Participants will learn how to use Information System Survey Data (IS Data) in:

• Program planning and evaluation in CAP Plans and Strategic Plans.
• Understanding annual evaluation and data implications.
• Using data inside and outside organization.
THE INFORMATION SYSTEM SURVEY REPORT
WHERE DID THE CSBG IS REPORT COME FROM?

- 1993 – The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) mandated that all federally funded programs be able to establish performance goals and measure results.
- 1994 – The Monitoring and Assessment Task Force (MATF) was created by the Office of Community Services (OCS) to explore the results that had been identified by various CAAs across the country. This group developed the six national goals and ROMA.
- 2001 – Information Memorandum (IM) 49 is the public policy document that sets ROMA within the context of compliance under GPRA, and provides guidance for both state CSBG agencies and the CAAs for managing client activities and reporting results.
- 2005 - ROMA reporting, using the National Indicators of Community Action Performance (or National Performance Indicators or NPI), became a mandatory activity for services delivered after July 1, 2005. The report has only had minimal changes since 2005.
The IS Report collects outcome data on ALL of the agency’s activities (not just CSBG-funded activities).

- IM 49: “OCS has concluded that it is both necessary and appropriate to apply ROMA concepts **to the work of community action, not CSBG alone.**"
WHAT DOES OUR DATA INCLUDE?

• Section A – C State level data
• Section D – Narratives
• Section E – CSBG dollars spent by service category and special age groups.
• Section F – All funds allocated to, administered through and generated by the eligible entity and the network. This is all Federal, State, Local and Private funding.
• Section G – All data on all clients, whether or not funded by CSBG or by other reported funding sources.
WHAT KIND OF OUTCOME DATA DO WE HAVE?

The NPIs report on the six national goals and track:

• Family level outcomes: families who obtain employment, housing, child care or other outcomes and services.
• Agency outcomes: training and certifications of agency staff and partnerships.
• Community outcomes: community resources and initiatives.
WHERE DOES IS DATA FIT INTO THE PLANNING PROCESS?

- Community Needs Assessment
- Strategic Planning
- Community Action Plan
The Results Oriented Management and Accountability Cycle

**Assessment**
Needs and Resources

**Evaluation**
Analyze data, compare with benchmarks

**Planning**
Use assessment data and agency mission statement to identify results, and strategies

**Achievement of Results**
Observe and report progress

**Implementation**
Strategies and services
CAP PLANS AND STRATEGIC PLANS
WHY PLAN?

• It’s in the **CSBG Act**!

• **Organizational Standards** 4.1 – 4.4 and 9.3 set the standard for eligible entities CAP Plans.

• **Organizational Standards** 6.1 – 6.5 set the standards for eligible entities strategic plans.
WHAT IS IN A COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN?

• At its core, a CAP plan:
  – Ensures your agency’s mission is articulated
  – Describes strategies and steps to work towards results/outcomes for customers
  – Meets the needs of the community
  – Provides direction and clear goals for agency programs

• Should include:
  • Who  What  How  Time Line
WHAT IS IN A STRATEGIC PLAN?

• Mission and Vision
• Analysis of Environment
• Strategic Goals and Priorities
• Action Plan
• Performance Metrics and Indicators
CONNECTION BETWEEN | STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAP PLAN

• Connects the dots between CNA and CAP Plan
  – CNA: What context are we working in? (community characteristics, needs, resources, agency mission)
  – Strategic Plan: What will we do and Why will we do those things specifically?
  – CAP Plan: How will we use our CSBG and other resources to accomplish the goals and priorities laid out in the Strategic Plan?
HOW DOES THIS ALL FIT TOGETHER?

Agency Strategic Plan

Community Needs Assessment

Community Action Plan

CSBG State Plan

Congressional Report

CSBG Annual Report
MANAGEMENT BASED ON DATA

You can’t “manage” performance if you can’t define and measure it.

Our expectations for outcomes must be based on who is served and the needs in the community.

– first collect appropriate data
– organize the data into useful reports for management
– enable agencies to more effectively connect people and distressed communities with the services needed to achieve specific outcomes.
– Identify actions to take to improve or strengthen outcomes
IS DATA FOR CAP PLANS AND STRATEGIC PLANS
COMMON QUESTIONS | THAT CSBG IS DATA CAN ANSWER

• Questions to ask when planning for upcoming years:
  – How many people were served?
  – How much service did they get? What types? For what impact?
  – What percent of those needing or receiving service achieved the expected result?
  – What effect will these results have on the families we serve? On our community?
EXAMPLE | USING IS DATA

Pennsylvania

Number of Agencies Reporting: 44

2a. Total Non CSBG resources Reported in Section F TOTAL
2b. Total amount of CSBG Funds allocated

Total Resources for FY 2015 (2a + 2b)

3. Total unduplicated number of persons about whom one or more characteristics were obtained
4. Total unduplicated number of persons about whom no characteristics were obtained
5. Total unduplicated number of families about whom one or more characteristics were obtained
6. Total unduplicated number of families about whom no characteristics were obtained

7. Gender
   a. Male
   b. Female
   TOTAL

8. Age
   a. 0-5
   b. 6-11
   c. 12-17
   d. 18-23
   e. 24-44
   f. 45-54
   g. 55-69
   h. 70+
   TOTAL

9. Ethnicity/Race
   I. Ethnicity
      a. Hispanic, Latino or Spanish Origin
      b. Not Hispanic, Latino or Spanish Origin
      I. TOTAL
   II. Race

Section G: Program Participant Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF PERSONS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF FAMILIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155,822</td>
<td>63,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228,024</td>
<td>35,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383,846</td>
<td>30,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,307</td>
<td>21,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32,176</td>
<td>11,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,048</td>
<td>5,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,670</td>
<td>1,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85,649</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,813</td>
<td>170,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43,472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,218</td>
<td>146,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273,049</td>
<td>18,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,267</td>
<td>164,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,218</td>
<td>14,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273,049</td>
<td>26,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,267</td>
<td>26,974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXAMPLE | USING PA TREND DATA FOR CNA

Brief Demographics PY12 – PY15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total People Served</th>
<th>Total Families Served</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Linear (Seniors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PY 2012</td>
<td>756,085</td>
<td>205,995</td>
<td>52,677</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY 2013</td>
<td>620,123</td>
<td>312,816</td>
<td>57,031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY 2014</td>
<td>789,270</td>
<td>364,791</td>
<td>62,811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY 2015</td>
<td>887,009</td>
<td>344,983</td>
<td>68,497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EXAMPLE | USING NPI DATA**

- Data tells a story:

**National Performance Indicator 1.1**

**Employment**

The number and percentage of low-income participants who get a job or become self-employed, as a result of Community Action Assistance, as measured by one or more of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Performance Indicator 1.1</th>
<th>I. Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)</th>
<th>II. Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)</th>
<th>III. Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (Actual) (#)</th>
<th>IV. Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Unemployed and obtained a job</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>507 individuals</td>
<td>202.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Employed and maintained a job for at least 90 days</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>308 individuals</td>
<td>205.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Employed and obtained an increase in employment income and/or benefits</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46 individuals</td>
<td>306.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Achieved &quot;living wage&quot; employment and/or benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Example | Using NPI Data

Table 1: Total amount of CSBG funds expended in FY 2015 by Service Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>CSBG Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employment</td>
<td>$44,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education</td>
<td>$61,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Income Management</td>
<td>$141,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Housing</td>
<td>$221,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emergency Services</td>
<td>$261,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nutrition</td>
<td>$4,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Linkages</td>
<td>$79,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self Sufficiency</td>
<td>$53,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Health</td>
<td>$17,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$884,768</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the CSBG funds reported above $88,469 were for administration. **10.00%**

Please consult the instructions regarding what constitutes "administration."
### EXAMPLE | USING NPI DATA

#### 4. Health and Human Services (HHS)
- a. LIHEAP - Fuel Assistance (include oil overcharge $$)
- b. LIHEAP - Weatherization (include oil overcharge $$)
- c. Head Start
- d. Early Head Start
- e. Older Americans Act
- f. Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)
- g. Medicare/Medicaid
- h. Assets for Independence (AFI)
- i. Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)
- j. Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b.</td>
<td>$1,265,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4i.</td>
<td>$520,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4j.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
- b. Section 8
- c. Section 202
- d. Home tenant based assistance
- e. HOPE for Homeowners Program (H4H)
- f. Emergency Shelter Grant Program (ESGP)
- g. Continuum of Care (CofC)
- h. All other HUD including homeless programs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a.</td>
<td>$572,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f.</td>
<td>$77,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g.</td>
<td>$659,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h.</td>
<td>$506,411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Department of Labor (DOL)
- a. Workforce Investment Act (WIA)
- b. Work related education and training

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a.</td>
<td>$177,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXAMPLE | USING NPI DATA

• What do we do with this information?
  – Ask why.
    • Was there additional funding, staff, outreach etc?
    • What services did this group receive in order to obtain a job?
  – Use this information to develop next year’s CAP Plan.
    • Should all things remain equal – the number expected to achieve should be closer to what was actually achieved (507).
    • Note how many people enrolled it takes to ensure that you can assist 507 unemployed people obtain a job.
TARGETING

• It is important for you to include the concept of setting targets as a part of the ROMA process.
  – This begins with your community needs assessment, followed by a consensus among your stakeholders on your agency’s overall goals.

• Goals, outcomes, indicators, benchmarks, and targets will help you measure your impact.
LEARNING FROM THE REVIEW

• It may be tempting to see target review as a simple yes-or-no question (Did we meet the target?)

• The second step is to seek answers to the question, “Why?”
  • Why did you meet the target or miss it?
WHY DO I NEED THESE NUMBERS?

• In multiple-component programs, you need a multi-part picture of results.

• Predicting your success at reaching a broad goal is the same as “setting a target,” which means making a commitment to aim for the target.

• Your success at reaching a broad goal can be better managed when you specify what program steps’ outcomes will move participants toward the goal.
CAP PLANS AND STRATEGIC PLANS

• Review CAP Plans and NPIs at mid-year to learn progress on outcomes.
• Review strategic plans at least annually and adjust as needed.
• Learn root causes of either over or underestimations early!
DATA CLEANING AND REVIEW

- Changes in data from year to year have implications at the local level and national level in story telling.
- Understanding these changes is key to understanding performance at the agency, state and national level.
IS DATA CLEANING

• Pennsylvania's 2015 IS Report results in data specific questions being asked to the state about eligible entity data.
• The follow-up questions are to inquire further on increases or decreases, statistically improbable data anomalies, and targeting issues.
• NASCSP follows-up with states when comments are not submitted or perhaps if they are unclear.
IS DATA CLEANING

Increases and decreases:

- Example: 6.2a – “Emergency Food”
  - An agency reported an 88% decrease in people obtaining emergency food in 2014 and 2015.
  - During follow-up we learned that this is where the agency reports FEMA funding and that there was a late release of funding affecting outcomes.
IS DATA CLEANING

Data anomalies - examples:

• Total number of seniors in Section G is lower than 6.1a, the total number of Senior Citizens receiving services

• No volunteer hours or low-income hours are higher than total volunteer hours
IS DATA CLEANING

Targeting issues:

- When targeting for NPI 1.1, 1.3, and 6.3 is outside of the 80%-120% range, we ask follow-up questions.
CASE STUDY | NORTH CAROLINA LIFE WORKS PROGRAM
OUTCOMES ACHIEVED

• Participants achieved success, with income above the federal poverty guidelines
• Participants completed major goals, with income above the federal poverty guidelines
• Participants rose above federal poverty guidelines in a prior year
WHAT HAPPENED TO THE PARTICIPANTS?

**Life Works Participants Discharged, FY 2014-15**

- **33%** Discharged as unsuccessful
  - (20 individuals)
- **44%** Successful graduates
  - (27 individuals)
- **23%** Met major goals, but were not able to rise above poverty level
  - (14 individuals)
WHO OBTAINED THE OUTCOME?

Characteristics of Successful Life Works Graduates, FY 2014-15

Of the 27 of participants who graduated successfully...

- 56% Single parent
- 89% Female
- 44% Minority
- 100% GED or higher education
WHO OBTAINED THE OUTCOME?

Educational characteristics of successful graduates, FY 2014-15
Of the 27 of participants who graduated successfully…

- 30% high school graduate
- 37% attended college/tech school (non-graduate)
- 11% received GED
- 22% college/tech school graduate
HOW MUCH TIME DID IT TAKE WITH EACH PARTICIPANT?

Key indicator of success: Participant contacts

Average number of total contacts,
(FY 2014-15 discharged participants)

A strong correlation exists between the number and type of contacts participants have with life coaches, and their rate of success.
WHAT ELSE CAN THEY LEARN?

• Were there themes in the services provided?

• What are the **characteristics** of the successful population?

• Were there trends in dollars spent vs. funds that were leveraged in the community?

• What can they learn from those who were unsuccessful?

• When comparing data analysis from 15/16 FY, are there other improvements that can be made?

• How do we best share the importance of education within our community and build relationships to maximize impact?
CASE STUDY | KENTUCKY
KINDERGARTEN READINESS
LOUISVILLE METRO COMMUNITY SERVICES

• The Mission of Louisville Metro Department of Community Services is to improve the quality of life for all residents and reduce poverty

• Serves roughly 16,000 families annually

• CSBG funds focus on improving employment and education to reduce poverty
IDENTIFYING THE NEED

• 2014 Needs Assessment:
  – Data review revealed that Head Start programs were at capacity
  – Reduction in childcare subsidies available strained low-income parents
  – Preschool Readiness data revealed that low-income children were less likely to be kindergarten ready than children coming from other households
KINDERGARTEN READINESS IN LOUISVILLE

2014-2015 Brigance Data By Zip Code
- Below 43% Ready
- 43% to 53% Ready
- 53% to 63% Ready
- 63% to 77% Ready
- Above 77% Ready
LMCS KINDERGARTEN READINESS STRATEGY

• Agency strategy of providing preschool scholarships focused on family-level services to address family-level need

• Larger, community-level problems existed that were not impacted by the scholarship program
IDENTIFYING A COMMUNITY-LEVEL STRATEGY

• How do we address community change as a single organization?

• What does the data tell us?
  – Poverty and kindergarten readiness correlate
  – Low-income neighborhoods lack sufficient preschool programs

• What can we realistically implement?
  – City-wide change, or neighborhood?

• Who else is doing this work?
EARLY EDUCATION 40210

• “The goal of Early Education 40210 is to increase early childhood education, specifically in the 40210 ZIP code area. This place-based effort will serve as a model for progress toward the community-wide kindergarten readiness goal of 77% by 2020.”
THE APPROACH

• Community Level:
  – Support expansion of kindergarten readiness best practices to childcare providers in 40210
  – Collaborate with Louisville Free Public Library’s “1,000 Books Before Kindergarten” program focusing on early literacy
  – Provide front yard libraries within 40210 to create increased easy access for family reading
DEVELOPING PARTNERSHIPS

• Given the expansive nature of the project, partners were strategically engaged:
  – Who works with this population?
  – Who has an interest in this outcome?
  – Who brings:
    • Funding?
    • Community Ties?
    • Recognition?
    • Human Capital?
PARTNERS

• Leadership Louisville Center (*Foundation*)
• Metro United Way (*Backbone*)
• Jefferson County Public School (*Data*)
• Louisville Free Public Library (*Books*)
• Louisville Metro Community Services (*Funding*)
• Private sector partners (*Volunteers*)
MEASURING SUCCESS

• Primary measure determined by 40210 kindergarten readiness rates

• Data collected from children and families engaged through their childcare centers using the Ages and Stages questionnaire
  – Success measured using a questionnaire for parents asking how the Ages and Stages questionnaire improved the development of their child
COMMUNITY LEVEL OUTCOMES

• The 40210 area saw an increase in readiness during implementation
  – The kindergarten readiness rates fell for the Louisville Metro as a whole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>40210 Kindergarten Readiness</th>
<th>Louisville Metro Readiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USING DATA TO IMPROVE

• Some portions of the strategy lack true evaluation techniques (IE, Little Libraries)

• Trouble with enrollment from childcare centers
  – Engage childcare training group who already has relationships with these centers

• Targeted approach with childcare centers—Children may not all be from target neighborhood
EVALUATION
VISUALS AND FLOW CHARTS
FLOW CHART FOR TARGETING REVIEW

Did we meet the target? → NO

Were there specific external circumstances which interfered? → YES
  Can we modify those circumstances? How? → NO

Did the customers (or process) move through the steps of the program as we had predicted? → NO

Were there specific points at which customers (or the process) failed to achieve desired interim outcomes? → NO

What do we know (or what can we find out) about what interfered with achieving the desired interim outcomes? → YES
  Can we alter or offset the interfering factors? How?

What does our analysis tell us about how much to adjust the target for the next program cycle?
Which individuals achieved particular outcomes?

What services were most used by individuals achieving the outcomes? What specific mix of services was most used by individuals achieving the outcomes?

What can we surmise about what services are most effective for achieving the expected outcomes?

Which NPIs did the agency meet? Not meet?

What services were most used by individuals not achieving the outcomes? Did the individuals not achieving the expected outcomes use different services? Not use specific services?

How well did we deliver services? (Timeliness, Accuracy, Cost, Client Satisfaction)

What changes should we make to our Service Model? What do more of, less of? Any services to stop delivering? Any services to deliver differently? Any services to add? Do we need to improve how we deliver services?

What was unexpected?
LOCAL DATA ANALYSES/DECISION MAKING:
What difference did we make? What program improvements will enhance our impact? What compelling story can we tell?

Analysis of Demographic Data
- Whom did we serve—income levels, employment and education status?
- How many people did we serve? (Unduplicated count)
- How is this different or the same from previous years (last year, 3/5/10 years ago)?
- What does this tell us? Are we reaching the right people? Enough people? Do we need to do anything differently?

Analysis of NPI Data
- Which NPIs did the agency focus on?
- Which NPIs did the agency meet? What was the basis for this success? (Which individuals achieved particular outcomes? What services/combination of services did they receive?)
- What does this tell us?
- Which NPIs were not met? What were the factors involved?
- What does this tell us?
- Do we need to do anything differently to increase our impact?
Analysis of Service Data
• What types of services did we deliver? (By domain)
• How many people received what services?
• What services were most often combined?
• What services/combination of services had the most effect on helping participants achieve results?
• What does this tell us? Do we need to make any changes to our Service Model? Any services to stop delivering? Any services to deliver differently? Any services to add? Do we need to improve how we deliver services?

Analysis of Community Strategies Engaged In
• What progress are we making toward changing the conditions in our community?
• Have we set the right goals? Do we have the right partners? Are we engaged in the right activities?

Telling the Agency Story: This agency achieved these Results (Outcomes) for this many individuals/families/communities (Outputs) with low-income by delivering these services and implementing these strategies (Outputs) using these resources.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the data received from the local agencies accurate? Reliable? (Unduplicated counts of individuals served?)</td>
<td>What Individual/Family Outcomes (NPIs) were met by each of the local agencies across the state? What outcomes were not met? Taken together, what outcomes (NPIs) were achieved across the state? What community changes were achieved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the CAAs conduct the needed analyses to understand what is working and what changes to make to increase their impact?</td>
<td>What service delivery models appear most effective? What local agency best practices should be replicated in other parts of the state?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many people were served across the State? What were the characteristics of the people served? How does this compare with what we know about the individuals and communities of low-income in this state? What trends are evident?</td>
<td>What local agencies should receive enhanced training and technical assistance? What actions might the State take to enhance performance and increase impact across the state?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What types of services were provided? How many of these types of services were provided across the state? How many agencies are engaged in partnerships or Collective Impact initiatives?</td>
<td><strong>Telling the Story of CA in the State:</strong> In this State, Community Action achieved these Results (Outcomes) for this many individuals/families/communities (Outputs) with low-incomes by delivering these services and implementing these strategies (Outputs), using these Resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*State Data Analysis/Evaluation*
Questions?

Rae Tamblyn
rtamblyn@nascsp.org
Using IS Data in Storytelling and Social Media
USING IS DATA IN STORY TELLING AND SOCIAL MEDIA
STEP 1: CHOOSE WELL

– The organization and its staff

– Responsible leadership

– Resources, partners, and innovation

– Delivery of high-quality, well-managed services or investments

– Positive results for individuals, families, and the community as a whole
INDIVIDUALS AND THEIR SUCCESSES: HOW DO THEIR STORIES FIT IN?

*Use the Personal Story as Just One Example, not as the Central Theme*

central plot of your stories should be your agency’s own formula for effectiveness in fighting poverty and improving communities
STEP 2: FRAME YOUR STORY

Guide the reader to interpret your story the way you want them to
THE COW AND FRAMING

This cow lives on a farm where some of the cows are getting sick

What is the cause of the illness?
THE COW AND FRAMING

Now that we’ve added in the backdrop...
CHOOSING WORDS THAT SPEAK TO OTHERS

• Avoid jargon
• Be mindful of stereotypes and connotations
• Make the story accessible to reader – “us” not “other”
**FRAMING WORDS THAT WORK**

(The **Bold** words in the left column are recommended over the non-bold.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Jobs/ Economy</strong></th>
<th>vs. <strong>The Poor/ Working Poor</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All of Us/ Unity</strong></td>
<td>vs. <strong>Them/ Others</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work</strong></td>
<td>vs. <strong>Worker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paying Well Enough</strong></td>
<td>vs. <strong>Working Hard Enough</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Failures</strong></td>
<td>vs. <strong>Individual Failures</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FRAMING WORDS THAT WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Problem/ Solution</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>Private Problem/ Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fix the Condition</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Fix the Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Sympathy Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Concern/</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Concern of Just Advocates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Diverse Voices</td>
<td></td>
<td>and Politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Government/ Business/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals as Isolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEP 3: THE SET UP

- Use active writing style
  - “We created” vs. “This came about”

- Show that staff is proactive;
  - Teamwork and partnerships

- Emphasize shared goals
STEP 4: IMPLEMENTATION

• Vision, decisions, and actions

• Explain steps clearly

• Example key words: Convene, plan, mobilize, coordinate, raise funds, persuade, manage
STEP 5: THE OUTCOME

• End with success

• Numbers may be useful, but be careful
IN SUM: 5 STEPS TO STRONGER STORYTELLING

1. Choosing well
2. Framing
3. Setting Up
4. Showing Implementation
5. Demonstrating Outcomes
MAKE YOUR DATA AND STORIES HEARD

• CREATING A STORY
• MESSAGING
  – *Know your audience*
• SOCIAL MEDIA
  – Branding!

NASCSP | Using IS Survey Data
ELEMENTS OF MESSAGING

**GOAL:** Why are you telling the story in the first place?

**Grab attention:** Why would the audience want to listen?

**Engage:** Why would the audience care?

**Enable action:** How can the story be shared? What can your audience DO?
GETTING YOUR MESSAGE OUT

• Create awareness about what you do
• Highlight the needs of the community
• Demonstrate success
• Protect/Increase Funding
STRATEGIC MESSAGING:
AND TO WHOM?

Policy Makers

Funders

Media

Clients
CONTENT PROMOTION

Press Release

Media Alert

Social Media

Publications

Letter to the Editor
Social media sites nonprofits expect to be the most important to communications strategies in 2014

- Facebook: 95%
- Twitter: 64%
- YouTube: 38%
- LinkedIn: 26%
- Pinterest: 8%
- Google+: 7%
- Instagram: 7%
- Flickr: 4%
- Vimeo: 4%
CONS: Twitter

• PROS
  – Communicate in real-time; massive audience
  – Easily join existing online conversations (using hashtags: #)
  – Can direct comments directly using handle (@)
  – Can follow and respond to persons & organizations of interest

• CONS
  – Requires constant upkeep, awareness
  – Character limit prevents detail, nuances
  – Difference in impact between individual and organizational twitter activity
Pros and Cons: Facebook

• PROS
  – Communicate in real-time; **most users**
  – Use hashtags to link Facebook to Twitter & vice versa
  – Can direct comments & share information w/ ease
  – NO character limit → enables detail, nuances, images

• CONS
  – Requires constant upkeep, awareness
  – Requires people to follow page vs using Twitter to tap into larger conversations through #s
  – Difference in impact between individual and organizations activity
USING PHOTOS TO TELL YOUR STORY

• Photos, like words, can convey positive and negative messages

• Your Photos Should Include:
  – Logos and Branding for your Program
  – Active, Engaged, Diverse, & Happy Individuals
  – Sense of a Goal, Community Impact, & Togetherness
TIPS AND IDEAS

Go to NASCSP.org & check out the Twitter feed!

• You can tweet to us
• Read our tweets even without access to Twitter
• See who and what we are tweeting
• Get ideas and info
• Get Hootsuite FREE version
MORE INFORMATION

**Visit** the NASCP website:

www.nascsp.org

**Contact** Rae Tamblyn:

rtamblyn@nascsp.org