NEW SECTOR ALLIANCE

RISE PROGRAM EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT

Submitted to:

New Sector Alliance

Brian Garshelis, National Program Director

by

Navin Associates

Chris Navin, Ed.D.

Anne Poling, M.P.H.

November 30, 2016

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>

New Sector Alliance (New Sector) issued a Request for Proposals for an independent, third party evaluation of its AmeriCorps RISE Program in five cities in the first quarter of 2015. Navin Associates (Navin) responded and was selected.

A contract was executed on March 25, 2015. A scope of services, workplan and timeline were developed and an Evaluation Team (Team) was convened consisting of Jenn Bender, Irene Saunders, and Brian Garshelis from New Sector, volunteer New Sector alumni Jessica Walker and Joey Parker, and Anne Poling and Chris Navin from Navin Associates. The Team developed the research questions and evaluation design; instruments were developed, tested and revised in the spring and summer of 2015.

Instruments were administered on-line by New Sector to Fellows and Host Site Supervisors at Start-of-Term (Aug.-Sept. 2015) and End-of-Term (July-Aug. 2016). Due to a very limited budget, data collection, tabulation and preliminary analysis was implemented by New Sector. Navin retained independent control of final data analysis and report-writing, including an interim report in December 2015 of findings from the Start-of-Term surveys, and this report.

FINDINGS

The 2015-2016 New Sector RISE Program Evaluation was intended to answer the following research questions.

> **Primary Research Question: Do the services provided to Host Sites by New Sector RISE Fellows increase the organizational capacity of the Host Sites in the short-term and the long-term?**
>
> **Secondary Research Question: Do the member development services provided to the Fellows by New Sector increase the Fellows' social sector-related knowledge and skills to effectively build organizational capacity of the Host Sites?**

Sixty-eight (68) Supervisor questionnaires were completed for both Start-of-Term (T-1) and End-of-Term (T-2), allowing for pre/post comparison of responses. Sixty-seven (67) Fellows completed questionnaires for both T-1 and T-2.[1] This is a final report of the findings.

New Sector RISE Program Goal 1: Increase organizational capacity of the Host Sites

Objective A: Increase capacity in the short-term

At T-1, Supervisors were asked how much they agreed with the statement *"I anticipate that the New Sector Fellow will help increase organizational capacity"* regarding six possible outcomes, namely,

- ✓ Creation of new services
- ✓ Improved outcomes of current services
- ✓ Increased awareness of services
- ✓ Increased number of potential beneficiaries reached
- ✓ Increased number of beneficiaries served
- ✓ Cost savings per beneficiary served

At T-2, they were asked how much they agreed with the statement *"I believe that the capacity-building services provided by the New Sector Fellow had a direct impact on increasing our organizational capacity"* regarding the same six outcomes. The scale was 1 (Strongly Disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Somewhat Disagree), 4 (Somewhat Agree), 5 (Agree) and 6 (Strongly Agree).

> ➢ At T-1, Supervisors' **expectations** about the Fellows' capacity-building efforts were uniformly positive.
>> - 100% of Supervisors selected "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" for at least one of the six outcomes listed above, meeting New Sector's very high T-1 success metric of 100%.

---

[1] Seventy-three (73) Host Site Supervisors (Supervisors) and 75 New Sector RISE Program Fellows (Fellows) completed Start-of-Term Questionnaires on-line in the fall of 2015. There were 13 instances of Supervisors completing a Start-of-Term or an End-of-Term questionnaire for a Fellow, but not both; the 13 were not included in the evaluation Similarly, 14 Fellows Start- or End-of-Term questionnaires were missing.

➢ At T-2, nearly all Supervisors believed that "the capacity-building services provided by the Fellow **had a direct impact on increasing our organizational capacity**".

- 97% of Supervisors selected "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" for at least one of the six possible outcomes. This surpassed New Sector's T-2 success metric of 80%.
- Each of the six outcomes averaged between "Strongly Agree" and "Agree".
  - Increased number of potential beneficiaries (5.47)
  - Increased number of beneficiaries served(5.45)
  - Improved outcomes of current services (5.40)
  - Increased awareness of services (5.27)
  - Cost savings per beneficiary served (5.21)
  - Creation of new services (5.20).

Fellows were asked at T-1 to respond to the statement *"During my term, I anticipate that the outcome of my project will be to increase organizational capacity at the Host Site"* regarding the same six possible outcomes.

➢ At T-1, 97% of Fellows selected "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" for at least one of the outcomes, just missing New Sector's lofty T-1 success metric of 100%.

- Fellows' expectations about increasing organizational capacity were less positive than Supervisors' expectations on five of six outcomes.
- The six outcomes scored between "Somewhat Disagree" and "Strongly Agree".
- The highest scoring outcome was "Improved outcomes of current services" (5.17) and the lowest was "Cost savings per beneficiary served" (3.84).

➢ At T-2, 88% of Fellows selected "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" for at least one of the outcomes.

- 88% was lower than Fellows' own T-1 expectation and their Supervisors' T-2 assessment of 97%, but high enough to surpass New Sector's T-2 success metric of 80%.
- Fellows' beliefs that they actually were "able to increase organizational capacity at the Host site" were again less positive than their Supervisors' beliefs.
- The Fellows scored each of the six outcomes between "Somewhat Agree" and "Agree".
  - Increased awareness of services (4.86)
  - Improved outcomes of current services (4.85)
  - Increased number of potential beneficiaries reached (4.79)
  - Creation of new services (4.74)
  - Increased number of beneficiaries served (4.66)
  - Cost savings per beneficiary served (4.39)

Supervisors' T-1 expectations and T-2 assessments of increased organizational capacity were more positive than those of Fellows. Next, each group's End-of-Term judgment about the Fellows' actual impact will be compared to its Start-of-Term judgment about expected impact. That is, how often had the Fellows met and/or exceeded Start-of-Term expectations?

➢ At T-2, between 66% and 81% of Fellows met or exceeded their Supervisors' T-1 expectations.

- o Cost savings per beneficiary served (81% met/exceeded the Supervisor's expectations)

- o Increased number of beneficiaries served (81%)
- o Increased number of potential beneficiaries reached (76%)
- o Improved outcomes of current services (68%)
- o Increased awareness of services (66%)
- o Creation of new services (66%)
- ➤ At T-2, between 42% and 67% of Fellows had met or exceeded their own expectations.
  - o Cost savings per beneficiary served (67%)
  - o Creation of new services (64%)
  - o Increased awareness of services (61%)
  - o Increased number of potential beneficiaries reached (54%)
  - o Improved outcomes of current services (49%)
  - o Increased number of beneficiaries served (42%)

Finally, Supervisors were asked to respond to the question *"How valuable to building your organization's capacity were the services provided by the New Sector Fellow in the past year?"* using a four-point scale from Not Valuable (1) to Very Valuable (4). Fully 97% responded "Very Valuable" (71%) or "Valuable" (26%). Two responded "Somewhat Valuable" (3%) and none responded "Not Valuable".

Summary of Goal 1. Objective A. Increase capacity in the short-term

In the opinions of the Supervisors, New Sector Fellows definitely were able to achieve outcomes that helped to increase the organizational capacity of their host sites in the short-term, even if the Fellows themselves were less certain. Both groups agreed that "Cost savings per beneficiary served" was a top outcome.

Goal 1. Objective B: Increase organizational capacity in mid- to long-term

At T-1 and T-2, Supervisors were asked how much they agreed with the statement *"I anticipate that the services provided by the New Sector Fellow will have a lasting positive impact on our programs and services beyond the end of the Fellow's term, excluding unforeseen changes (e.g., changes in resources or staffing)."*

- ➤ At T-1, Supervisors were very optimistic that there would be lasting benefits from their Fellows' service.
  - • 97% chose "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" regarding "a lasting positive impact" (5.68 of 6)
- ➤ At T-2, Supervisors were just as sure that there would be lasting positive impacts on their organizations due to their Fellow's work.
  - • Fully 97% of Supervisors selected "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" for one or more of the six possible outcomes. This surpassed New Sector's T-2 success metric of 80% selecting "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" for one of six outcomes.
  - • Moreover, each of the six outcomes averaged between "Strongly Agree" and "Agree".
    - ▪ Improved outcomes of current services (5.44)
    - ▪ Increased awareness of services (5.25)
    - ▪ Increased number of potential beneficiaries (5.25)

- ▪ Cost savings per beneficiary served (5.20)
- ▪ Increased number of beneficiaries served (5.18)
- ▪ Creation of new services (5.12).
- • Only two Supervisors did not select "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" for any outcome. One selected "Somewhat Agree" across the board and the other selected "Strongly Disagree" but wrote this very positive comment – *"I think the impact of her work has been tremendously positive and impactful. Her work directly relates to our strategic goal to demonstrate effectiveness."*

➢ At T-2, Supervisors were asked *"Were there any unintended effects (positive and/or negative) of the capacity-building services provided by the New Sector Fellow? If so, please describe."* Comments were as follows.

- ▪ *"Karen helped manualize some of our existing processes, as well as processes she created - huge benefit for us!"*
- ▪ *"Deeper consideration of our theory of change"*
- ▪ *"Yes--learnings that disproved some pre-conceptions of senior manamngment about host willingness and participation."*
- ▪ *"He's been proactive about making sure the rest of the organization is on the same page as our tech team. As a growing organization, that was an important perspective that our team will continue to keep in mind moving forward."*
- ▪ *"Molly was able to make connections in the community that we had been unable to do in the past due to capacity. Having her located within a service neighborhood really increased the community connections we were able to establish."*
- ▪ *"Some of our core staff were initially hesitant about working with a New Sector Fellow, but now they think they won't be able to function without one."*
- ▪ *"Garrett's bus itinerary form that he made for his new sector project is going to save us so many headaches."*
- ▪ *"Kayla's work will have a lasting impact on our talent development and recuitment processes, which are critically important to delivering the best services"*
- ▪ *"Stephanie's willingness and ability to ask challenging questions in a thoughtful and respectful manner has caused me to re-think the growth plan we had."*
- ▪ *"Dan taught a lot of staff improved strategies for using MTS and for data collection and analysis"*
- ▪ *"Siena's writing ability has enabled her to create highly visible and effective work products; she has shown an ability to synthesize ideas into practical proposals and related processes"*
- ▪ *"Nothing negative" "None" "No"*

Summary of Goal 1. Objective B. Increase capacity in the mid- to long-term

In the opinions of nearly all of the Supervisors, the New Sector Fellows' work will have a lasting positive impact on Host Site programs and services beyond the end of the Fellow's term, with respect to all six possible outcomes.

Goal 2: Increase Fellows' social sector-related knowledge and skills in order to build capacity of sites

---

Goal 2. Objective A: Increase Fellows' knowledge and skills in foundations of social-sector leadership

New Sector targeted seven knowledge and skill areas:

- ✓ Interpersonal Effectiveness
- ✓ Engaging Stakeholders
- ✓ Problem Solving
- ✓ Cultural Competence
- ✓ Ethical, mission-driven work
- ✓ Adaptability
- ✓ Project Management

Importance to Host Supervisors

At Start-of-Term (T-1), Supervisors were asked to rate <u>the importance</u> of each of these knowledge and skills areas for Fellows' ability to effectively build organizational capacity, using a scale of 1 (Not important) to 4 (Very Important).

- ➢ All seven areas of knowledge and skills were rated "Very Important" or "Important" by over 90% of Supervisors. <u>This exceeded New Sector's metric of success of 80% of Supervisors selecting "Very Important" or "Important" for at least one knowledge and skills area.</u> Average scores for importance were tightly clustered.
  - o Project Management (3.84)
  - o Interpersonal Effectiveness (3.79)
  - o Problem Solving (3.75)
  - o Adaptability (3.71)
  - o Ethical, mission-driven work (3.62)
  - o Engaging stakeholders (3.59)
  - o Cultural Competence (3.57)
- ➢ Only 12 Supervisors rated any area as "Somewhat Important"; five gave that rating to "Ethical, mission-driven work", three to "Engaging Stakeholders", two to "Cultural Competence", and one each to "Interpersonal Effectiveness" and "Adaptability".

Supervisor-Reported Increases in Skills and Knowledge

At End-of-Term (T-2), Supervisors were asked about each Fellow they supervised"*To what extent did the Fellow's knowledge and skills <u>increase </u>during the term?*" A six-point scale was used: 1 (No Increase); 2

(Minimal Increase); 3 (Small Increase); 4 (Moderate Increase); 5 (Major Increase); to 6 (Outstanding Increase). Sixty-two (62) Fellows were rated by their Supervisors on this question at T-2.

➢ 93.5% of Supervisors selected "Outstanding Increase", "Major Increase" or "Moderate Increase" for four or more knowledge and skill areas. <u>This exceeded New Sector's success metric of 80% of Supervisors selecting one of these scores for four or more knowledge and skill areas</u>.
  o <u>67.7% did so for</u> all seven areas
  o 8.1% did so for six of seven areas
  o 11.3% did so for five of seven areas
➢ In the opinions of their Supervisors, the Fellows' average increases in the knowledge and skill areas ranged from a high of 4.70 (out of 6) for "Increase in Adaptability" to a low of 3.75 for "Increase in Engaging Stakeholders".
  o Increase in Adaptability (4.70)
  o Increase in Project Management (4.62)
  o Increase in Interpersonal Effectiveness (4.42)
  o Increase in Problem Solving (4.39)
  o Increase in Cultural Competence (4.33)
  o Increase in Ethical, Mission-Driven Work (4.25)
  o Increase in Engaging Stakeholders (3.75)
➢ <u>The four most important knowledge and skill areas according to the Supervisors were also the top four areas of increased knowledge and skills that they saw in the Fellows</u>.

Fellow-Perceived Increases in Skills and Knowledge

At the <u>Start-of-Term (T-1)</u>, Fellows were asked to rate themselves on the same seven knowledge and skill areas – *"Please rate yourself on the following knowledge and skills."* The scale was 1 (Never), 2 (Rarely), 3 (Sometimes), 4 (Often), 5 (Almost Always), 6 (Always).

➢ At T-1, Fellows tended to rate themselves in the upper-middle of the scale (i.e., "Often" and "Almost Always"). No Fellow chose "Never" for any area of knowledge and skills, and there were only three Fellows who chose "Rarely", one time each.
➢ The areas in which Fellows rated themselves highest were "Ethical, Mission-driven Work" (5.07) and "Cultural Competence" (4.92).
  • "Always" was the most frequent rating for "Ethical, Mission-driven Work".
  • "Almost Always" was the most frequent rating for "Cultural Competence".
  • "Often" was the most frequent rating for all other knowledge and skill areas.
➢ In the seven knowledge and skills areas, at T-1 Fellows on average rated themselves as follows.
  • Ethical, Mission-driven Work (5.07)
  • Cultural Competence (4.92)
  • Problem Solving (4.77)
  • Interpersonal Effectiveness (4.67)
  • Adaptability (4.45)
  • Project Management (4.43)

- Engaging Stakeholders (4.28)

At the <u>End-of-Term (T-2),</u> Fellows again were asked to rate themselves on the same seven areas.

➢ <u>Fellows on average rated themselves higher in all seven areas at T-2</u>.
- Ethical, Mission-driven Work (5.41)
- Cultural Competence (5.32)
- Adaptability (5.17)
- Project Management (5.13)
- Problem Solving (5.11)
- Interpersonal Effectiveness (5.08)
- Engaging Stakeholders (4.85)
➢ At T-2, more than 80% of Fellows selected "Always" or "Almost Always" on six of seven areas.
- <u>This exceeded New Sector's success metric</u> of 80% selecting "Always" or "Almost Always" for four or more knowledge and skills areas.
- The only area in which fewer than 80% of Fellows selected "Always" or "Almost Always" was "Engaging Stakeholders" (69.4%)
- None of the Fellows chose "Never" for any knowledge and skills area.
➢ Nearly two of every three Fellows (64%) rated themselves higher at T-2 than at T-1 on three or more knowledge and skill areas
- Nearly half (47%) rated themselves higher on four or more areas
- One in three (33%) rated themselves higher on five or more areas
➢ The highest average increases among Fellows from T-1 to T-2 were in "Adaptability" (0.72) and "Project Management" (0.70).
- Adaptability (0.72)
- Project Management (0.70)
- Engaging Stakeholders (0.57)
- Interpersonal Effectiveness (0.41)
- Cultural Competence (0.40)
- Problem Solving (0.34)
- Ethical, mission-driven work (0.34)
➢ There were three areas in which at least half of the Fellows rated themselves higher at T-2 than T-1: "Engaging Stakeholders" (56%); "Project Management" (53%); and "Adaptability" (50%).

Comparison Between Supervisor and Fellow Reports of Increased Knowledge and Skills Areas

At T-1, Supervisors were asked to rate the importance for their Fellows of each of the knowledge and skills areas. (The Supervisors were not asked to rate the Fellows on these areas at T-1, because they did not know them well enough.) At T-2, each Supervisor was asked to rate each Fellow's **increase** in knowledge and skills using a six-point scale: 1 (No Increase); 2 (Minimal Increase); 3 (Small Increase); 4 (Moderate Increase); 5 (Major Increase); 6 (Outstanding Increase). Fellows were asked to rate themselves on the seven knowledge and skill areas both at T-1 and at T-2, also using a six-point scale: 1

(Never); 2 (Rarely); 3 (Sometimes); 4 (Often); 5 (Almost Always); 6 (Always). The difference between the Fellows' answers was calculated as T-2 minus T-1. Table 1 shows the comparison in the reported increases according to the Supervisors' average ratings of their Fellows.

Table 1. Comparison of Supervisor-Reported Increases in Knowledge and Skill Areas and Fellow-Reported Increases*		
Knowledge and Skill Areas	**Supervisor T-2 Report**	**Fellow T-2 minus T-1**
Adaptability	#1 / 4.70	#1 / +0.72
Project Management	#2 / 4.62	#2 / +0.70
Interpersonal Effectiveness	#3 / 4.42	#4 / +0.41
Problem Solving	#4 / 4.39	#6 / +0.34
Cultural Competence	#5 / 4.33	#5 / +0.40
Ethical, mission-driven work	#6 / 4.25	#7 / +0.34
Engaging Stakeholders	#7 / 3.75	#3 / +0.57

➢ <u>Supervisors and Fellows reported increases in all seven knowledge and skill areas</u>.
- Supervisors on average reported increases that were between Moderate and Major in six of seven knowledge and skills areas; the increase for Engaging Stakeholders was between Small and Moderate.
- Fellows reported increases of at least 0.34 in all seven knowledge and skill areas.

➢ <u>Supervisors and Fellows agreed on three of the four top increases: Adaptability; Project Management; and Interpersonal Effectiveness</u>.

➢ The area in which Supervisors and Fellows disagreed the most was Engaging Stakeholders, in which Supervisors saw the least increase and Fellows reported the third highest increase.

Table 2 shows the Supervisors' average ratings of the **importance** of the knowledge and skill areas, compared to the Fellows' average self-ratings at T-1 and T-2.

Table 2. Fellow's T-1 to T-2 Increases in Knowledge and Skill Areas by Supervisors' Importance Rating			
Knowledge and Skill Areas	**Sup. Rating of importance 1 – 4 scale**	**Fellows' avg. T-1 Self-rating 1 – 6 scale**	**Fellows' avg. T-2 Self-rating 1 – 6 scale**
Project Management	#1 / 3.84	#6 / 4.43	#4 / 5.13
Interpersonal Effectiveness	#2 / 3.79	#4 / 4.67	#6 / 5.08
Problem Solving	#3 / 3.75	#3 / 4.77	#5 / 5.11
Adaptability	#4 / 3.71	#5 / 4.45	#3 / 5.17
Ethical, mission-driven work	#5 / 3.62	#1 / 5.07	#1 / 5.41
Engaging Stakeholders	#6 / 3.59	#7 / 4.28	#7 / 4.85
Cultural Competence	#7 / 3.57	#2 / 4.92	#2 / 5.32

➢ The two areas that Supervisors considered most important, "Project Management" and "Interpersonal Effectiveness", were areas in which Fellows rated themselves relatively low, ranking 4th and 6th respectively at T-2.

> ➢ The two areas in which Fellows rated themselves highest, "Ethical, Mission-driven Work" and "Cultural Competence", received low importance ratings from Supervisors, 5th and 7th respectively.
>
> ➢ There are few areas in which the Supervisors' assessment of importance coincides with the Fellow's assessment of their skills. The closest tend to be in the midrange ("Problem Solving" and "Adaptability") or near the bottom (Engaging Stakeholders).

<u>Summary of Goal 2. Objective A. Increase Fellows' knowledge and skills in foundations of social-sector leadership</u>

In the opinions of the Host Site Supervisors, New Sector chose seven areas of social sector knowledge and skills that fall between "Important" and "Very Important" with respect to Fellows' ability to effectively build organizational capacity. Two-thirds of Supervisors reported that their Fellows' knowledge and skills increased in all seven areas and nearly all Supervisors reported that their Fellows had increased in four or more areas. The four most important knowledge and skill areas according to the Supervisors were also the top four areas of increased knowledge and skills that they saw in the Fellows. Fully 89% of Fellows rated themselves more highly at T-2 than at T-1 in at least one area of skill and knowledge, and nearly two-thirds in three or more areas.

New Sector exceeded all three metrics of success that it had established for this Objective. These were:
- ❖ 80% of Supervisors selecting "Very Important" or "Important" for at least one knowledge and skills area with respect to building organizational capacity of Host sites;
- ❖ 80% of Supervisors reporting "Outstanding Increase" to "Moderate Increase" in four or more of their Fellows' knowledge and skills areas; and
- ❖ 80% of Fellows selecting "Always" or "Almost Always" for four or more knowledge and skills areas.

Supervisors and Fellows agreed that, on average, Fellows improved in all seven knowledge and skill areas. It is interesting to note that the two areas that Supervisors considered most important, "Project Management" and "Interpersonal Effectiveness", were areas in which Fellows rated themselves relatively low, ranking 4th and 6th respectively at T-2. However, Supervisors and Fellows agreed that "Project Management" and "Interpersonal Effectiveness" comprised two of the top four increases.

The two areas in which Fellows rated themselves highest at T-1 and T-2, "Ethical, Mission-driven Work" and "Cultural Competence", received low importance ratings from Supervisors, 5th and 7th respectively. Supervisors and Fellows both agreed that Fellows increased relatively little in these areas.

Goal 2. Objective B: Fellows' use knowledge and skills to build capacity of sites

At T-2, Fellows were asked "*How effective were the following New Sector program elements in helping you to build organizational capacity at your Host site*?" The five New Sector program elements were Training, Mentoring, Learning Teams, Coaching and Host Site Supervisor. A six-point scale was used: Very Ineffective (1); Ineffective (2); Somewhat Ineffective (3); Somewhat Effective (4); Effective (5) and Very Effective (6).

➢ About two-thirds of Fellows selected "Very Effective", "Effective" or "Somewhat Effective" for all five program elements. The percentages of Fellows that selected one of these ratings for each element are presented below along with its average numerical score on the six-point scale[2].

- 86.1% selected "Very Effective" to "Somewhat Effective" for Host Site Supervisor (4.89)
- 83.3% did so for Training (4.23)
- 73.6% did so for Mentoring (4.12)
- 66.7% did so for Coaching (4.31)
- 65.3% did so for Learning Teams (4.0)

➢ If only scores of "Very Effective" or "Effective" are considered, however, there is a stark divide between Host Site Supervisor and the other program elements.

- 72.2% selected "Very Effective" or "Effective" for Host Site Supervisor
- 38.9% did so for Mentoring
- 37.5% did so for Training
- 36.1% did so for Coaching
- 33.3% did so for Learning Teams

➢ <u>72.2% of Fellows selected "Very Effective" or "Effective" for Host Site Supervisor almost met New Sector's success metric of 80%</u> of Fellows selecting "Very Effective" or "Effective" for at least one response.

➢ "Somewhat Effective" was the response most often selected for every program element except Host Site Supervisor for which "Very Effective" was the top response by 41.7% of Fellows.

At T-2, Fellows had the opportunity to comment upon the effectiveness of the program elements in helping them to build organizational capacity at their Host Site; they offered the following.

➢ "Again, i had two host site supervisors"
➢ "trainings were often repetitive and I would not say they were the most appropriate setting for learning, mentor was great but hard to schedule time together, not sure about coaching"
➢ "Host-site Supervisor answer speaks to Bayview location"
➢ "My mentor was very unresponsive during the course of the year, and fulfilled very few of the agreed-upon responsibilities for his role, which was very disappointing. Other than that, the New Sector program was perfect for me."
➢ "My mentor was not in the social sector and never had been, so we did not have any overlapping professional interests. This made the mentoring relationship challenging."

At T-2, 72 Fellows also were asked *"Please indicate which New Sector program elements were effective in building the following knowledge and skills"* referring to the seven knowledge and skill areas.

➢ Fellows ranked the effectiveness of the five program elements.

---

[2] Calculation of the average scores excludes responses of "Don't know", whereas calculation of the percentage of responses of "Somewhat Effective" to "Very Effective" included all 72 responses. Consequently the rank ordering of the two methods produces somewhat different results.

- Host Site Supervisor (45)[3]
- Training (32.9)
- Mentoring (26.7)
- Learning Teams (24.6)
- Coaching (20.7)

➢ Fellows reported that <u>Problem Solving was the knowledge and skills area that was most effectively built</u> by the program elements and Cultural Competence was the least effectively built.

- Problem Solving (41.8)
- Interpersonal Effectiveness (37.8)
- Project Management (32.0)
- Adaptability (28.4)
- Ethical, mission-driven work (26.6)
- Engaging Stakeholders (26.2)
- Cultural Competence (22.4)

<u>Summary of Goal 2. Objective B: Fellows use knowledge and skills to build capacity of sites</u>

With respect to helping to build organizational capacity at Host Sites, the five program elements' average scores for effectiveness all fell between "Somewhat Effective" and "Effective". The only program element that the majority (72.2%) of Fellows judged to be either "Very Effective" (41.7%) or "Effective" (30.6%) was Host Site Supervisor; this nearly met the New Sector success metric of 80% selecting "Very Effective" or "Effective" for at least one of the program elements.

With respect to *w*hich New Sector program elements were effective in building the seven knowledge and skills areas, Host Site Supervisor was again judged to be most effective by a substantial margin, followed by Training, Mentoring, Learning Teams and Coaching.

In the opinion of the Fellows, there was a considerable spread among the scores of the knowledge and skill areas that were most effectively built by the various program elements. However, the top four as identified by the Fellows were the same top four that the Supervisors identified regarding Importance and Increased Knowledge and Skills, namely, Problem Solving, Interpersonal Effectiveness, Project Management, and Adaptability.

---

[3] This is the average number of Fellows selecting Host Site Supervisor for each program knowledge and skills area.

CONCLUSIONS

The objectives of this outcome evaluation were to determine whether the 2015-2016 New Sector RISE Program achieved its measurable outcomes, which were that a) the services provided to the Host Sites by the New Sector RISE Fellows will increase the organizational capacity of the Host Sites in the short-term and the long-term, and b) the member development services provided to the Fellows by New Sector will increase the Fellows' social sector-related knowledge and skills to aid them in building organizational capacity of the Host Sites. These objectives were treated as the primary and secondary research question and are answered in this section. The following and final section of the evaluation will consider suggestions for program improvement.

Primary Research Question: "Do the services provided to Host Sites by New Sector RISE Fellows increase the organizational capacity of the Host Sites in the short-term and the long-term?"

Increased organizational capacity was defined as six possible outcomes: Creation of new services; Improved outcomes of current services; Increased awareness of services; Increased number of potential beneficiaries reached; Increased number of beneficiaries served; and Cost savings per beneficiary served. Host Site Supervisors and Fellows were asked about their expectations for outcomes at Start-of-Term (T-1) and about actual outcomes at End-of-Term. Supervisors also were asked about the value of the Fellow's service and about any unintended effects of the Fellow's services.

Host Site Supervisors were nearly unanimous (97%) in their belief that, with respect to one or more outcomes, the services provided by New Sector RISE Fellows increased the organizational capacity of the Host Sites in the short-term **and** in the long-term. Twelve Supervisors commented on positive and/or negative unintended effects of the capacity-building services provided by the Fellow. Every comment was positive and included a wide range of effects such as the following.

> "Deeper consideration of our theory of change."

> "Molly was able to make connections in the community that we had been unable to do in the past due to capacity."

> "Kayla's work will have a lasting impact on our talent development and recruitment processes."

> "Dan taught a lot of staff improved strategies for using MTS and for data collection and analysis."

The New Sector RISE Fellows expressed less certainty and unanimity than the Host Site Supervisors but still agreed overwhelmingly (88%) that the services they provided increased the organizational capacity of the Host Sites[4] with respect to one or more outcomes.

Consequently, based upon 1) the opinions of the Host Site Supervisors and the New Sector Fellows about direct impacts on organizational capacity *during the Fellows' term*, and 2) the opinions of the

---

[4] Data were available from Fellows about short-term impacts only

Supervisors that the Fellows' services would have "*lasting positive impact … beyond the end of the Fellow's term*", Primary Research Question #1 can been answered in the affirmative. **New Sector services provided to Host Sites by New Sector RISE Fellows do increase the organizational capacity of the Host Sites in the short-term and the long-term.**

<u>Secondary Research Question "Do the member development services provided to the Fellows by New Sector increase the Fellows' social sector-related knowledge and skills to effectively build organizational capacity of the Host Sites?"</u>

New Sector identified seven knowledge and skills areas that it considered to be foundations of social sector leadership, namely, Interpersonal Effectiveness, Engaging Stakeholders, Problem Solving, Cultural Competence, Ethical mission-driven work, Adaptability, and Project Management. Five program elements were employed as member development services to increase these knowledge and skill areas in Fellows before and during placement at the Host Site. The program elements were Training, Mentoring, Learning Teams, Coaching, and Host Site Supervisor.

Importance and Utilization of the Seven Knowledge and Skills Areas

More than nine in ten Host Site Supervisors confirmed that all seven, social sector-related, knowledge and skills areas were important to Fellows' ability to build organizational capacity at Host Sites. Four of five Fellows at T-2 reported that they "Always" or "Almost Always" utilized six of the seven knowledge and skill areas.

Increases in Knowledge and Skills Areas

The overwhelming majority (93.5%) of Supervisors reported that the knowledge and skills of Fellows at their sites had increased in four or more areas. Nine of every ten of Fellows rated themselves more highly at T-2 than at T-1 in at least one area of skill and knowledge, and nearly two-thirds did so in three or more areas.

Top Knowledge and Skills Areas

According to Supervisors, the four most important knowledge and skill areas (Adaptability, Problem Solving, Project Management, and Interpersonal Effectiveness) were also the top four areas in which Fellows showed increased knowledge and skills. Fellows agreed with Supervisors on three of the four top increases, but named Engaging Stakeholders instead of Problem Solving.

Effectiveness in Helping to Build Organizational Capacity[5]

How well did the program elements help Fellows *build organizational capacity* of Host Sites? Fellows' average scores of the five program elements ranged between "Somewhat Effective" and "Effective" on a six-point scale. The only program element that more than 39% of Fellows scored as "Effective" or "Very Effective" was "Host Site Supervisor" (72.2%).

---

[5] Only Fellows were asked about the effectiveness of the program elements.

Effectiveness in Building Social Sector-Related Knowledge and Skills Areas

How effective were the program elements in *building Fellows' social sector-related knowledge and skills*? Again, the most effective program element by far was Host Site Supervisor followed by Training, Mentoring, Learning Teams and Coaching. Fellows' reported that their increases in knowledge and skills were due more to Host Site Supervisors and Training than the other three program elements combined.

Fellows reported that the top four knowledge and skills areas built by the New Sector program elements were Problem Solving, then Interpersonal Effectiveness, Project Management, and Adaptability. It is noteworthy that these are the same four knowledge and skills areas in nearly the same order that the Supervisors a) ranked highest in importance to Fellows' ability to build organizational capacity and b) reported as the largest increases in Fellows' knowledge and skills. As noted above, Fellows agreed with Supervisors on three of the four top increases, selecting Engaging Stakeholders instead of Problem Solving as the fourth.

To sum up the conclusion regarding the secondary research question, the answer is "Yes, the member development services, or program elements, do increase the seven knowledge and skill areas that help Fellows build organizational capacity." However, 1) the seven knowledge and skills areas seem to fall into two different levels of importance, according to the Host Site Supervisors, and 2) the five program elements vary widely in their effectiveness, with Host Site Supervisors being by far the most effective, according to New Sector Fellows.

<u>CONSIDERATIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT</u>

Both research questions were answered in the affirmative. First, New Sector RISE Fellows did provide services to the Host Sites that increased their organizational capacity while the Fellows were there and are expected to continue to do so following their departure. Second, New Sector's five member development program elements increased Fellows' knowledge and skills in social sector-related areas and that helped them build Host Site organizational capacity.

The first answer is unequivocal, at least within the limitations of this evaluation's research methodology. It relied on the opinions of two populations, Supervisors and Fellows that cannot help but have biases because the measurable outcomes being studied pertain directly to them. With many more resources than were available for this study, New Sector could design an evaluation that utilizes more objective outcome measures for organizational capacity and for changes in the Fellows' knowledge and skills, and perhaps attitudes and values. However, for now it is clear that New Sector Fellows are effective in building capacity within Host Sites.

The answer to the second research question, while affirmative, contains the following threads that may be worth attending to for program improvement purposes.

> Knowledge and Skills
>
> As noted above, Supervisors favored Adaptability, Problem Solving, Project Management, and Interpersonal Effectiveness, in varying orders, over Ethical, mission-driven work, Engaging Stakeholders, and Cultural Competence. They considered the "top four" more important and they believed that Fellows increased their knowledge and skills in those areas more than in the other three areas.
>
> Fellow saw themselves as strongest in Ethical, mission-driven work and Cultural Competence at T-1 and T-2. Nevertheless, the results of the Fellows' T-1/T-2 self-ratings generally coincided with the Supervisors belief that the biggest gains were in three of the top four (Fellows saw more of an increase in Engaging Stakeholders than Problem Solving.) Given the superior effectiveness of Host Site Supervisor among the program elements, according to the Fellows, is it surprising that Fellows' greatest increases were in the knowledge and skills areas that the Supervisors valued most? However, that begs the question of why the Supervisors value them so highly. Are they seen as more concrete? Are they in fact less relevant to the Supervisors' organizations and/or the Fellows' assignments?
>
> Notwithstanding the fact that New Sector exceeded its three metrics of success regarding knowledge and skills areas, this would seem to be an area for further study that possibly could lead New Sector to replace one or more of the lower-scoring areas of knowledge and skills. For example, interviewing a representative sample of Supervisors might provide insights into how they prioritize the knowledge and skills areas.

Program Elements

The success metric for this objective was that 80% of Fellows will select "Effective" or "Very Effective" for at least one of the five program elements, Training, Mentoring, Learning Teams, Coaching, and Host Site Supervisor. Host Site Supervisor was selected by 72.2% of Fellows, so the standard was just barely missed. However, no other program element was selected by more than 39%. In fact, Fellows on average selected "Somewhat Effective" for every other response. The combined scores for "Very Ineffective", "Ineffective" and "Somewhat Ineffective" for the program elements may be another cause for concern.

Coaching	13.9%
Host Site Supervisor	13.9%
Training	15.3%
Mentoring	21.8%
Learning Teams	27.8%

A puzzling response about the effectiveness of Coaching was that nearly one of every five Fellows (19.4%) selected "Don't Know", suggesting perhaps that little or no Coaching occurred.

While these data about program elements do not provide a roadmap for how to improve New Sector's member development services, they at least serve as a baseline against which to measure progress and can inform further inquiry for program improvement purposes.

In conclusion, the New Sector RISE Program has been shown to be a highly effective program at building organizational capacity of Host Sites, and at providing member development services in conjunction with the Host Site, which increase Fellows' social sector-related knowledge and skills to aid them in building organizational capacity of the Host Site.