

South Carolina Partners In Policymaking: 2004 Evaluation

Table #1: Demographic Characteristics of 2004 PIP Class

Gender	Female	19
	Male	3
Race/Ethnicity	African American	8
	Caucasian	13
	Asian American	1
Age	20-29	3
	30-39	9
	40-49	5
	Over 50	5
Community	Rural	9
	Suburban	7
	Urban	5
Income	Less than \$15,000	5
	\$15,000 - \$30,000	7
	\$30,000 - \$45,000	3
	\$45,000 - \$60,000	3
Education	Less than HS	1
	HS certificate	2
	HS diploma	3
	Some college	8
	College diploma	6
	Some graduate	0
	Masters degree	1
	Doctorate	1
Disabled Person	Self	5
	Family member	14

The forms did record type of disability, but many participants recorded more than one disability, making it confusing to report and use these data.

Due to the small number of persons in the class, only descriptive statistics are used in this evaluation. Further, to allow the reader to assess the variation across class members, frequency data are presented rather summary descriptive statistics such as means, medians, etc. At the first class, members of the 2004 Class were asked to complete a baseline measure to record their prior activities (previous six months) and their assessment of their current knowledge and skills in key areas.

Table #2a shows the number of participants who had not engaged in the activity (None), those who had engaged in it 1-3 times, etc.

Tables #2a & 2b: Baseline Measures

Prior Activities	None	1-3	4-8	8+
Contact federal officials	12	7	1	0
Contact state officials	7	10	4	0
Contact local officials	4	7	4	6
Testify	20	1	0	0
Present to group	9	8	1	4
Present at conference	19	3	0	0
Serve on committee	12	9	0	0
Appear in media	12	9	0	0
Contacts by mail	14	5	2	0
Contacts by phone	7	12	2	1
Contacts in person	12	5	3	0

Table #2b shows the number of participants who evaluated their baseline knowledge and skill in each area as “Not Much,” “Some,” through “Excellent.”

Knowledge/Skills	Not Much	Some	Average	Above Avg	Excellent
Federal laws/rights	4	11	6	1	0
State law/rights	1	12	6	2	0
State/private services	2	11	6	3	0
Communicate w/officials	4	5	9	4	0
Communicate w/media	11	4	5	0	0
Provide leadership	4	5	8	5	0
Secure services	3	6	6	4	3
Organize others	6	5	7	4	0

In reviewing the data in the baseline measures, it is obvious that many class members had contacted state and local officials by mail or phone, but more sophisticated activities such as testimony, conference presentations, committee service, and media appearances were much less frequent.

At their final class, participants were asked to again record their prior activities and an assessment of their current knowledge and skills in the same areas measured at baseline. Rather than compare summary measures of baseline and post-program, Tables #3a and 3b present the change in individual scores relative to baseline. For example, if a person changed from “None” to “1-3” times for an activity, that would be shown in the “1” column. If a person jumped two categories, for example from “1-3” to “Over 8,” then that would be shown in the “2” column. If, at the end of the program, a person had engaged in less activity as compared to baseline, that would be shown in the “-“ columns.

Tables #3a & 3b: Change Relative to Baseline After Program

Prior Activities	Change in Categories				
	-1	0	1	2	3
Contact federal officials	2	5	7	2	2
Contact state officials	2	4	11	0	2
Contact local officials	5	6	6	0	1
Testify	0	15	2	0	1
Present to group	2	9	5	2	1
Present at conference	0	12	5	0	2
Serve on committee	1	14	0	2	0
Appear in media	2	15	0	1	0
Contacts by mail	1	3	6	5	4
Contacts by phone	1	10	6	1	1
Contacts in person	1	10	4	1	1

The data presented in Table #3a show that for most participants, the number of contacts with public officials increased substantially. For many, the number of presentations to other parents and groups also increased. For the more sophisticated activities – testifying, presenting at conferences, serving on committees, and appearing in the media – most participants showed no change.

Knowledge/Skills	Change in Categories						
	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
Federal laws/rights	0	1	2	8	5	1	2
State law/rights	0	2	2	6	7	2	0
State/private services	0	1	3	8	5	1	1
Communicate w/officials	1	0	1	6	8	3	0
Communicate w/media	0	0	3	5	7	1	2
Provide leadership	0	0	4	8	5	0	2
Secure services	0	1	8	5	3	2	0
Organize others	0	0	4	7	4	3	1

The data presented in Table #3b show that the PIP program had a much more substantial effect on knowledge and skills than was reflected in behavior change. Very few members showed no change (or change in the wrong direction), most showed increases of one to two categories (for example, from “Not Much” to “Some” or “Average”). A few members showed increases of three to four categories – a very large increase in their assessment of their knowledge and skills after participating in the program.

Interaction Between Demographic Characteristics & Change

While the small number of participants makes sophisticated analyses of the effects of various demographic characteristics inappropriate, some crosstabs were completed to look at any apparent effects. (These “eyeball” comparisons do not control for the effects of other variables – for instance, race, education, and income are generally related in

these types analyses, but the small number of participants does not allow such adjustments.) There was only one “post” assessment for males, so no comparisons were possible. Comparisons looking at race and income showed that African Americans and person with lower family income reported somewhat larger increases in activities, knowledge, and skills.

Summary

The demographic characteristics of the class reflect a diverse group in most ways, though the class was almost exclusively female. The baseline data show a moderate amount of prior activity and a modest assessment of their knowledge and skills. After the class, there was some increase in contacts with public officials and a small increase in other activities. If the program intends for increases in the more sophisticated activities – testifying, presenting at conferences, serving on committees, media appearances – these activities will need more attention. The largest effect of the program appears to be in self-assessed knowledge and skills across all demographic groups, with particular effect on African Americans and persons with lower incomes.

Follow-up Surveys

The PIP Program also sends surveys to previous graduates to assess long term effects for alumni. However, the design of that survey is problematic, so the following seven tables just report the data returned by alumni. I would recommend that a small group of alumni, representatives from the funder, and PIP staff meet to revise these follow-up surveys. As an example of a problem, the survey asks for the number of contacts with public officials since graduation – six years for some alumni. These numbers are suspect, and some alumni noted a shorter time frame. Rather than suggest a minimal fix for this and other problems, it would be better for a group of interested stakeholders to develop a more meaningful measure.

Ability to secure necessary services since graduation from PIP for self or family member

Year	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1998	0	0	1	2	3
1999	0	1	0	2	1
2000	0	0	1	3	2
2001	0	0	2	2	2
2002	0	0	1	10	3
2003	0	0	1	2	5
Total	0	1 (2%)	6 (14%)	21 (48%)	16 (36%)

Skills continue to help secure necessary services today for self or family member

Year	Seldom	Some of the Time	Most of the Time
1998	0	2	4
1999	0	1	3
2000	0	1	5
2001	1	0	5
2002	1	3	9
2003	0	2	7
Total	2 (5%)	9 (20%)	33 (75%)

Current leadership/advocacy skills

Year	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1998	0	0	1	3	2
1999	0	0	2	2	0
2000	0	0	2	2	2
2001	1	0	0	2	3
2002	0	0	3	7	4
2003	0	1	1	6	0
Total	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	9 (20%)	22 (50%)	11 (25%)

More independent

Year	No	Yes
1998	0	6
1999	0	4
2000	0	5
2001	0	6
2002	0	14
2003	0	9
Total	0	44 (100%)

More productive

Year	No	Yes
1998	0	6
1999	1	3
2000	0	5
2001	1	5
2002	4	10
2003	0	7
Total	6 (14%)	36 (86%)

Increased Self Determination

Year	No	Yes
1998	0	6
1999	0	4
2000	0	6
2001	1	5
2002	0	14
2003	1	8
Total	2 (4%)	43 (96%)

More community integration and inclusion

Year	No	Yes
1998	0	6
1999	0	4
2000	1	5
2001	1	5
2002	0	14
2003	0	9
Total	2 (4%)	43 (96%)