Safe Schools/Healthy Students Webinar

Developing Your Logic Model

9/9/2009

JIM VETTER: Welcome to the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Webinar on *Developing Your Logic Model*. I'm Jim Vetter, one of your Technical Assistance Specialists at the National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention.

This is one of a series of events to support you throughout the years of your Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant, in addition to all the support you get from your individual Technical Assistance Specialists that's assigned to your site.

We really appreciate your taking the time to be here today for what we think promises to be some very valuable assistance for you, particularly because your logic model is one of the key tools that sites use to plan, to implement, and to evaluate your work throughout the time of your grant.

In just a moment, I'll turn things over to Scott Formica, of Social Science Research and Evaluation. All of the slides and other materials that Scott will be sharing with you today are available now at the www.promoteprevent.org website. You can access them also directly through a link you received today with your webinar reminder email, or any time when you go to visit Promote-Prevent.

We're also recording the entire webinar in case you'd like to review it again later or share the material with other colleagues.

One reason you might want to share this material with other colleagues is if you have not yet hired your Project Director. I heard that one of the Project Directors was just hired, just had your first Core Management Team meeting with your Project Director today.

Today Scott's going to be sharing with you lots of really valuable information about what to do with your Logic Model, how to create a strong Logic Model, use this new format that's maybe different than what you had in your application.

But at the same time Scott's going to be sharing a lot of great information with you, he's also very eager to hear your questions.

Today, we have with us someone who really is probably one of the best possible people to guide you in taking the next step in developing your Logic Model.

Scott Formica of Social Science Research and Evaluation has had many years of experience working with Safe Schools/Healthy Students sites just like yours, and also with the grant program on the national level.

In fact, when your Federal Project Officers for this program wanted to develop a Logic Model format that would really be specific for this grant program, they turned to Scott. So Scott's the person who created the Safe Schools/Healthy Students recommended format Logic Model. Today Scott is going to share with you strategies for using this format most effectively. So Scott, welcome.

SCOTT FORMICA: Thank you Jim. I actually tend to prefer anonymity when it comes down to who is responsible for developing the Logic Model format. Because I find that I get less hate email that way.

JIM VETTER: [LAUGHS] Thanks for revealing that secret, Scott.

SCOTT FORMICA: But that's okay. This morning we're going to be going through what is termed the Logic Model Refinement. And really when we look at this, I tend to think of this more as the Logic Model expansion. Or Logic Model version 2.0 or Phase 2 of the process if you would.

And when I say that, what I mean is we are not asking grantees at this point to make any significant or substantive changes to the Logic Model they provided as part of their original application.

What we're asking folks to do at this point is incorporate information that most likely already exists within the context of your existing proposal.

So, it's adding information here and there, tightening it up a bit, and incorporating one or two other elements. But most of the work has already been done when you're thinking about this. Historically, Logic Models were not a required component of this grant. This changed in 2006 with a group of grantees that came on in 2006.

And for those of you who don't know, this initiative, Safe Schools/Healthy Students actually dates back all the way to 1999.

But it was really around 2005 leading into 2006 when a group of Federal Project Officers from the Department of Education from Sampson, from the Department of Justice sat down, talking about what were some of the characteristics of sites that tended to perform well with regard to outcomes and just implementing the grant.

And what they found in looking across and identifying the sites that were the high performers, they did have something in common.

They all had on their own, since it wasn't required at that point, developed a Safe Schools/Healthy Students Logic Model. After making this realization, that's what

Jim was speaking about: they came to the National Center and asked us to draft a template or worksheet to guide folks through thinking more seriously about developing this type of model.

And you develop this as part of your original application, and once again, this is really Phase 2 of that process.

I think it's important to, particularly for those sites who have not yet hired their Project Director, that there are representatives who fulfill other roles at the site. Because really this comes down to a task that the Project Director is charged with completing. But it's a task they're really going to need help from additional folks at their site, grant partners, their supervisors. So this is really an opportunity both for the Project Director and for the site to come together and engage in collaborative and meaningful conversation about what the grant's going to look like over the course of the next four or five years.

We are doing this now in the process because we want to give grantees and sites tend to really digest this material and begin working on the Logic Model prior to arriving at the new grantees' meeting.

I think when the new grantees' meeting comes up, every site will have an opportunity to sit down and do some more intensive work on this with their Technical Assistance Specialists. But we really want to introduce this concept to folks and allow people to digest the material and maybe begin working through some of these issues.

As Jim mentioned, we will be stopping at several points within the presentation. First, to allow those people on the phone to provide examples from their own Logic Model. This is really an opportunity for you to share with other folks and me where your Logic Model is with regard to some of the components at this point.

And we're going to be providing some on the spot feedback, and I'll speak to that a little later.

And we're also going to be stopping at a couple different points, just to field any questions that people have. I'm going to try to go through in a relatively quick manner so that we can maximize the time for questions.

So this first slide really looks at the purpose of this presentation. And I spoke a little bit about this. But in looking at this, the purpose of the presentation is to walk the grantees through the recommended format for what we're terming your "Final Safe Schools/Healthy Students Logic Model."

That's a misnomer in some sense. Because as you will find in discussing this with your Federal Project Officer and Technical Assistance Specialist, this is a deliverable that comes along pretty quick in the project. But the Logic Model is intended to be a living, breathing document that will potentially change through the course of your grant.

It's really the central brain, or foundation for the rest of the project. As I mentioned, the Logic Model, the final version of it, is due as part of your final Memorandum of Agreement along with your Six Month Project Report.

As this slide shows, this process is intended to accomplish four goals. The first of which is to help you deliver and develop a tool for describing and sharing aspects of your Safe Schools/Healthy Students project.

Now, a Logic Model, for those of you who've worked with one before is a very efficient and compact way to summarize what your project is doing and why it's doing it.

So it can be a very valuable communications tool. If you're trying to engage new partners, or since the grant was granted some time ago, for bringing partners back in the fold and serving as the basis for, once again, having open communication. Having something that can very easily summarize your project.

The second purpose here is to promote the use of a consistent model or process across all the different Safe Schools/Healthy Students grantee sites. And this is done for a variety of reasons.

We refer to this as a "recommended structure for the Logic Model." But I think it really behooves sites to pay attention to this model, and to the extent possible to try to adopt it locally. Because it really facilitates discussions.

One, with your Federal Project Officer moving forward. Two, with your Technical Assistance Specialist. And three, across Safe Schools/Healthy Students grantee sites. And when you come to face to face meetings or we're talking on the phone, we find it really helps if people have adopted similar models so there's a common language occurring.

So I can say, well, "I'm dealing with Element One and here's my objective." And we're talking about the same thing. So we're really stressing and promoting the use of this model.

Third, the purpose here is to assist in the development of your site-specific evaluation plan. You're going to be hearing more about evaluation plans as time goes on, probably within the context of the new grantee's meeting. But each site is going to be required, when you have your evaluator on board, or for those sites who already do have an evaluator on board, to submit and evaluation plan.

And the format for the evaluation plan the Technical Assistance Specialists have pulled together is really driven by the Logic Model. So, a lot of the fields are set up to be similar, so you can very easily copy and paste information out of the Logic Model into your evaluation plan.

So it’s really designed to facilitate that process of down the line developing your site-specific evaluation plan.

And the final, probably most important purpose here is this template has been designed in a manner that it also will facilitate your reporting on the 524B Reporting Form that every site is required to submit biannually.

And what I mean by that is, once again, very similar to the way in which this is designed to dovetail with the evaluation plan, it’s designed to dovetail with the reporting forms.

So in essence, a lot of the 524B up front section, Section A, can really be pre-populated based on simply cutting and pasting information right out of a site’s logic model.

So we’ve designed it with a number a purposes in mind and I just want to point that out.

It really does fit in with a number of different products, deliverables and components for the initiative.

So, this first slide is really a schematic of the Logic Model. And what we’ve done here is, as I’ve said before, all sites were required to develop a Logic Model as part of their original application. And this maps together what similarities and differences are between the two models.

So in the preliminary program Logic Model every site should have, there are a couple of components. This is illustrated here in the top row.

Every site should have identified their goals for the initiative, their needs and gaps they’re trying to address, their objectives, although in the preliminary Logic Model this was termed Outcomes. Here, we’re going to be speaking about it as being part of the objectives of the initiative. I’m going to talk about that as we get further along in the presentation.

The next column is the Activities column, where sites were required to indicate the program’s policies and procedures being put in place as part of the initiative. Then there was the partner’s roles column, identifying those partners on the grant who will be working on the initiative.

Then the last column everyone should have is How Outcomes Will Be Measured.

When we move into the recommended final implementation Logic Model, there are two new boxes. And really the rest of the boxes draw directly from the original columns.

So first we have the Safe Schools/Healthy Students element. And I think this is probably implicit in a lot of Logic Models that were developed as part of the application.

We're just asking for it here to be described in more explicit terms. So, having you go through and identify which physical Healthy Students element you're speaking about in each of the respected pages of the Logic Model.

And once again, I'll be speaking about that.

The recommended final implementation Logic Model often in a column called the Goals, similar to your original column. We have Baseline Data and Needs. Here, we're emphasizing Baseline Data, and again this is a point I'm going to be coming back to later in the presentation.

It's going to be very similar to your original Needs and Gaps column.

As I mentioned before, we have the Objectives column, which really replaces the Outcomes column from the original model. Activities remains the same. There's a new column here termed Process Measures we'll be asking people to work on, and I'll describe how we'd like people to do that.

The Partner's Roles column will transition easily into the Partners column. And then the column that had originally been How Outcomes will Be Measured, here we're terming it Indicators and GPRA. And this is very deliberate language.

Let me say it a different way. If you haven't heard about GPRA yet, you will be hearing about GPRA through the course of this initiative, it's a term that will be repeated again and again. So, even though the column includes similar information, there's really a reason the language has changed here so to speak.

So let's look at the recommended Logic Model step by step as we go through this. So I'm going to look over here. And what I have pulled together for you initially is an example of what the recommended final Safe Schools/ Healthy Students Logic Model might look like for one goal.

You'll see here the eight different components are represented. On the top, we have the Safe Schools/Healthy Students element. Then this is followed directly beneath by the goal. And then we have from left to right Baseline Data and Needs, Objectives, Activities related to those objectives, our Process Measures related to those Activities.

The partners who will be working or contributing to each of the activities being put into place, and then finally we have the indicators and the GIPRA column. The presentation is designed to go through these step by step. We have an eight step process.

At this point, some of you may be saying, “We already have a Logic Model. Why are we having to do this, why are we adding on?”

I think there are really two answers to that. First, I think it’s important to acknowledge that things change. And as I said before, at this point the grant was for many months ago. This is really an opportunity or a gift if you would to take another look at your Logic Model and to incorporate or reflect any changes that have occurred either as a result of your post-award letter from your Federal Project Officer or your post award call, whichever mechanism that took, or in response to local conditions that may have changed.

You may have, in your original Logic Model or application, identified an evidence-based program. And when you started to research it more, identified, well maybe training’s not available, maybe it’s a lot more expensive than we initially anticipated. So this is an opportunity to incorporate some of those changes that have either occurred through the natural cycle of time, or in response to issues that were raised with the application when it was funded.

So with that in mind, I’m going to go over to step one.

So as I said before, really, Safe Schools/Healthy Students grantees, and this is probably not new information, must focus on the activities curricula, programs and services in a manner that responds to the community’s needs, gaps or weaknesses in areas related to the five Safe Schools/Healthy Students comprehensive plan elements.

The elements are listed up here on the slide, in response to the federal mandate about what this program is intended to and ought to do.

Looking through the first element, we have those activities that are designed to promote safe school environments and violence prevention activities. Element two deals with alcohol, tobacco and other drug prevention activities.

Element three looks specifically at student behavior, social and emotional supports. Element four deals with mental health services both in schools and community based settings.

And then the fifth element deals with early childhood social and emotional learning programs. Now, in thinking about this, the five elements are really the major organizational framework upon which the Logic Model rests. And as such, the first step in developing the final logic model is once again to explicitly identify which element each page of the Logic Model is addressing.

Now, you should refer back to the Safe Schools/Healthy Students program announcement for a complete description of each of these five elements.

There’s a very nice description of what activities or needs naturally tend to cluster under each of these different elements. So if you have not, again, explicitly noted this in your original proposal Logic Model, you may want to refer back to the original program announcement and look at the federal description of these different elements.

So, just to give an example of what this might look like, and the example I put up earlier and the one we're going to be speaking to, the example would be, element one: safe school environments and violence prevention activities.

A bad example would be character education programs, because this is not one of the five Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant elements.

Basically anything that's not an SSHS grant element, one of the five, would be a bad example here. Some construction tips for this that we've learned over time in working with a number of sites. When developing this final version of the Logic Model, you may find it useful to begin by working on the element you feel most comfortable describing.

So rather than going immediately to element one just because it falls first in the sequence, you may find that just by the way that you've described it in your application or the way it's already pulled together, you're really more comfortable speaking about the mental health element.

In that case, what you might want to do is focus on that element. And then once you're done with the single element, send it off to your Technical Assistance Specialist here at the National Center for feedback.

This allows you to really help ensure you're on the right track and it provides you, really with a site-specific model that can be used as a reference for working on the other elements.

That's just one example of a best practice I think a number of sites have identified and tried to incorporate over time.

The second step of the process is to define the goals. And really when we look here, again, most of this will probably already exist in your preliminary Logic Model in that Goals column.

And when we're talking about goals, we try to be very consistent with the language that was provided in the application.

Thinking about goals as being very broad statements that describe the longer-term impacts you're trying to reach. Goal statements describe the intended long-term outcomes of the initiative in once again, very large and broad terms.

When developing your final logic model, you should be asking yourself which needs cluster together to define a common issue. In fact, even though goals tend to fall in this model at a higher level up underneath the element, you may find it useful to first go over to step three and try to group together common needs or issues, then return to step two and define what the overarching goal is. If you're able to specify the goal up front or literally transplanting it from the preliminary Logic Model over to this format, you may still want to return to this step after you complete step three.

Just to ensure the goal still adequately captures or reflects the underlying issues you've identified as per the original application. Each page of the Logic Model should have its own goal, although you can use more than one page to describe the objectives, activities and other factors associated with a single goal.

So examples of program goals here that are relevant to Safe Schools/Healthy Students may be reducing youth drug use, reducing violence in schools, increasing access to mental health services for students.

Again, the real point here is that each page of the Logic Model should have one goal on it. And again, this may span multiple pages but really what you want to avoid doing is putting more than one goal per page…. It's just an organizational technique or device.

Okay. An example goal statement here: so, in the example we've been using, an example goal statement may be: "To reduce the level of bullying among middle grade youth and grades six through eight in our school district."

Now, this, I think as you'll see in just reading it on the screen really conforms to what we spoke about before. It's something defined in very broad language, identifying what we're trying to get to. What that end outcome is ultimately going to be.

This is a bad example, might be, "To implement a violence prevention program." Now in looking at this, it's an activity, not a goal. Your ultimate aim here is to reduce levels of bullying, not to implement a program.

The program is a means by which to get to your goal. So again, you'll want to be thinking about, "Okay, what are we trying to get to? What outcome or state are we trying to get to?" That's going to inform the creation of the goal statements.

As I mentioned before, if you think about it in sequence, the needs you've identified drive your goals. But once again, organizationally it just makes sense to have goals up at that higher level. But once again you may want to bounce back and forth here between the Goals section and the Needs and the Baseline Data column, just because they're so intimately linked together.

What we want to do on this next slide is open up the phone lines and see if anyone would like to, based on their preliminary Logic Model, give an example or two of some of the goals they may have already identified.

I'm going to hand it back over to Jim at this point.

JIM VETTER: Great! So Scott…what we're now supposed to do, is if you look on the right-hand side of your screen in your Webinar Control Panel, that little Questions for Staff box, so if you would just right now take a look at your own Logic Model and see what you've got in there for a particular goal, an element one goal.

So if you would just type right into your Questions for Staff box that element one goal. And what Min's going to do in just a moment is take some of the examples people are sending in and put them up on the screen so we can take a look at them.

So right now, just take a look at your own Logic Model: what have you got in there for a goal for element one, and just take that and type it in there.

And what you'll end up getting from this as well is obviously Scott is not going to be able to tailor his feedback. Because he's not going to know your entire application, but Scott will take a look at these and give a few suggestions that might be generally helpful. And who knows? Since you made the contribution, you may get something that will be useful as you're revising your Logic Model.

So Scott, it looks like we've got three examples up there. So Scott, what do you think?

SCOTT FORMICA: All right. And as Jim said, that's a point I really want to make. These are just going to be some very quick reactions to the examples. I think the important thing to keep in mind is this really is a process. And when you're working on this at the local level or with your Technical Assistance Specialist or with other folks, this really takes a lot of thought and some time to think through.

And in order to do this appropriately, you'd really need to sit down. And the person working with your site at minimum would need to read your grant application.

I just want to mention this would be gut level responses.

So looking at the example goal statements we have, the first one is "To improve safety in the school environment." I think this meets all the criteria we've been speaking about. It's obviously very broad in identifying what the site here wants to ultimately accomplish.

And I think an important characteristic here is it's not that limiting. And to give you an example of what I mean by a goal that may be limiting, I saw one example a couple of years back I think, it was very similar. It may have been "To improve safety in the school environment by adopting school resource officers and having them patrol the campus." Now that once again incorporates very limiting language.

Because rather than just identifying what the outcome is, you're also identifying how you want to get there, which is a piece that's going to come later in the process.

So looking at this first one, "To improve safety in the school environment," Once again, I think this is a very nice example of what a goal may look like.

Second example, "To provide students with a safe learning environment." I think once again this has many of the characteristics of the first example. In broad terms and doesn't include limiting language. But at the same time, it really helps to identity where the site is ultimately trying to get to: a safe learning environment.

Next one, "Increase student safety on school campuses and in surrounding communities." Here, again, I think this is a good example. So once again we have the broad language, we "Want to increase student safety on school campuses, and in surrounding communities."

The only point I might make here is it may be useful, and I would have to do the entire Logic Model, to maybe break this into two goals. So, one goal would be on school campus and the other would be in surrounding communities. That would depend on the steps that are being taken. If there is a lot of similarity across the activities that are going to occur or if it was part of a systems change or a broadly sweeping intervention then it may make sense to keep it together.

Again, it's just food for thought, but you might want to break this into two. So one being "increase student safety on school campuses," and then, "to increase safety in surrounding communities."

And finally here, we have, "To create and maintain a safe and orderly environment for all students and staff."

Once again, I think this is a great example—we have that very broad language. I would have a similar comment for number four and number three. It may make sense just based on the activities and the needs, and how things are clustered to break this into one goal for students and one goal for staff rather than lumping them all together.

But that would very much depend on the specifics of what the site was doing.

But these are wonderful examples and again I think all are perfectly acceptable and will be great to incorporate into the new model. So, thank you.

All right: I think next, we're going to move on to opening up the phone lines, Jim? For questions that anyone may have at this point?

JIM VETTER: That sounds great! So at this point Min will put us back up here so we'll be able to see the information on where to go next.

If you have a question, Scott's just given you a lot of interesting information and examples here. If you have any questions about this, just press "star pound" on your telephone line to raise your hand, or you can do what a number of people have been doing right along, and just type your questions into the Questions for Staff Box. And I do see we've got several people here who have some questions.

JIM VETTER: And Scott…it's looking like you've given people a clear explanation, they don't have any questions at this point, so let's just keep going.

SCOTT FORMICA: Okay. That's perfectly fine. And one of the things I perhaps neglected to mention up front is that when we're going thought the Logic Model and transitioning this, there is a process that has been established to help sites in doing this.

Obviously most sites at this point, have already spoken or interacted with their Technical Assistance Specialist here at the center.

And on the center's side, for these first couple months of the grant, I think the lion's share of technical assistance and activities and resources are devoted to getting people to that point where they do have an updated Logic Model. So on this side of the coin, you probably will be contacted if you have not already by your Technical Assistance Specialist.

And they also will be working with an Evaluation Consultant here at the center. We have a wonderful team that we've pulled together of evaluators either under contract as part of the TA center, and also evaluators who have evaluated other Safe Schools/Healthy Students sites and previous cohorts.

So we've identified evaluators who have a lot of experience working with this initiative to help work through that process. And we just find that in some instances it's useful to have that perspective. Particularly when we're talking about the Logic Model, something that's really going to ultimately information the evaluation plans down the road.

So that's the assistance and service that is going to be available. So that's also an opportunity for any questions you may have after we get off the phone today. You can also feel free to send email. We'll try to be as responsive as possible to that.

All right. So, moving along here to our next slide: All right. Step three. So here in step three, we're looking at defining the Baseline Data and Needs. And Safe Schools/Healthy Students projects are needs-driven.

This is what I was referring to before. We tended to put goals at step two just because it fell in the hierarchy that way. But when you're thinking about your project, everything is going to be based on the needs you've identified.

Needs are problem statements. They really seek to identify information on the extent to which there are gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, opportunities and or resources that may exist in your target area.

The needs and problems you're seeking to address should be data-driven. So what we mean by that?

Really what we're saying here is the need and problem statements should be based on either quantitative and or qualitative data for the district, students, families and the community. So here we're looking for actual numbers against which you can measure change. Or very informed descriptions of circumstances that may exist in the community.

You must include Baseline Data for each of the objectives you list in your Logic Model. And it may not have been organized this way when you were at your original application.

But here, once again, it's a little bit of a refinement to that process. You're going to be asked to report data on each of the objectives you list, and this is the opportunity to really sit down and say, "Okay, we're measuring progress against what standard?" So here's the baseline.

As described in the program announcement, sites are expected to conduct two data collections in year one.

The first data collection would be to collect baseline data that is the point prior to implementing the project. And the second is to collect year one actual performance status for the annual performance report.

Now, baseline data may have already been incorporated in your original application, in which case, you don't have to collect additional data at this point. It would really just be that data plus the end of the year. But really when we're thinking about it, baseline data must either be included in the model, or you need to identify when and how it will be collected prior to program implementation.

And this is a point that your fellow Project Officer in particular is going to be looking for in that first report you send into them. Do you have baseline data? If so, great. If not, when is it going to be collected, and will it be collected prior to any activity that is actually being put into place? So this is something that's going to be very important from their perspective.

In many cases, this information will most likely come from the Needs and Gaps column in the Preliminary Logic Model, or be embedded somewhere in the original application. We want to take that information and carry it forward in a more deliberate way here.

Let me give a couple of examples. Two example Needs Statements. So, the first one may be, "25% of middle grade youth surveyed in April reported engaging in bullying activities in the past 30 days." So that would be one example of a baseline data statement.

Another would be "35% of middle grades youth surveyed in April reported being bullied, threatened, or pushed around in school or on the way to and from school in the past 30 days." Many of you may recognize this as being one of the GPRA measures, which we're going to be talking about a little bit later down in the presentation.

A bad example here may be, "bullying is a problem among middle grades students." This may be the case, but this statement is not supported by evidence as currently worded. And it's not specific to the local setting.

So once again, it's not providing any baseline data or information that's going to allow us to track change over time in your local setting.

When determining the needs you'll be addressing, it's important to try to be as succinct as possible and limit yourself to the needs that in essence already have been identified in your proposal.

This isn't an activity in trying to come up with new needs, or as we were saying earlier, to modify either your project or your original Logic Model. But it's really just filling in some holes or some areas that may not have been so explicitly populated in the original go at things.

So once again, we're going to ask folks to the extent possible to provide a couple of examples so that we can look at it and kind of learn from each other.

JIM VETTER: Great! Okay. So let's just do the same thing again, just looking across your Logic Model. Again, let's stick to element one of your Logic Model. So as you're looking at element one of your Logic Model, if you would just type again in the Questions for Staff box there your example of a goal. So, what is one of the goals you have for element one?

So what's a need that you find in your Logic Model? What's a needs statement there? Thank you, Cynthia. So again, we're going to post these up here, we're not going to be able to post all of them, but type yours in there. Okay. So, Scott, shall we put one or two more up or go with these three?

SCOTT FORMICA: We have four, I think that's fine. I'm interested in keeping the process going. I'm just looking at these…. I have to say that I am continually impressed that every year these just get better and better. This is great. So the first example here, "Over 600 instances of juvenile crime occurred within the community during 2006," I think this is exactly what we're looking for.

We're looking for the number of incidents.

To the extent that, at this point, you could be more specific, it says “over 600,” so if you can pin it down to a more exact number that would be great. If not, I think the estimate would suffice, provided that you are acknowledging it as being an estimate.

The second example, “40% of 9^{th} and 31% of 11^{th} grade students have been victims of bullying, hit or pushed in the past 12 months.” Once again, I think this has all the characteristics we’re looking for and the source is identified as the 2008 California Healthy Kids’ Survey, if I have the acronym right.

So this is a great example here of what it would look like. And we’re identifying baseline, and the actual need itself: victimization of bullying. Next, “While over 300 youth were served by Perry County District in 2008, zero formal coordination of services exists between provision and schools.” In this example, I would have very similar comments. Number one: if we do have a little bit more specific information on the exact number of students, that would be ideal.

If not, and this is about as solid of an estimate we can get, it would be fine to incorporate, I would just acknowledge it as such.

And then, “…zero formal coordination of services exists between probation and schools.” I’m a little less clear on the point of context what exactly this means. I’m assuming the need here is to increase coordination of services between provision and schools. So, we’re going from a baseline of zero and trying to measure change against that.

So I think that works as well. The next one, I can’t quite see yet. There we go.

“During 2006 and 2007, the district documented 990 physical sites for its 8,916 students.” Again, I think this is a wonderful example. Here, we have the number of sites and we have a denominator. We have the full count of students. And this is exactly in the format you’re going to in essence have to report on in the 524B form.

So, you have two wonderful things. You have a numerator, and you have a denominator. So this is a great example here.

And number four, the final example, “Students do not feel physically or emotionally secure in targeted schools.” I think this is similar to the example I put up in the Examples slide. And here, I think once again, the point is that this is a true statement, I have no doubt, for the site that contributed it. But, it would be very important here to provide evidence of this in some manner. Whether it be through student service, whether it be through referral records, disciplinary records. So, some indicator or measure of that really helps illustrate they’re not feeling physically or emotionally secure.

Since we're talking here about attitudes, I'm assuming this ultimately would come from student survey data. So, this is an important point. If those data weren't incorporated in the original application, this is the instance that I was speaking of when I said before, if you don't have the data, and this truly is a need, these data are going to need to be collected prior to actually putting any activities in place. And that would be something that would need to be discussed with the Federal Project Officer.

We're going to once again open it up for any questions that have come up. And this can be either specific to this element we're talking about now, or any material or content I've covered up to this point.

JIM VETTER: Okay. So folks, as you're looking at your Logic Models and you're looking at that recommended format and what Scott's been explaining to you, just any questions you might have about how to make this transition work….

To be able to connect in what you have, in your original application Logic Model, you did this new implementation format. If you have any questions, you can press "star pound" to raise your hand, or type that question into the Questions box.

LAUREN GILMAN: There is one question that just got sent in. Somebody wants to know, is the new format available online?

JIM VETTER: Okay. And thanks, that's from Pat Sanborn. Yes, Pat. If you go to PromotePrevent.org, and follow the links to the Events page for this event, you'll see Scott's been nice enough to give the template for that Logic Model, that new format, and instructions on how to use it as well as these slides are all there now.

The link to that page is also on the reminder email you got about an hour ago, and another follow up email is going to go out at the end of this Webinar.

SCOTT FORMICA: Right. And developing the template or tool kit, there are two things. One is a blank template that folks can utilize that's been provided in Word format. And the other is really the set of instructions. Then looking at the set of instructions, what I did is I really tried to base all notes and instructions there on the talk I'm giving now. So what it boils down to in essence is my speaker notes for this presentation.

Everything I'm covering here is written in that tool kit available online. So just to point that out.

LAUREN GILMAN: Okay. And we do have a few more questions that came in, in writing. Dora Soto-Delgado asked "You used character education programs in an example. The example stated that this program could not be used in any element. Couldn't this fall under the element of Safe School Environments and Violence Prevention?"

SCOTT FORMICA: With regard to character education programs, I think that in the instructions of the bad example….

I didn't necessarily put it as being a bad example because it's not allowed. But really, I think once again is a… More questions for your Federal Project Officer, but my understanding of this, I just don't want to misinform you so I would advise you to follow up with your Federal Project Officer afterwards.

That really has to do with more of the congressional [SOUNDS LIKE] incentive that have or have not been approved by the Department of Education as being available. So even though we used that as an example here, I think it is still an activity or type of program that cannot be implemented.

So Lauren, or Jim, I don't know if you have anything to add on that?

JIM VETTER: Sure. It's that those kind of categories…. What is considered a character education program, a violence prevention program, a social and emotional learning program? There are a lot of different programs that could go under any of those titles.

So some of the evidence-based social and emotional learning programs are also called character education programs. So this really has much more to do with the program itself than the particular category it may be called.

Your Federal Project Officer would really be able to give you the thumbs up or thumbs down on it.

SCOTT FORMICA: Right. And thinking about this more, I don't know that it's a prohibited type of program. I think that type of program may be funded under separate initiatives, so they're just trying to maintain the lines between the two different initiatives being funded.

But that's really a discussion to have with your Federal Project Officer. Thank you for the question.

LAUREN GILMAN: We do have another question. "What if your Need or Gap addresses something that's missing? For example, reverse evacuation procedures, rapid reentry into the building have not been practiced and are not defined in the current emergency management plan. What would make this a stronger need gap description?"

SCOTT FORMICA: Well, I think that's an example that we provided before of how needs can in fact be qualitative descriptions. Provided that they do impart some type of information or measure upon which to track change over time.

So in that instance, you're identifying a need as the absence of a protocol, or some other mechanism. So there, I think that would suffice in and of itself. That what you're trying to get to is the introduction of that, or an increase above, in essence, the absence of or a zero state.

So I think you could accommodate that within this model.

JIM VETTER: I'm sorry, Scott. I have a little more information about Dora's question.

SCOTT FORMICA: Okay, great.

JIM VETTER: Looking back on the Logic Model instructions, that where they put the example is would be somebody who lists character education programs in the Logic Model in the column for Safe Schools/Healthy Students element.

SCOTT FORMICA: Right. It was used as a bad example. Yes. Right.

JIM VETTER: Yes. And it says what's wrong is that this is not one of the five Physical Healthy Students grant elements.

SCOTT FORMICA: Right.

JIM VETTER: So, that's the only reason for that example. Is just that if you're going to have one of these elements, it's got to be one of the five off the list of Safe Schools/Healthy Students elements.

SCOTT FORMICA: Right. My understanding was the question was a little broader than that. It was more along the lines of why can't character education programs be used for this initiative.

JIM VETTER: Well, her question was that the example stated this program could not be used in any element. Which really, that's really not what this is trying to say. This is trying to say that character education programs are not one of those five elements.

It doesn't mean that a character education program couldn't fall under one of these elements. And Dora, if that's still not clear, talk to me afterwards, or to your Technical Assistant Specialist who can help clear that up.

And Lauren, we have some more questions? I think we've got some more questions in there, so if you'd just un-mute your phone….

LAUREN GILMAN: Actually, if you wouldn't mind, if you could read the last question that just came in, that would be great. Do you see it there?

JIM VETTER: Sure. I see a question that came in that was: "Wondering, Scott, whether you can talk about having the objective being creating a system? Such as a probation example versus an outcome of having coordinated services." Is that question clear?

SCOTT FORMICA: I think so, and the way that I would probably choose to address that would be to describe the system or the system chains as being the goal.

And then trying to identify some measureable objectives. So in that case, if you're trying to develop a system, there are probably some subcomponents that fall under that.

Whether they be formal memoranda of agreement between different partners, or other things that might be more measurable.

Meeting minutes, or things along those lines. So I would probably choose to move that up a level and then identify things you can measure as being evidence of the implementation of the system.

JIM VETTER: Great. Okay! Those seem to be all the questions we have right now. Thanks for the folks who asked questions. And again at any point as Scott keeps going, you can press "star pound" or just type your question in the Question box as a way to let us know you've got questions. Scott?

SCOTT FORMICA: Okay. Moving on to step four, specifying your objectives. This is really the step which I think a number of sites historically have struggled with, just because there's a very concrete process or very concrete example that we're trying to get folks to adopt.

So here, the objectives are more specific statements to contrast some of the goal statements, which are very broad that identify three things. One, what will change or whom. Two, by how much things will change, and three, by when.

Typically, and this really starts with the question we just had, objectives are related to changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills and behaviors. Objectives can be either short term, immediate, or long-term in nature. It's possible, in fact it's probable, that you will have multiple objectives for each goal based on the needs that have been identified.

There should be a one-to-one relationship between the needs you've identified and the number of objectives. This stems from the fact that you need to provide, as we said before, baseline data for each of the objectives you identified in your Logic Model. So that's why we have that one-to-one. Any time you have a need, you want an objective. Any time you have an objective, you want it to be informed by a need.

Now, I'm going to refer back to the example I put up earlier that we're going to be returning to again and again. And here, this really lays out a numbering convention that we found to work in the past that I think sites may want to adopt.

And here, each objective is numbered sequentially based on the element number and objective number. So for example here, we have….

And I don't know if Jim can bring up the pointer. Under the objective, we have "1.1" That would indicate we are within element one and this is our first objective. Below, "1.2." We're in element one, this is the second objective within element one. And really holding that across the needs data and the baseline data and Needs column, and the Objectives column.

Once again, in thinking through moving this into dropping it into the Evaluation Plan and reporting on the 524B form. Having this consistent number scheme helps to facilitate communication, even at the local site with grant partners.

Not required by any means, but it's a convention a number of sites have adopted we're identifying as being a Best Practice in this area. Okay. One way to thin about specifying your objectives, and this may be terminology more familiar to some folks on the line, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have been working with what they call a "SMART process."

They have SMART objectives. And here, each of the letters in SMART stand for a characteristic of objectives that is desirable. So objectives are supposed to be…

Specific. They're identifying a defined event. For example, reductions in bullying others.

Measurable. Here's where we're talking about we want to specify a baseline value and a quantity of change that's expected to occur as a result of the program activities being put into place. An example here, reducing bullying from 25% to 21%. We have our baseline and where we want to end up in the end.

Achievable. The objectives need to be realistic to expect in the specified timeframe something you can realistically do in the next four to five years.

Relevant. So here, we mean links to your goals, and in this case links to the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative.

And Time-bound. Which is the "T" in SMART. And this means providing a specified time frame by which the objective will be achieved. In most cases that will likely be by the end of the project, the Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant funding.

Some constructing tips when thinking about objective, questions to ask yourself, what changes are reasonable to expect? What difference will your activities make, for whom and by when? And how is this objective logically linked to your needs and your goals?

The next one looks at two examples. So here the first example may be of an objective, "to reduce the percentage of students in grades six through eight who report bullying others in the past 30 days by 15% from baseline by the end of the project in June."

Another example, and this, for those of you who've been following along, follows from the needs we identified earlier, so here, "to reduce the percentage of students in grades six through eight who indicate they were bullied, threatened or pushed around in school or on the way to or from school in the past 30 days by 25% here from baseline," once again, "by the end of the project in June."

Bad example may be, "reducing bullying." This doesn't have the characteristics we've been speaking about. So it doesn't identify the target of the change, who we're talking about, the quantity of the change, where we want it to go, nor the timeframe in which the change is expected to occur.

Now, one question that consistently comes up again and again is, okay, we're saying we're going to have a 15% change in reported bullying. We're going to have a 25% reduction in those who refer to being victims of bullying. Where do those percentages come from, how do we specify percentages and make them make sense?

I think the answer to this is two or maybe threefold. First, one place you can look, if you haven't come up with these objectives yet, the percent of increase or change, is to look back in the literature. And particularly for evidence-based interventions you're putting in place.

So, if you're implementing for example, you have the life skills training program, you might want to look back at the original research and find what they found.

So did they find a 15% reduction in alcohol use for example? You might say, okay, we're probably not likely to experience as much of a decrease, because they implemented this program in very controlled settings. We're going to be more conservative, maybe we'll go for an 8% change. So we're still with in that, but we're kind of paring it back a little bit.

Another thing you could do, is if you have your baseline data already and say, here, in the first example that we know that 30% of students reported they bullied others, thinking about where you'd like that number to be.

What is going to be acceptable to your site? To help influence stakeholders in your grant? Maybe make the case to superintendents or others that the program, if it affects change, is going to be something you want sustained. Is it 20%? In which case, we want to get to 30%, Let's calculate the change between the two, and that's our target. That's another way you can identify these, and you can also consult with your Technical Assistance Specialist in trying to set these targets if they have not already been set.

The most important thing, again, the big point is to try to make them realistic. We don't want to promise things we can't deliver on. Okay. Once again, I think this is the last time we're going to do this. We're going to ask for folks to send in any examples they may have of objectives from the preliminary Logic Model they pulled together.

JIM VETTER: Okay. And some folks were already following right along, Scott, they knew where you were heading. They have a couple of examples that already came in there.

Everyone, if you would just pull out your Logic Model, take a look at it now, and within that Logic Model, just go ahead and look at one of your objectives for element one, and just type an objective into that Questions box, then just go ahead and hit the Send button, and we'll use just a few of these as examples, but feel free to do that.

We'll just grab a couple from somewhere on that list.

SCOTT FORMICA: I'm just going to start speaking, just in the interest of time here. We have about 25 minutes left, so I just want to keep this moving along. So an example, the first example here, "decrease the number of assaults on teachers by students by 20% each year of the grant from the baseline determined in January 2009."

Now this, I think is a wonderful example here. And we have a number of positive things. We have what we're trying to do, "decrease the number of assaults on teachers by students." We specified our target here, 20% each year. Based on where the baselines are for these, I may look at that target and see if it's realistic. It depends. If it's a relatively rare event, that might be a perfectly acceptable target. That's something I would just look at.

And then, "from the baseline determined in January 2009." So here's the important point. This site does not yet have baseline data, but they're identifying when the data will be available. And I think your Federal Project Officer would point this out.

But this is something you probably would have to wait on, on doing a lot of activities prior to collecting baseline data. You may have to wait to roll out these activities until baseline data are collected in January.

Just going to go to number two: "by June 2012, all staff will receive 64 hours of Crisis Prevention and Management training and Mitigation Preparedness Response and Recovery."

Now this is an example we're going to be talking about as we move forward. It really, in this case depends on what the need is.

But this seems to me to be more of a process measure. What we're saying is, we want all staff to receive 64 hours of Crisis Prevention and Management training and Mitigation Preparedness Response and Recovery.

So that's really more of a yes-no question. Did staff receive the 64 hours? That, to me, again, void of context, really speaks to as the program activity implemented as opposed to was there an outcome.

An outcome of this may be increased staff knowledge in the area of crisis prevention and management. Or increased staff certification. Some outcome that flows from this. This seems more related to, again, a process measure, whether or not an activity was implemented, yes or no. So that would be my comment on this. But again, it depends on the surrounding context, but that would be my first reaction. And if it's okay I'm going to skip over the third one in the interest of time.

JIM VETTER: Sure and particularly because we do have a couple of questions. So Lauren, would you like to share the questions with us?

LAUREN GILMAN: Sure. The first question is, "We're collecting baseline student survey data in October, and can we add this to the Logic Model?"

SCOTT FORMICA: Can you add data collection to the Logic Model... I would identify those objectives for which the data from that survey are coming. So when you have an objective and you don't have baseline, that's being collected until October, that's where I'd indentify it. I'd say "we are collecting baseline data in October." I wouldn't say it's an activity. I don't see how collecting data would influence the five elements.

LAUREN GILMAN: I'm not sure exactly what the question refers to, but it could mean what you just said, that maybe the person is planning to collect baseline data to be able to put that in. Okay. Thank you.

Another question. "Can you please discuss significant enough changes, specifically speaking? For example, 3% may not be significant."

SCOTT FORMICA: Right. And here, we're not asking folks to identify whether or not a change is significant. It really boils down to whether or not you're dealing with your school district, or a sample. And in this case I would assume most of these interventions deal with the entire school population. So in that sense, strictly speaking, significant testing tends to have less [SOUNDS LIKE] median.

But really I think the important point is that's not a requirement of this grant. So it's not whether or not it's a significant change, although you may want to incorporate that information. It's more along the lines of, is it a realistic change, one. And what I said before, in setting that target, I think the higher benchmark here is whether or not it's a practical change.

Whether or not it's a clinically significant change. Whether or not it's something that's going to inform people, particularly talking about large school districts, where you could have a 2% change being significant, but is that going to influence opinions or stakeholders.

I would just think of it that way. But again, significance testing is not a requirement of this grant.

JIM VETTER: Great. Thanks Scott. I see we have a question from somebody here within the National Center offices. So do you have a question?

FEMALE PARTICIPANT 1: Oh. Hi! This is…okay. I was actually just going to call, we were adding to the Logic Model with data collected in October question. I just wanted to clarify it to get the response. What we were asking about is that we will be collecting some baseline data about some of our Outcome Measures in October. So we wanted to be able to update the Logic Model, the Needs and Gaps column, with the numbers from that baseline data, but weren't sure about the deadline for updating the Logic Model, if we would have a chance to add in baseline data that was collected in October.

SCOTT FORMICA: I understand. That's a wonderful question. And that relates back to my additional point that in many ways the Logic Model at this point forward is a living and breathing document. If your data collection point or baseline falls after the point the Logic Model is technically required with that first progress report, at the point at which you submit with that first six month report, identify the data will be collected.

In your next report you send to your Federal Project Officer, your update report, that's where you update that Needs column with data you have collected and identity your second hind point of data collection. That's the point at which you want to update it. You may not wish to wait that long. If beyond October falls after the due date, you can probably send it along to your Project Officer in the interim. The official way would be the progress report that falls most closely to the data collection point.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT 1: Excellent! Thank you.

JIM VETTER: And I see Nancy Kelly, do you happen to have another question?

NANCY KELLY: No, that was all, Jim.

JIM VETTER: Great. All right. Thanks.

SCOTT FORMICA: Moving right along, then. Okay. Step five. Specifying your program activities. The next step in developing the Logic Model is to specify one or more program activities intended to address each stated objective. This information is most likely included in the

Activities, Curricula, Programs and Services column of preliminary Logic Model.

This column should include the evidence-based programs, practices and policies you'll be putting into place with grant funding.

Some folks have incorporated activities into their logic models that aren't being paid for with Safe Schools/Healthy Students money. I think just as a Best Practice, it's best to stick to those activities that are being funded by Safe Schools/Healthy Students to make it a little more clean.

That's a point where if you do fund some activities with other external funding, you may want to put it in there. But I think it's cleaner to limit it to Safe Schools/Healthy Students. The important point, your needs, goals and objectives should guide your choice of activities, not vice versa.

So any additions, deletions, or modifications of activities identified in the original application must be approved by your Federal Project Officer. The reason for this is it has budgetary implications, and what you wrote in the application serves in essence as your agreement between your site and the federal government.

So any changes you want to make, really need to be passed by your Federal Project Officer. Again this may be for the reasons mentioned before, an evidence-based program, training is no longer available for it, maybe a whole host of reasons why things need to change at this point. But any changes made to the original application with regard to activities really need to be run by your Federal Project Officer.

The next slide illustrates that numbering scheme. So here, what we've done, and I don't know if Jim can bring back up the pointer.

As we're looking at activities, we're adding on another digit. So in this case, it's related to Objective 1.1, so we have Activity 1.1.1. And this is really about as far out as we get. We're talking about element one, objective one and the first activity under objective one. Below, we have the same convention.

Element 1, Objective 2, Activity 1, and below it we have Element 1, Objective 2, Activity 2. So, this is just a convention that has been identified as a Best Practice by a number of sites.

All right. And here really, I think the point here is, what we see too often is that there isn't a logical connection between a proposed activity and a program objective, and a need.

And a lot of times this occurs because sites have identified an activity and haven't linked this back up to the needs that are present.

So if you've done it that way it's trying to justify the activity by trying to come up with needs after the fact. It tends not to work that way. We've seen again and again that the best cases re when the activities flow from needs you've already identified rather than the other way around.

Just a couple of examples here, we have the first one, "to implement the Stop Bullying program." And I made that up, so if there really is a Stop Bullying program, I apologize for the copyright infringement, "…with middle school youth in grades six through eight in all schools in the district."

Another example activity may be, "school resource officers will patrol the campus and common walking routes to school."

A bad example here, "we will reduce level of bullying among middle grades youth." This I think as we reflect back is an example of a goal, not an activity or strategy designed to reach that goal. The opposite characteristic of the bad example I provided earlier, an activity serving as a goal. Here, this is not an example of an activity.

The next step, step six, is specifying your process measures. After you've identified your program activities, you should identify your process measures.

This information was most likely not provided in your preliminary Logic Model. But it's important going forward for both the creation of your Local Evaluation Plan and as a way of defining means or measuring program implementation.

So here when we say process measures, this is a term familiar to many people. But we're talking about data used to document the implementation of activities. There should be at least one process measure identified for each activity in your Logic Model.

Once again here, we're using a similar numbering convention. We have the process measures, Element 1, Objective 1, Activity 1, and then Process Measure A, B, and C, because these are all related to Activity 1.

A question that's come up in the past is how many process measures do we need for each activity? That's going to vary from site to site. You want to identity at least one process measure so you can be sure at a minimum that the activity was implemented.

You may want to have more process measures, and this is something you can speak to with your evaluator, you may want to have more process measures for those activities that consume a disproportionate amount of resources. So, if you have for example an activity that costs very little and is small in scope, you might just one to have one process measure.

If you have an activity that constitutes a third of your Safe Schools/Healthy Students funding for that one activity, you probably want to know more about the implementation of that. You can use that information to explore outcomes and help make the case to sustain it in the long-term if it proves to be successful.

That's just another Best Practice we've identified over time. The other important point is this Process measures column, while we would like everyone to identify one in their Logic Model, this may expand when you get to the Evaluation Plan when your evaluator has an opportunity to take more of a look at this.

So this may be another column that may change over the course of time. That's an example of process measures here, the example that we've been using, may be the number of teachers trained to deliver the curriculum for our Stop Bullying program. The number of sixth and eighth grade classrooms who receive the bullying prevention program, number of sessions per classroom, measures of program fidelity such a classroom observation or teacher checklists, school resource officer event log.

These are just some examples of things as you look down this list. These help answer the question, was the activity implemented as planned? It goes along a process of rigor from one, did we train our staff, up to that second to last one. Did we actually send someone in to track fidelity to a curriculum, are we having the implementers report back on their level of faithfulness or fidelity to the intervention? So there's definitely a continuum here we're illustrating.

Bad example may be reductions in the level of bullying in the school. Again this is measuring the potential outcome, not the process by which it's implemented. And we're assuming no one has any examples at this point, but we are going to open up for questions very quickly.

JIM VETTER: Great. And Lauren do we have any questions that came in?

LAUREN GILMAN: There is one question that came in. Somebody would like to know "if we should use fidelity measures from an EVP, or from an evidence-based practice or pogrom as a process measure."

SCOTT FORMICA: I think that's a wonderful process measure, again the example I was just covering. If you can actually obtains for the evidence-based prevention the fidelity checklist or tools that were used by the original program developer.

I think that's probably the ideal form of process measure for an activity. But again, it may be the case that you don't have to do that for every single evidence-based prevention intervention. And that's where the discussion around different resource allocation comes in. That needs to be had with the evaluator. Obviously, they to some extent have limited resources.

They're going to have to allocate their resources in different areas. That's more of a discussion, fidelity measures in many ways symbolize the idea.

JIM VETTER: Great. And Scott, those are all the questions we have right now.

SCOTT FORMICA: All right. I'm going to try to tie this up in five minutes. We're up to step seven, specifying your partners and resources.

So after you've identified your process measures, you should identify who will help with each activity. This information will most likely come from the Partners' Roles column of your preliminary Logic Model as we've discussed.

This will help map out how each of your partners is contributing to the overall initiative. It can help in many ways to serve as the basis for work plans or an ongoing memorandum agreement. It's an accountability tool in some ways. From the Federal Project Officer's perspective, it helps them interpret the budget and the different resources that may be going to different partners.

That's a very important element as well.

And here, just to put our example back up, we adopted the same numbering scheme. The same numbering used for the Activities column we're going to want to carry to the Partners column. In our first row of our example, all these partners are contributing to Activity 1.1.1.

It doesn't necessary need to be [SOUNDS LIKE] queued out this way by partner, it could be one entry. But the point being is we want to in some way indentify or tie our description of the partners back to specific activities.

That's the point we're trying to convey. All right, examples of what might appear in this….

So in the example we've been using, "the health partner will assist with staff training. The teacher will deliver the Stop Bullying program, and students who exhibit high levels of risk will be referred to the mental health partner for services."

So here, every partner that's interacting or playing a role in our Stop Bullying prevention program is indentified here, and the nature of that role. A bad example would be "to implement a bullying prevention program." Again, this does not identify who will help, or the partners who will be taking part in that process. That's really the key point here.

Which brings us up to our last column, in many ways the most important column or indicators in different columns, "performance indicators in GPRA are the source of evidence for determining whether or not your program is reaching its specified objectives." This column is similar, again, to the How Outcomes Will Be Measured column in the preliminary Logic Model. It has maybe some differences which I'm going to explain.

The performance indicators in GPRA will match your Objectives column with the addition of how performance will be assessed. This means you should simply copy your objectives over to this column, and then add a phrase onto the end of how this objective is going to be measured. The source of information you're using to track this objective. This is all that's being asked. So just copy your objectives over and identity what you're using as a source of evidence.

This may be student service, program records, whatever the source of information is.

The numbering in this column will be exactly the same as your Objectives column. There's a one-to-one correspondence between your objectives on the left and indicators and GPRA on the right.

As you see here, I've underlined, so this is what we're adding on in the first row, "as measured by a school wide survey." That's our source of information. That's the characteristic or feature of this column that's unique.

Going back over to this slide again. All physical Healthy Student sites, and I think this is information that's already been related to you, must identify and include at least one measurable and attainable performance indicator for each of the five elements and all six GPRA indicators that are listed in the program announcement.

And the GPRA indicators should be identified as being GPRA indicators.

Really what this means, and this may be a point of confusing, is you need to identify or pick one primary measure for each of the five elements in addition to or in conjunction with the six required GPRA measures. So these will be, and this may either add up to eight or eleven…

But these will be the measures that you report on in section a of your U.S.C.D. 524B Reporting Form. All other measures you identify, all other indicators here, will go down in Section C.

This is asking to, for each of the different elements and for the GPRA, identify one good measure for each element and include that in Section A.

It's also required you put your GPRA up in section A. Everything else goes in Section C. That's a very important point. So here in this slide are the six required GPRA measures. Many of you've seen this before.

"The percentage of students who didn't go to school on one or more days during the past 30 because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to or from school," "Physical fighting on school property in the past 12 months" "30 day marijuana use," "30 day alcohol use," "Number of students who've received school base mental health services," and "the percentage of mental health referrals for students that result in mental health services being provided in the community."

So every site needs to report data on these six GPRA indicators. This is a very strict requirement of the grant. You need to provide data on each of these six measures. Just to recap, it's recommended once again that sites specify up to eleven indicators for their project.

Or, if permissible to combine a performance indicator with a GPRA measure. So this would result in eight. What I mean by this is in looking at your GPRA indicators, the GPRA indicators in this last line…

The first one, the first two GPRA indicators around not going to school out of fear for personal safety or physical fighting at school, these most likely will fall in element one. The second two, "percentage of students who reported 30 day marijuana use and 30 day alcohol use," those will probably end up in element two.

And the final two GPRA will probably end up under element four, mental health services. You can use the GPRA indicators as "one of your primary measures" for each of the different elements. In that case you would have eight overall indicators for Section A as opposed to eleven if you adopted one for each element.

And then in addition to that, the six GPRA. We just wanted to illustrate that point. I've gone over the example of performance indicators in the chart we already looked at, so just to jump ahead to our final example.

Really, the only difference between this column and the Objectives column is the underlined part, "as measured by a school wide survey." And this is the case.

And on the bottom, this is the other point I wanted to illustrate. If it's a GPRA measure, it should be identified as a GPRA measure. So this is GPRA measure number one. "The percentage of students who indicated they were bullied, threatened, or pushed around in the past 30 days."

So we're going to move over….and I think just move to our final round of questions at this point. So that's the Logic Model training, and thank you all for listening. I hope this has been useful. We're going to open it up to one last round of questions.

JIM VETTER: Great! Thanks, Scott. I see at this point we don't have any more questions. I think again you've really done a nice, comprehensive job, you've answer questions folks have as we're going through. I see we do have a question coming in from Warren Fauver from Bowling Green, Ohio. And Warren, your line's open. What's your question?

WARREN FAUVER: Our question is whether we're going to get a template for redoing the Logic Model with the new columns.

JIM VETTER: That's a great question.

WARREN FAUVER: And second is the PowerPoint, and I presume it is, going to be available online for reviewing after today?

JIM VETTER: Great question Warren. What you'll see is in the reminder email you got about an hour before this started, and in another email after the event is over, you'll see there's a link that goes to a special event page for this event. And that on that event page, you'll see al ink that will take you through to all the slides Scott just shared. It will take you, also, to this template.

And a detailed set of instructions Scott put together that will really walk you through how to make this transition from your application Logic Model to this implementation Logic Model.

You'll also see that within a week, on that same event page, you'll also have available a full recording of this webinar.

As well as also you'll have there a transcript of the webinar. Both because you may just want to go back and review things again, or you might find there's somebody else on your staff you'd like to share this with. And you'll have all that material to be able to do that.

Lauren, I think we have another question someone's typed in. Do you want to share that with folks?

LAUREN GILMAN: Yes, I do. The question is, "what is you do not have baseline on a GPRA measure? Such as the number of students referred to mental health services. Would you try to recapture that in a previous year, because it would not make sense to collect that in a one month period of time?"

SCOTT FORMICA: Yeah, there are a number of sites for which this is an issue, and if you can reliably estimate it based on a previous year, that's one way to go. Other sites, I know what they've tried to do is collect that information over one or two months and extrapolate that out to a year.

And assuming no services have actually been implemented yet, really that does in essence constitute a baseline. It really depends on local site characteristics and the data you have available. But if you have data from last year, that may be the most appropriate to use.

The other thing to do would be, if you do have that data, look at it for last year and maybe for the first two months of this year track what the data are and extrapolate out and see if they're similar or dissimilar [SOUNDS LIKE] attributes that track on one another.

But this is a common issue, particular for mental health services, that baseline data has been a challenge. The other approach would be to talk to either your Federal Project Officer or national evaluation team liaison who's been assigned to your site. They may have some additional suggestions or recommendations about how to collect the data.

JIM VETTER: Great. Okay, Scott. Those are all the questions folks have. So if you have additional questions, you know as Scott mentioned, you can always talk with your Federal Project Officer, and Technical Assistance Specialist, who can both help you out with your Logic Model, and also we'll have some special Logic Model consultants available offering extra help.

Your Technical Assistance Specialist can help arrange for someone who really has that special expertise focusing just around Logic Models who can provide you with that kind of support as well.

SCOTT FORMICA: And if anyone does have a question specific to this presentation, you can feel very free to either call or email me directly. I don't know if I can help with your entire Logic Model, because that's going to be based on which consultants are assigned to which Logic Model. But if there are any questions, please do feel free to contact me.

JIM VETTER: Great. And you can see that Scott's information is right up there on the screen now and also included in the copy of the PowerPoint presentation you'll find on PromotePrevent.org. Also, if you go to PromotePrevent.org, you'll see a list of other events coming up over the next months. On October 14, the Communications Team is going to be giving a webinar about identifying and attracting great partners.

There's also a December 3rd webinar (registration will be available sometime fairly soon) where Scott's going to come back and be sharing with you about how to create your evaluation plans, another step in this process. So please do take a look at all the events on PromotePrevent.org. We look forward to connecting with you individually if we're the Technical Assistance Specialist for your particular site, or back here on one of these webinars, or one of the in person events. Thank you all, thanks very much, Scott, and thanks to you for being with us today.