

#	Evaluation Question	Data source	Cross-site Metrics	Grantee Operationalization (should cross walk with grantee logic models)	Timepoints
1 How did community engagement advance the community's collective action to solve problems?					
1.1	How did East5ide & their partners engage community members (e.g., timing, accommodations)?	Grantee progress report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* # &amp; type of engagement events (e.g., meetings, door to door)</li> <li>* timing of group events (e.g., morning, evening)</li> <li>* location of group events (e.g., community center, church, school)</li> <li>* accommodations provided at group events (e.g., childcare, transportation, food)</li> <li>* barriers/facilitators to engaging</li> </ul>	<p>Engagement is both community members and anchor institutions and is facilitated by East5ide Unified/Unido</p> <p><u>Engaging Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* # &amp; type of engagement events (e.g., meetings, door to door)</li> <li>* timing of group events (e.g., morning, evening)</li> <li>* location of group events (e.g., community center, church, school)</li> <li>* accommodations provided at group events (e.g., childcare, transportation, food)</li> </ul> <p><u>Engaging Anchor Institutions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* # &amp; type of organizations engaged (type and size of institution)</li> <li>* # &amp; type of engagement events (e.g., meetings)</li> </ul>	Semi-annually
1.2	Who was engaged?	Grantee progress report Qualitative interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Description of target audience (i.e., age, race, ethnicity, population impacted by inequity)</li> <li>* barriers/facilitators to reaching target audience</li> </ul>	<p><u>Engaging Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Report who was invited and representative of neighborhood (NE Denver)</li> </ul> <p><u>Engaging Anchor Institutions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* # &amp; type of organizations engaged (type and size of institution)</li> <li>* # &amp; role of representatives from anchor institutions engaged</li> </ul>	Semi-annually
1.3	What was the purpose of community engagement?	Grantee progress report; Qualitative interviews	Spectrum of community engagement (impact on decision making) Inform, Consult, Involve, Collaborate, Empower	<p>Only include engagement that included community and/or anchor institutions</p> <p>Examples include: learning conversations, asset mapping, community outreach, community events</p> <p>Do not report project management meetings that do not include community engagement or meetings with anchor institutions</p>	Semi-annually TBD (interviews)
1.4	EU implements community driven processes that increase trust, cohesion and collaboration between EU members.	Annual Survey with EU members participating in council, community meetings and action team	none	<p>Collaboration among stakeholders will be assessed annually over the course of the project. To assess collaboration, EU stakeholders will be asked to complete an annual survey consisting primarily of Drs. Carl Larson and Darrin Hicks' Process Quality Rating Scale and their Working Together index of collaboration, aimed at assessing the quality of the collaborative process.</p>	Annual
2 How did multi-sectoral partnerships advance the community's collective action to solve problems?					
2.1	What was the role of partners?	Grantee progress report Qualitative interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* # &amp; type of partners involved</li> <li>* role of partners (bidirectional relationship - partner's providing support, partners receiving support)</li> <li>* type of support (e.g., provide training, convene community, provide financial support, advocacy)</li> <li>* barriers/facilitators to partner engagement</li> </ul>	<p>Grantee will capture current and new partnerships using our current network map. EU partners' role will be captured by how they are engaged (what subnetworks they participate in, ex. council, action team, general or community member)</p> <p>Note: anyone or any organization can have the partnership, not just Civic Canopy Project management team will encourage participation by EU partner in the network map through participating in the Civic Network. Grantee will capture changes in network map for this data point and include a qualitative description of changes to include roles and types of support as available.</p>	Semi-annually
2.2	How are relationships with partners changing?	TBD	none	<p>Grantee would like to measure change in the quality of partnership. Though intentional data collection may not be implemented until end of year 2 or in year 3, throughout the grant period qualitative and observational information may be gathered and highlighted from other sources (such as community engagement activities: ABCD Asset Mapping; Annual process quality surveys; learning conversations; annual celebrations) that will help inform a deeper dive into this important question.</p>	end of grant
3 How did community resident capacity or partner building advance the community's collective action to solve problems (policy, system and environment problems)?					

#	Evaluation Question	Data source	Cross-site Metrics	Grantee Operationalization (should cross walk with grantee logic models)	Timepoints
3.1	How did EastSide build resident capacity?	Grantee progress report	* # & type/purpose of trainings (leadership training, building resident champions, building specific skills, etc.) (operationalize with grantees) * barriers/facilitators to building resident capacity	* # & type/purpose of trainings (leadership training, building resident champions, building specific skills, etc.) (just community members not anchor institutions) <b>Grantee will track trainings highlighted in community communications:emails, newsletters (this may include trainings offered by internal or external partners)</b>	Semi-annually
3.2	Who was trained?	Grantee progress report	* Description of target audience (i.e., age, race, ethnicity, population impacted by inequity) * # of residents participating * barriers/facilitators to reaching target audience	* NE Denver residents * # of residents participating ( <b>we can track # of residents participating in trainings offered internally</b> )	Semi-annually
3.3	What was the outcome of building resident capacity?	Grantee progress report; Qualitative interviews	* Engaging in advocacy, serving on committees, volunteering, community organizing, etc. (operationalize with grantee) * barriers/facilitators to the experience (e.g., engaging in advocacy)	Could take 18 months to see the outcome Annual reflection of impact of EU. Method: storytelling - instead of capturing it with a tool - more celebratory (they might do a community event, video or other to bring this out)	Semi-annually TBD (interviews)
<b>4</b> How many and what type of policy, system or environmental changes were adopted/implemented?					
4.1	What is the prioritized policy, system or environmental change?	Grantee progress report Qualitative interviews	* type of changes, describe * how/why prioritized (e.g., community assessment) * barriers/facilitators to prioritize changes	* Organizational policy changes aimed at building community economic assets. (e.g., Family Friendly Policy, use their assets to support the community, sharing of space, purchasing from neighborhood, procurement resources infuse neighborhood, workforce pipeline) * # of anchor institutions committed to being responsive to community voice to improve institutional policies	Semi-annually TBD (interviews)
4.2	What progress has been made towards implementing prioritized policy, system or environmental change?	Grantee progress report; Qualitative interviews	* use activities from grantee logic models * barriers/facilitators to progress	* Asset based approach including community outreach and engagement * Organized efforts to prioritize community needs * Develop and implement a structure for EastSide Unified/Unido * Action teams implement community events * Convene council and anchor institutions to define economic stability and mobility with community direction * Develop sustainability plan to continued community engagement * Develop and support community resident leadership and ownership	Semi-annually TBD (interviews)
4.3	Was the prioritized policy, system or environmental change informed by authentic community engagement?	Qualitative interviews	* describe how the community voice informed this change * barriers/facilitators to community voice impacting decision	* description of how the community voice was incorporated into changes in anchor institutions policies and how the institutions support the neighborhood	TBD (interviews)
<b>5</b> What was the impact of policy, system or environmental changes on social and economic resources?					
5.1	How did the availability, accessibility, and acceptability of social and economic resource change as a result of policy, system or environmental change?	Policy Impact Assessment (led by PiER)		* Stronger relationships between community members and anchor institutions * Anchor institution organizational polices support economic mobility & stability in neighborhood (e.g., local purchasing)	As appropriate
5.2	How many individuals were impacted (directly/indirectly) by policy, system or environmental change?	Policy Impact Assessment (led by PiER)		* Residents of NE Denver (need an indicator of economic mobility & stability - e.g., # of local businesses with contracts with anchor institutions, # of residents employed by anchor institutions (this effort is not focused on changing the number of 80205 residents employed at anchor institutions but increasing the number of FFP's adapted by the institutions therefore if there are employees they may receive the benefits of the new policies), # of 80205 residents frequenting anchor institutions ex. museums. hospitals (to the same affect the activities of EU will not intentionally seek to change how residents frequent these institutions but if they are frequenting their experience may be impacted by the increase in FFP)	As appropriate
5.3	What was the impact of the policy, system or environmental change on individual-level outcomes?	Policy Impact Assessment (led by PiER)		* Data dashboard from EastSide Unified/Unido - has indicators for longer-term outcomes	As appropriate