

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
2002 AGENCY EVALUATIONS**

Conducted for

**CITY OF COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
OFFICE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES**

April 9, 2002

Conducted by



**409 Vandiver Drive
Building 6, Suite 102
Columbia, Missouri 65202
Telephone: (573) 874-1333
Fax: (573) 874-6904**

www.horizonresearch.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Background	1
Process.....	1
Secondary Data Collection and Reporting.....	1
Agencies and Program Services Evaluated	2
Program Types	2
Summary of Scores.....	3

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

For the past four years, the City of Columbia has contracted with Horizon Research Services to evaluate city-funded human services agencies. Part of Horizon's role has been to help agencies move toward outcomes-based planning and performance evaluations.

For each year's evaluation, the Office of Community Services decided to choose programs that are generally related to a service delivery system focusing on a specific population being served or a similar set of services being provided. The evaluations for 2002 focused on services for homeless individuals and prevention of homelessness.

Process

At the beginning of the evaluation process, the evaluator conducted a review to determine if each program had written measurable objectives and outcomes. The Social Services Proposals to the City of Columbia, Boone County, and Columbia Area United Way for the years 2002, 2001, and 2000 were the starting points for the review. The agencies were asked to send supporting documents to HRS such as instruments used in internal program evaluation and review processes, instruments from client feedback mechanisms, and instruments from outcomes-based evaluation processes already in use. These documents, reports from all of these measures, as well as reports from external reviewing agencies were reviewed.

The HRS evaluators used their expertise to determine if the program's objectives and outcomes were measurable and appropriate for the programs offered. If the agency had not developed a set of measurable objectives and outcomes for their specific program service, the evaluator developed some suggested outcomes objectives. These were discussed with the appropriate agency personnel during a site visit to the agency. The evaluator used a combination of available program records and secondary data to determine the measurable outcomes for the program.

Secondary Data Collection and Reporting

In addition to the specific program information gathered during the process, relevant secondary, community-wide data relating to this issue/program area was also included in the report. This allowed the services being evaluated to be compared to broader community needs and relevant "community benchmarks."

Also included were interviews with the various "Community Support Teams" of the Community Partnership and the Health Report Card Project to gather their input and any available data that relates to the issue/program area being evaluated.

Agencies and Program Services Evaluated

The agency program evaluation process was conducted for seven program services, with six agencies involved in the evaluation process. The Office of Community Services chose these seven programs for evaluation in 2001-2002.

- The Front Door
- Harbor House
- Rainbow House – Crisis Care
- Rainbow House – Emergency Shelter
- Reality House
- The Shelter
- Welcome Home

Program Types

Programs classified according to the definitions in the 1998 MASW report on homelessness are listed in the table below.

Type of Shelter	Emergency Shelter	Transitional Shelter	Referral Shelter	Permanent Shelter
Harbor House	X			
Rainbow House		X		
Reality House		X		
The Front Door (not listed in the MASW report)	X	X		
The Shelter	X			
Welcome Home		X		

Summary of Scores

PROGRAM NAME	SCORE ON THE FRAMEWORK FOR CONTINUOUS EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT (15 maximum)	SCORE ON THE FRAMEWORK FOR GATHERING AND ANALYZING OUTCOMES (15 maximum)	PROGRAM ADDRESSES IDENTIFIED COMMUNITY ISSUES (128 maximum)	SUMMARY OF MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS
Front Door	10.5	9.5	71	Emphasize the quality of service objectives in the Social Services Proposal.
Harbor House	8.0	8.0	31	Restate current objectives as outcome objectives. Refine definitions into measurable segments.
Rainbow House – Crisis Care	10.0	9.0	34	Use objectives on internal planning documents as objectives for the Social Services Proposal. Maintain consistent objectives from year to year.
Rainbow House – Emergency Shelter	10.0	9.0	32	Use objectives on internal planning documents as objectives for the Social Services Proposal. Maintain consistent objectives from year to year.
Reality House	7.0	9.0	56	State objectives more strongly in the Social Services Proposal. Refine the definitions of the words in the mission statement.
The Shelter	10.0	11.0	44	Restate current objectives as outcome objectives. Use existing data collected.
Welcome Home	4.0	5.0	24	Use existing data collection forms to formulate outcome objectives.

Score on the frameworks: Program personnel were asked to rate themselves on the evaluation frameworks and assign a score to their agency's efforts. The self-rating appears in the columns reporting the score on the frameworks.

Score on addressing identified community needs: In the main report "2002 Agency Evaluations" each table in the section entitled "Assessment of relationship of goals to pertinent community issues" was scored, assigning 2 points for a major goal and 1 point for an indirect goal. This was used only as an indication of how many of the identified community issues each program was addressing with no positive or negative value attached. Many of the programs have definable goals and objectives aimed at a specific population.