectively in faith communities, and advocate for children with state agencies. Representative comments follow:

> *We thought we would get a lot more done in the first year. This needs to be longer time frame—it took five or six months before we could talk to the right person.*

> *We look to hear the commitment of one person from that church—then the priest gets involved and then he has the small community to get involved.*



**NNAAP Grantee Lessons Learned**
**Grant Year 2004-2005**

| | Aid to Adoption of Special Kids |
|---|---|
| *Quarter 1* | 1. Managing the schedule of the project is critical to meeting our quarterly goals. We also learned that the community is very helpful, cooperative, and interested in the Uno Iglesia Un Ninos mission. |
| *Quarter 2* | 1. Managing the coordination between AASK's departments is critical to meeting our identified deadlines. AASK's community recruiters, development, and community relations staff members are holding weekly meetings within their departments. <br> 2. Department managers are meeting weekly to discuss progress toward OCOC goals. |
| *Quarter 3* | 1. Although AASK does not have the official support of the Diocese, the church community has embraced the program and is cooperating fully |

| | Aid to Adoption of Special Kids |
|---|---|
| | with AASK to recruit on behalf of Arizona's Hispanic children. |
| *Quarter 4* | 1. The use of collateral materials may not be an effective recruitment strategy for the Hispanic community. AASK is now utilizing a more grassroots approach to recruitment to reach the Hispanic churches within Maricopa County. <br> 2. AASK has discovered the Hispanic community must be recruited through grassroots efforts. Making a phone call and presenting a formal presentation packet as the first step of initiating church involvement was unsuccessful because pastors felt that the majority of program-related responsibilities would fall upon them. By recruiting volunteers at AASK orientations and using those volunteers to bring the program to their own church pastors, AASK has developed a grassroots approach to developing and maintaining high commitment participants. This approach also assures pastors that the congregation will be actively involved in the program, and in turn, allows pastors to more comfortably accept responsibility for the program. These volunteers bring the churches to AASK recruiters, rather than AASK recruiters making cold calls. AASK recruiters report that they now have the ability to focus on participating churches and churches that are likely to participate rather than utilizing that time calling churches that are not interested in the program and will not likely commit. <br> 3. By formalizing commitment level into a categorical system with identifying characteristics, AASK has been able to better evaluate the commitment level of participating churches. Maintaining high commitment and participation in the program has been simplified by designating specific events that must occur in order to achieve high commitment status. <br> 4. In Arizona, it is legally required that families apply for adoption certification through the Juvenile Court System. Agencies are not legally able to certify families, match families with children, or place children into adoptive homes. Rather, potential adoptive families are trained and prepared for certification through private or public agencies. AASK and other adoption agencies submit their clients' home studies to the Juvenile Court System for approval. Once certified, families are considered for placement. Adoption agencies present and advocate for their families to the child's case manager, an employee of the Arizona Department of Economic Security, who then selects a family from a pool of interested families from all adoption agencies. Typically, the process from intake to certification takes 6-9 months. Once certified, the process of matching a family and child can take anywhere from 1 to 18 months. |

| | One Church One Child of Oklahoma |
|---|---|
| *Quarter 1* | 1. Communication is paramount. |

| | |
|---|---|
| *Quarter 2* | 1. Persistence pays off!<br>2. Future timelines should consider the family schedule and availability of the family to receive the needed services. |
| *Quarter 3* | 1. Attending the grant evaluation training helped provide significant insight into developing a plan approach to project finalization It is critical for the person that will be responsible for the quarterly reporting to be able to attend the pre-program orientation and training. This provides invaluable insight into what is needed during the reporting phases and what is expected from the respective agency. During the development of this program, it was assumed that referral information would be up to date and that the existing lines of communication and avenues of support would be sufficient to complete this project. The reality is due to staff turnover and, in-come cases, frequency of moves, the information was outdated. OCOC-OKC determined that the best resolution was to provide CAP information to families as soon as they complete the certification process and follow-up with them at placement. This will allow time for the families to become familiar with the services and determine what needs may exist. |
| *Quarter 4* | 1. None |

| One Church One Child of Southeast Texas | |
|---|---|
| *Quarter 1* | 1. Projects plan proceeding as scheduled. |
| *Quarter 2* | 1. To contact NNAAP for suggestions |
| *Quarter 3* | 1. The objective was completed by providing updated technology to assist OCOCSeT in the areas of Service Delivery, Data Collection, Evaluation and Reporting. Assistance with monthly cell phone fees ensured communication while out of the office.<br>2. Include credits for NNAAP in the newsletter. |
| *Quarter 4* | 1. None |

| Washoe County Department of Social Services | |
|---|---|
| *Quarter 1* | 1. Keep trying.<br>2. Start up is greatly challenging due to system issues but benefit will be great.<br>3. Government bureaucracy can be a barrier. Do not give up. |
| *Quarter 2* | 1. This writer perceived that gaining a board for One Church One Child would prove to be relatively simple and that the challenge would be gaining consensus and having the board work well together. The exact opposite has proven to be true as the board is working well together with no philosophical challenges now that it is together.<br>2. The needs of children in foster care surpass any differences in how worship is conducted with the board members and they have risen greatly to the opportunity that One Church One Child has provided |

| | |
|---|---|
| | them.<br>3. This must be a collaboration and partnership to work. No one entity moves ahead without the other.<br>4. Trust your board. |
| *Quarter 3* | 1. The board seems to not only know their own churches but through their church contacts have an affinity for other churches. WCDSS needs to keep an openness to learning rather than making churches fit what was written<br>2. Keep communicating and recognizing those who work with this program.<br>3. Ministers are busy but seem to have trouble at times designating responsibility. Since the board is comprised of ministers they also have trouble with moving the responsibility to an appointed person even though they all voice an understanding of the need.<br>4. Now that OCOC board is formed and operating it is time to look at the sustainability of the program and keeping a strong board supported.<br>5. WCDSS rep. needs to let go and let the board take over. The board and the Advocate Coordinator have the ability to be self-governing if given the tools to do so. |
| *Quarter 4* | 1. None |

| | |
|---|---|
| | **Southern California Foster Family and Adoption Agency** |
| *Quarter 1* | 1. Churches move slowly! |
| *Quarter 2* | 1. We continue to find that while our message is consistent, we have to tailor that message for each congregation. Having direct dialog with congregation leaders is tremendously helpful, especially when we make appearances at services. Being able to plan with the pastor or rabbi how the message should be delivered is critical to reaching those present. Also, knowing as much as possible about the demographics of the congregants ahead of time helps the SCFFAA staff to craft a heartfelt message geared to engage the parishioners. In addition, learning specifically how each congregation wants to be involved in their community is helpful in that we can better understand what their motivation is and how we can utilize them in future presentations. If a congregation has an active number of people wanting to become parents, our goal is to encourage the congregation to become extended family for the children who will eventually come into the homes. By engaging the congregation as a whole, we will have ongoing success after children have been placed in the first families coming through the OCOC program. |
| *Quarter 3* | 1. Progress is slow when communicating and working with churches, as a result of organizational structuring and the necessary steps we must go through to accomplish decisions within the church. |
| *Quarter 4* | 1. As we have consistently reported, churches move slowly in communication and in action planning. |

| | One Church One Child of Los Angeles |
|---|---|
| *Quarter 1* | 1. Coordinating pastor input took longer than projected. Learned it is important for pastor is to have a biblical context in understanding the greater application of needs in a social service setting (i.e., Jesus was adopted by Joseph). Also, that there is limited research on faith-based adoptions outreach and volunteerism in this arena. |
| *Quarter 2* | 1. Volunteers are very willing to work and expect some form of recognition.<br>2. The training events have benefited trainees as well as trainers by increasing their understanding of the field and the work to be done. Most all trainers that have come forward through the churches to date have either had previous experiences as a foster or adoptive parent and have an interest in parenting or children. Ninety percent of the volunteers to date not only have previous experiences in the field, but also have been African American females. |
| *Quarter 3* | 1. The internet and email are the fastest and most (cost & response) effective way to communicate/capture information, conduct trainings and TO distribute our Volunteer Adoption Ministry outreach materials. |
| *Quarter 4* | 1. None |