Peer Networking and Community Change

Measuring Impact

Author:
Thomas E. Backer, PhD
Human Interaction Research Institute

PEER NETWORKING

AND

COMMUNITY CHANGE

Measuring Impact

Thomas E. Backer, PhD
Human Interaction Research Institute

Funders, nonprofits and communities invest significant resources in peer networking activities that bring together both people and organizations for sharing, support and problem-solving. These activities use a blend of face-to-face gatherings, telephone conference calls and other low-tech approaches; and high-tech strategies, including those that draw on the internet in ways similar to social networking approaches like Facebook.

Participant satisfaction with many of these efforts seems good, but two important questions remain: *Does peer networking work*? *How can its impact be measured?*

As a mission-driven organization committed to improving outcomes for vulnerable children and families, the Annie E. Casey Foundation invests in peer networks to seed and support learning communities. These help peers bring together good practices, research, and lived experience to find solutions to problems that, without such a network, had seemed intractable.

This study focuses on *impact.* It builds on previous research about the Foundation's involvement in peer networking strategies, and examines how effective peer networks operate and self-sustain. The study report also offers a beginning framework for measuring their impact on the issues, challenges, and opportunities they were formed to address, analyze and advance.

Background A previous two-year study by the Human Interaction Research Institute of the Foundation's peer networking activities highlighted good practices and challenges of these interactive approaches to problem-solving and decision-making. That study's 2008 report, *Peer Networking and Community Change: Experiences of the Annie E. Casey Foundation,* looked at both peer networking Casey supports for professionals and community residents, and peer networks in which Casey and other foundations participate.

Findings from the 2008 study were mostly about the *process* of peer networking - how peers come together to exchange information, disseminate good practices, and build leadership structure for work they do together, such as a community change initiative. At least among those interviewed, and the participants they cited, these activities generally were regarded as successful, and as having significant impact on the work they were intended to support. Specific outcomes of peer networking sometimes were mentioned, but were not the major emphasis of this study. A convening of Casey staff to discuss its implications was held in Baltimore in October 2008.

Study Questions Stated more formally, the two main questions posed by the impact study are:

*What is the impact of peer networking on participants (individuals and organizations) and on systems serving vulnerable children and families? (Examples: increased knowledge, connections with others for problem-solving and emotional support, identification and implementation of good practices in service systems and communities, enactment of policy reforms, etc.)

* How can that impact be measured? (Examples: individual observations, written case studies, qualitative or quantitative impact evaluation research, and so forth)

Impact Study Overview The small research study reported here was conducted in late 2008 and early 2009. Based on input from the October 2008 staff session, and on additional interviews with key Casey staff and two members of peer networks, a qualitative analysis was conducted about the actual impact of Casey's peer networking efforts. In this report, several impact evaluation activities are described, but more often, impact is indicated through case examples provided by interviewees. Many interviewees also offered a more global assessment of the

impact of peer networking activities in which they had been involved.

Results are reported where possible in terms of one of three levels of outcomes from peer networking, identified at the October 2008 Casey staff meeting:

* *Immediate outcomes* (e.g., one member of a network talks to another on a subject of interest)

* *Intermediate outcomes* (e.g., a network member hires other network members or people referred by them)

* *Long-term outcomes* (e.g., a local or national policy is changed in the area of the network's efforts, a peer network becomes institutionalized so that its sustainability is assured)

At the October 2008 session, it was re-confirmed that there have been relatively few evaluations of Casey's peer networking activities to date (among the five exceptions is a study of the Children & Family Fellows network, but it focused mostly on process, not on outcomes; another is the set of follow-up case studies done by the Technical Assistance Resource Center for their peer matches, results from which are on a searchable database). So the information about outcomes reported here is largely qualitative rather than quantitative in nature. Still, it can collectively help to understand what kinds of impact these activities have, both within the Foundation and in the community.

Next Steps This report provides a basis for activities the Annie E. Casey Foundation may organize to share more widely both what was learned from the two studies about peer networking, as well as challenges and shortcomings observed. These include a journal article recently submitted to *Foundation Review*. A webinar on outcomes of peer networking and a national conference presentation (e.g., at a future

Council on Foundations meeting) also are being considered.

These dissemination vehicles will present basics derived from the 19 Casey peer networking activities, e.g., answering questions like "how do you set up a peer network and how do you maintain its viability over time?" Challenges about how to design and conduct an impact evaluation for a peer network also will be addressed.

Plans also are underway with the Center for the Study of Social Policy to hold a consultative session on peer networking. The session will be co-sponsored by the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Human Interaction Research Institute. It will bring together this study and its predecessor with related work CSSP has been doing for review and analysis. And it will build on a session about peer networking CSSP convened some years ago.

This study and the consultative session also will provide input for leaders of the *Making Connections* program about how peer networking can facilitate professional development and local or higher level policy change. Such input is particularly important given that the *Making Connections* initiative is presently completing a transition from Casey management to local control, to which peer networking might contribute substantially.

Other issues that will be addressed at the consultative session include: what has been the impact on peer networking of the extraordinary rise of internet-based social networks? More generally, what is the impact of technology on peer networking (e-mail, blogs, Twitter, software systems for peer-to-peer communication, etc.)? How might technology contribute to the cost-effective development of peer networks? Also, what are the most appropriate roles for funders to take on in community-based peer networks?

Study Method For each of the 19 peer networking activities, an interviewee from the first study (all were Casey staff or consultants) was asked to provide input on the two questions posed above. In some cases, an interviewee provided input on more than one peer networking effort. In two instances for foundation peer networking efforts, the Casey interviewee also recommended obtaining input from a senior staff person at another foundation. A list of interviewees is provided in Appendix A.

All interviews were done by telephone between November 2008 and April 2009. A content analysis then was conducted at two levels: first, to provide a brief summary of what is known about the impact of peer networking for each activity (including examples where available); and second, to derive some overall conclusions about how to evaluate the impact of peer networking, and what next steps might be taken in exploring this topic.

A draft report on findings from this study was circulated to all interviewees in June 2009. A final draft incorporating their suggestions was completed in July 2009.

Results: Casey-Coordinated Peer Networking Learnings and observations about each of the 13 Casey-coordinated peer networking activities follow. The five activities which have undergone a defined evaluation process are presented first (four of these activities also have some type of database available that support evaluation). Summaries for most, but not all, of the remaining eight activities include specific case examples of impact.

Children and Family Fellows Alumni Network

Since 1994, the Foundation has provided one-year fellowships to professionals working in the children and family services field. More than 75 Fellows have now participated in the Children and Family Fellowship. Their continuing involvement in the Alumni Network is itself an indication of the impact of this peer network, which grew out of the desire of the first class of Fellows to stay connected.

Many of the Fellows are now in leadership positions. In their earlier days, the Fellows weren't as high up in their organizations, so their impact was limited - now many of them are in senior management and so have more chances to be influential.

Both process and impact evaluations of this program have been undertaken. To measure impact, periodically Casey staff does what they call an "eyeball assessment" - assessing what positions past Fellows are in as opposed to where they were when they started the program. The assessment will be done again in the near future, and results from previous assessments indicate that there has been an upward career trajectory for most of the Fellows (although this measure does not determine how much of that upward progress is due to having had the Fellowship).

Turning Curves, Achieving Results: A Report of the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Children and Family Fellowship, published in 2007, helped refine and expand these "eyeball assessments." The report concludes: "The results presented here clearly show that Children and Family Fellows are helping agencies, nonprofits, and other organizations achieve dramatic, measurable results that have a direct impact on the quality of life for vulnerable children and families."

Aside from demographic data on the Fellows, the main evidence presented in the 2007 report is contained in five profiles of Fellows' work undertaken since they participated in the Fellowship program. For instance, Craig Levine, a 2000 Fellow now working for the New Jersey Institute for Social Justice, reported that he

collaborated with officials in Essex County, New Jersey to implement Casey's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative there. He had learned about JDAI through his participation in the Fellows Network, and its implementation in Essex County helped to reduce the number of youth detained from 244 in 2003 to 115 in 2006. As in many of these impact examples, it must be noted that other forces (e.g., the efforts of Levine's collaborators in Essex County) also were at work here, and contributed to this outcome.

Another measure of impact comes from the program's mini-grants to Fellows, which have been used to launch what have become significant programs in their organizations. Fellows have leveraged the funds obtained from Casey to expand these efforts. Each grant proposal in recent years has had a set of performance measures, and the grant report has to address these measures - so it is now possible to go back and assess performance against these measures. More than a million dollars in grant funding has been given out so far. The Network has helped to both inspire Fellows to apply for these mini-grants, and to provide knowledgeable support for the resulting projects from other Fellows.

As mentioned, the Children and Family Fellows program also has been the subject of a considerable amount of process documentation, including an external evaluation by OMG Center (described in the 2008 HIRI study). According to those interviewed, another followup research study on the process by which Fellows interact may be undertaken in 2010 or 2011.

At present, there apparently are no further plans for analyzing impact data about the Network's operation or the Fellows' program as a whole. In fact, data on outcomes for the program's early years are limited, mostly anecdotal, and not in electronic form so they would be difficult to analyze. The mini-grants have led to real change,

but results haven't been analyzed yet as was suggested above.

Thus, said interviewees, there is a real opportunity to learn more about the impact of the Children and Family Fellows program and its Alumni Network (clearly an important part of what makes the Fellows program successful). Doing so will require gathering new evaluative evidence on process and impact, and bringing together currently-available data in one synthesized frame. Data sources include the OMG study, the 2007 *Turning Curves* report, performance measures from the mini-grant reports, and the planned new "eyeball assessment." Once properly synthesized, these data also could provide a baseline for future evaluation activities.

Language Access Network

One of the ways that the Foundation helps assure that immigrant and refugee families with limited English proficiency are able to build assets, access benefits and overcome employment barriers caused by limited proficiency in English is to invest in a peer network of practitioners. This network helps to implement high quality language access programs in public, private and nonprofit agencies that serve this often highly vulnerable population.

The Language Access Network (LAN) is now a national group of expert implementers of language access strategies. One indirect evidence of LAN's impact is that it has grown from 54 initial members to more than 400 state and local language access practitioners from across the country.

Three examples of direct impact of LAN were offered:

(1) The Migration Policy Institute (MPI), which supports this initiative, initially was charged with

putting together in-person training institutes for public agency staffs from different states, using LAN members as trainers and resource persons. However, budget cuts for the participating agencies as a result of the recession means that in-person training couldn't be done, so MPI organized two webinars instead.

One webinar focused on qualifications and use of multilingual staff, and on requiring citywide language access by Executive Order. The second webinar concentrated on strategies for developing partnerships to provide interpreter training and language referrals. The webinars had 85 and 92 participants respectively, and post-webinar evaluations were very positive, indicating impact of LAN at the level of professional and organizational development.

(2) Casey staff has asked MPI to place documents related to LAN onto MPI's Language Portal website, launched in February 2008. These included a set of master contracts to use as examples for local contracting, information on how to deal with unions, information on how to recruit bilingual staffs cost-effectively, and policies at state and local levels, among other resources. In the first year, 1,700 documents were placed on the website, and 115,000 pageviews were generated (there is now a search mechanism on the website to facilitate access to these documents).

This level of use also is an indication of LAN's immediate impact. In addition, MPI is now studying how to evaluate impact of the Language Portal in other ways - looking at its role as a "one-stop shopping" resource for local government administrators, policymakers and others responsible for providing high-quality, cost-effective translation and interpretation services.

(3) A Hennepin County, Minnesota Casey Fellow is also a LAN coordinator, and inquired through the Network about whether Executive Orders

promoting language access can be issued as part of the poverty commissions being created around the country by city and county leadership. One example given was the poverty commission in New York City (the Economic Opportunity Commission created by Mayor Bloomberg), which added resources for language access as one of its early acts. LAN may be able to document other examples of such resource allocation and how they were achieved, then share information through the Network to help LAN members do the same in their own communities.

Some more direct evaluation approaches are being explored. Casey staff now does not track impact because the Migration Policy Institute has responsibility for supporting the network as an intermediary organization. However, Casey does plan to send out an inquiry on the LAN listserv, asking whether there are specific examples of outcomes from being part of this network (including the convenings, individual contacts initiated by LAN members, and the resources on the LAN website).

When results have been obtained, a report will be prepared about the impact of the Network, which will also be sent out for review by all those interviewed. Then the final report can be used in whole or in part by the various networks for their own purposes (justification for continued support, learning, etc.)

Leadership in Action Program

Casey's Leadership in Action (LAP) program brings community, nonprofit, and government agency managers (most of them representatives from *Making Connections* sites throughout the country) together in an intensive process to focus on results and accelerate improvements for families creating change, using facts and statistics. Employing a collaborative model, a collective vision for targeted improvement is adopted,

tailored and supported in order to produce both immediate results and long-term change.

As one example of impact, for the last seven years Maryland officials have used the LAP approach to track and improve school readiness in their state. Of course, as with many of the peer networks reported here, there is no way of verifying independently how much of these results is due to LAP, though the results are very encouraging.

Given this qualification, Maryland provides a strong example of impact. The LAP program was started there in 2002, at which point 49% of kindergartners entering school were assessed as being fully ready to learn. As of April 2009, that percentage has risen to 73%. As was reported by interviewees, LAP contributed to this outcome, although there were policy changes and other investments going on simultaneously that also made a difference.

Baltimore is another powerful example of impact. In 2004 28% of children entering Baltimore city schools were assessed as being fully ready to learn. As of April 2009 that figure had risen to 68%. As with the state data, this was at least partly the result of the work done by LAP in facilitating the training of teachers, activities for parents and children and training of child care providers.

More study (including evaluation) now is needed to determine how to sustain this highly results-focused leadership network.

TARC Peer Matching

Established at the start of the *Making Connections* initiative, the Technical Assistance Resource Center (TARC) was designed to connect sites with actionable ideas, in order to build local capacity for advancing a results-focused community change agenda. Sites develop technical assistance requests with local partners and initiative managers. Then peer matches bring teams from two or more sites together, to exchange experiences and practical knowledge. Later, the participants work to document results from the exchange.

Considerable data gathered over several years by Community Development Associates indicate that the TARC peer matching system and the technical assistance it facilitates can have powerful impact, especially when part of a larger comprehensive community change effort. Success comes in part from how well-defined the purposes of the match are before it happens, from the time spent at the end of the match in clarifying what was learned, and especially from the time spent committing to action steps to be completed when back at home base. The Community Development Associates assessment of peer matches made in 2002 found that 100 percent of respondents indicated overall satisfaction with their participation in this innovative and highly hands- on form of technical assistance.

The impact of TARC peer matches, made between *Making Connections* sites and other agencies, comes first from the experience of the peer match itself, which is focused on a particular challenge or opportunity in one or more sites. Later the impact also comes from ongoing access to the peers interacted with, to help further in problem-solving.

Three specific examples of the impact from TARC peer matches are:

(1) A match between San Antonio and Fairfax County, Virginia enabled participants from the San Antonio *Making Connections* site to bring back a model for performance-based budgeting that has dramatically changed the way in which the agency works with providers. Its implementation has made great differences in both initial contracting

and ongoing project management. Performance-based budgeting helps to hold contractors accountable in ways that were not possible before. This peer match was so successful that an agency in Los Angeles visited San Antonio in order to learn from them what they had implemented from the Fairfax County program.

(2) A team from the Hartford, Connecticut *Making Connections* site traveled to Portland, Maine to learn about two "Time Dollar" programs for supporting resident volunteer activities - the Maine Time Dollar Network (now called New England Time Banks) and Family Ties Time Dollar Network from San Diego. The Hartford team learned about strategies for planning and implementing a Time Dollar program, what results the two model programs had achieved, and how to adapt this model for use in Hartford. The team returned to Hartford and immediately began to work on implementing a program there, including bringing on AmeriCorps volunteers to assist in staffing it.

(3) Sometimes, however, the positive result of a peer match is that the potential adopter community decides against replication. When site visitors from the Camden, New Jersey *Making Connections* site came to visit a program in Baltimore, they quickly learned that the level of resources required to replicate the Baltimore program was too high for what was feasible in Camden. They decided not to implement a program that had previously been under serious consideration, believing that to do so would have wasted resources, given the very likely outcome.

Now the door is open for further assessment of impact of the TARC program. There are some valuable resources which can be used much more systematically than they have been up to now for gauging impact. For instance, there is an extensive database, which lives on a protected section of the Casey website. This database

includes a large number of peer match reports (a total of 80 peer matches were conducted between 2000 and 2009).

The database was created about five years ago. TARC coordinators are asked to enter into the database all requests for peer matches as they occur. The entry for a peer match is then updated out to 18 months - to show outcomes both for families and for organizations that are participating in the matching activity.

Recently a group of TARC peer match participants came together for a Casey consultative session about what they have learned and how to re-shape the peer matching role. A writer is now synthesizing what was learned from this session, which will be shared with all involved in the peer matching process to improve practice.

The TARC customer satisfaction data previously mentioned, along with database entries about self-reported outcomes as part of the case studies, could be analyzed to provide more evidence about impact. The case studies are mostly oriented to process, although there are some qualitative data about impact, including input from sites about how the peer match directly affected their practice, as presented in the above three examples. Interviewees reported that some comparative data also are available from other networks on related topics, such as from Jobs for the Future, which manages the National Fund for Workforce Solutions.

Urban Child Welfare Leaders Group

The Human Interaction Research Institute has recently completed a small-scale qualitative evaluation of the Urban Child Welfare Leaders Group, whose members head the ten largest child welfare agencies in the U.S. The study involved gathering data primarily by telephone interviews with most of the current Group members. The

meeting process also was observed by the evaluator at the Group's February 2009 meeting in Las Vegas.

Sixteen examples of impact were identified by the evaluation study. Three of these impact examples are presented here:

(1) One child welfare agency director returned from a recent Group meeting with information on how the Las Vegas agency has "turbocharged" their family search effort in the first hours that a child comes into protective custody. The other agency followed up to learn more about this program from the Las Vegas leadership, obtaining information about how it is staffed, and about what software program is used to search for relatives. What was learned had direct impact on implementation of a similar program in the inquiring agency's jurisdiction.

(2) The New York child welfare agency director has a regularly-scheduled meeting with his managers that focuses on data they have available to understand the agency's operation, and the impact it is having on children and families. The agency director has been using these data to change practice, because it gives him the ability to talk with managers about specific cases. There is increased quality control of cases because managers can report out on them at the "data meetings," and there is also the opportunity to look at consistency of practice throughout the agency.

Another agency learned about this program at a Group meeting, and now has implemented a similar effort, which they call the "human service agency statistics" meeting. As with the New York program, specific cases are brought to these meetings so they can be looked at in light of actual data. The adopting agency director noted that it might have been ideal to actually observe one of the data meetings in the New York environment,

but that the report on them at the Group meeting was quite vivid, so it sufficed to inspire adoption.

(3) An agency director wanted the child welfare agency to engage birth parents more deeply in the service process, and learned through a Group meeting about another member's program for doing this. Following the Group meeting, staff from the agency that had implemented the birth parent program were invited to visit the agency wishing to adopt this approach, in order to help get the program off the ground in its new setting.

A draft final report on the evaluation study was presented for review by Group participants, then discussed by the entire Group at its August 2009 meeting. Final revisions in this evaluation report currently are being made.

* * * *

Child Welfare Training Directors Group

The Child Welfare Training Directors Group focused on the role of staff training and development in systems reform for child welfare agencies, bringing together agency directors of training. After several years of successful operation, the decision was made by Casey to end this group in 2006. Almost all of the participants have expressed interest in the Group continuing, but no one has stepped up to provide the continuity of effort and financial support needed. However, Group members found value in both the general sense of community and the specific problem-solving capacity Group provided.

What does continue is informal interaction with the Group's facilitator. She reports that questions will come in from a Group member, and the facilitator will then do an informal linkage to connect the questioner with another Group member who may be able to help. A good deal of problem-solving happens this way.

One example of impact was given: the former facilitator of the Group connected (via a Casey staff member as an intermediary) a trainer in Louisiana with counterparts in Oregon and New York who all were starting up a training academy. This connection provided the Louisiana trainer with useful input about how to create her own state's training academy, and helped to launch it more successfully.

Community Foundation Exchange

To help assure that their learning network continued to help address challenges around community leadership, members of the Community Foundation Exchange (a peer network composed of leaders of community foundations across the country) decided to continue their meetings after the formal network concluded - an example of immediate impact. East Bay Community Foundation's then-CEO, Michael Howe, viewed the Exchange's meetings as among the most important events he went to as a community leader. Similar comments came from community foundation leaders from Milwaukee and New Orleans, according to those interviewed.

To this day, many of the members of this network stay connected to each other. They telephone each other to discuss operating problems and circumstances unique to community foundations. They exchange e-mails and get together at conferences for the same purpose.

This interaction is not structured, however. The Exchange has now turned into a much more informal peer network than when it was staffed and funded by Casey.

Two examples were given of Community Foundation Exchange impact on individual participating foundations. As a result of what was learned through their participation in the Exchange, the Milwaukee Community Foundation

refocused their overall strategy for engagement with the community around the Family Economic Success approach. They acted as a catalyst to focus a broad range of civic leaders on assuring that more families are able to work, earn and save their way out of poverty, especially men and women returning to the community from prison, and low income workers who need their driving privileges restored in order to get and keep a job.

A second example of impact was the creation by the Des Moines Community Foundation of a different way of partnering with other community organizations and with donors, again based on what they learned from participating in the Exchange. This partnership effort has resulted in the community foundation becoming much more of a leader than it had been in the past, working to convene other philanthropic organizations in the region on key issues - including the redesign of the region's workforce development system.

In addition, Casey staff worked with several of the Community Foundation Exchange participants to disseminate the Exchange's leadership development curriculum, for instance presenting it to a conference of Community Foundations of America, the national affinity group of community foundations. Fifteen community foundations participated, and at the end of the session reported it had offered them valuable learning. No follow-up, however, has been done to learn whether or not any of the participants have subsequently adopted the curriculum.

Family Strengthening Awards

For nearly a decade, the Annie E. Casey Foundation has worked with leading national child and family service organizations - such as the Boys and Girls Clubs of America, Goodwill Industries, the National 4-H Council, and the YMCA - to recognize exemplary work by their local affiliates. This work focuses on improving

outcomes for disadvantaged children, by strengthening family connections to jobs, assets, and success in the critical early grades of school.

While winning a Family Strengthening Award is an honor for a nonprofit organization, the real impact comes from participating in peer networking with other winning organizations. This strategy isn't left to chance - a coach who works for the Awards program facilitates contacts among the winners. These contacts are organized around identifying activities of one nonprofit that another might have an interest in learning about and adopting.

In addition, as winners become better acquainted with each other they start to go directly to their peers and not through the coach, using each other as informal consultants and advisors. Their goal is to change actual practice of their members, which can involve site visits as well as telephone or e-mail contact. At present, however, no mechanisms have been set up to gather specific examples of impact, so that the success of the Family Strengthening Awards peer network organized for this program could be measured more precisely.

Making Connections Local Coordinators Network

The most general impact of the *Making Connections* Local Coordinators Network, according to interviewees, is its success in helping coordinators - usually Foundation consultants with strong ties to their respective *Making Connections* program sites - manage the on-the-ground work of the initiative. Coordinators were doing difficult work that wasn't always understood or universally-respected locally, and the expectations for their performance weren't always as clear as they might have been. This network helped coordinators get support from peers, and focus on ways to exchange learning about and experience with core

strategies - to produce improved outcomes for vulnerable children and families.

One interviewee highlights the practical value of the Network: "The Network provided the best support and counsel these coordinators had - to each other, on a more informal and as-needed basis than anything the management team was able to provide to them. They could share with each other, problem-solve with each other in ways that no one else could." The peer-to-peer input was supplemented by TARC peer matches and Casey-provided leadership development opportunities. No specific examples of impact were identified.

Network meetings used to be conducted over breakfast with Frank Farrow, director of the Center for the Study of Social Policy and the former head of Community Change Initiatives for the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Coordinators wanted to speak with him directly about problems they were having and how to solve them. The participants could listen to each others' observations, and they also could approach some problems collectively . This was particularly important for both problem-solving and building an environment of support and respect.

In addition, the Local Coordinators have received a great deal of technical assistance, which as a by-product reduced the felt need for peer support through the Network. And as people got to know each other through the informal meetings, as with other peer networks they began to connect with other members directly, rather than just at the meetings.

So far no impact evaluation of the Local Coordinators peer network has been conducted. Many issues would be worthy of exploration in such a study, including the contributions of Casey staff with expertise in system change and community mobilizations, as well as the role of a

community in supporting this type of peer network.

Making Connections Resident Leadership Network

Active leadership and sustained participation among residents in the *Making Connections* program sites (as well as related Casey Civic sites) is a central goal of the Foundation's investments in place-based strategies to improve outcomes for children and families. The Resident Leadership Network was created to help strengthen authentic resident engagement in and leadership of comprehensive community change initiatives. Residents who participate in the Network learn how to use data to build the case for change, facilitate strategic partnerships among multiple stakeholders, and learn how to set and promote accountability to clearly defined results. Several participants have gone on to serve in leadership positions, both within the local governance of *Making Connections* and on community decision-making boards and commissions.

One of the un-answered questions for impact evaluation is how often "siloed investments" - to promote resident leadership, positive social networks, and authentic demand for better results among those who live, work and worship in dis-invested places of concentrated poverty - can be brought together with more synergy. So far there has not been an impact evaluation of the Resident Leadership Network, which could help to address the synergy issue, and also identify specific examples of impact.

Making Connections Social Network

Making Connections site teams are the core membership of the Social Network, which is focused on how to use social networking approaches to achieve and sustain the initiative's core result and capacity building goals. Input

from intermediaries with successful track records in this area (e.g., Lort Community Works, La Union El Pueblo Entero and Beyond Welfare) has helped to shape the influence and impact of this networking initiative.

The Network had a major meeting in June 2008, totaling five days of learning exchange. Participants felt that enough benefit has accrued from the Network's operation to warrant its continuation and the investment of time participants are making in it. There is a desire now to build a community of practice on a national level.

One example of direct impact of the Social Network was offered. The African Culture Center serves refugees coming into Denver, among other responsibilities. The Center identified a need for a social network to bring together people from specific African ethnic groups, and have them greet refugees at the airport and also meet in the community once they are resident in Denver.

This effort has developed through interaction with the Social Network. The resulting activity has helped newly-arrived refugees get involved in the broader community. The self-directed function of this networking activity also has freed up African Culture Center staff to do more in other areas.

National Partners Network

Supporting Casey's community change work are partnerships with national organizations through the National Partners Network - including National Governor's Association, National Conference of State Legislators, National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors. These partnerships are designed to help bring effective strategies to scale, through advocacy and policy change at the state and national level.

According to interviewees, the convenings of the National Partners Network are valuable to the participating organizations. They felt it was worthwhile to get together periodically with people who are doing the same job, to talk about common challenges and opportunities. For example, the Foundation has worked with NGA, NCSL and USCOM to focus attention on policy advocacy strategies to promote common sense approaches to helping more low income working families succeed, increase choice and competition in dis-invested neighborhoods, and strengthen state and local protections against predatory lending.

The convenings also stimulate connections that go beyond the in-person meetings. For instance, two CEOs who are close to each other geographically can interact by phone or e-mail about a common issue.

No systematic evaluation of the impact of the National Partners Network has been done to date. It proved difficult to isolate an example of impact because each of the member organizations have a range of distinct methods and operations.

United Way Family Strengthening Fellowship Program

This peer network brings together rising leaders from United Ways in *Making Connections* sites and other Casey-supported sites, for training in family strengthening approaches. Anecdotal evidence of its impact is available, such as about increased ability of participants to contact each other, and to get coaching, practical advice and emotional support . A number of the network members have, as a result of their networking experiences, considered or actually adopted Family Economic Success strategies or other interventions that are part of the overall Casey approach. This constitutes the most specific evidence of impact to date.

Further examples of areas of impact for the United Way could come out of asking for recollections about such contacts between participants. The topics for these interactions are important for leaders in this national group of organizations. For instance, one organization might be interested in learning about how to get a United Way chapter allocations committee to go along with a certain disbursement strategy. Approaches for communicating to other member agencies also are a topic for discussion and potential impact.

Results: Externally-Coordinated Peer Networking

None of the six funder peer networks in which the Annie E. Casey Foundation is a participant have had any type of formal evaluation. However, interviewees were able to offer examples of impact for four of them, and one also has been building a database on activities that could be readily adapted to evaluation uses.

Casey/CSSP Alliance for Race Equity in Child Welfare

Members of this peer network on disproportionality in child welfare include the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Casey Family Services and key associations such as the Race Matters Consortium and Black Association of Social Workers.

Two examples of impact for this peer network were provided:

(1) Members are getting help in gathering information and practical strategies about how to use "race equity score cards" as a way of tracking disparities and disproportionality in child welfare systems. A consultant has helped municipalities trade their experiences on this topic, and then to work together on desired changes in local practice. Done right, these "score cards" can both be a short-term way to increase vision about possible change strategies, and a way to report

longitudinal data that can influence policy change. As information is synthesized about "race equity score cards," it can then be shared with all network members through the Alliance's regular activities.

(2) Possibly the strongest example of the Alliance peer network impact is that peer networking activities led to the passage of legislation on disproportionality in Washington state. The peer networking involved interaction by Washington with counterparts in Michigan and Texas.

Lead Program Executives Group

According to interviewees, building easily-accessible, and ongoing relationships with the other members of the Lead Program Executives Group (members are all executive vice-presidents of major American foundations) is what matters the most. The impact of this peer network comes primarily from the ability to pick up the phone (or send an e-mail) and ask a question of someone who holds a similar leadership position in another foundation.

This accessibility is particularly important for those who are relatively new to the "Number Two" position in their foundation. While there are of course individual differences in how a lead program executive position is structured, there also are some commonalities.

These come out most usefully in crisis situations, when having access to an experienced peer can be more important than access to one's own foundation CEO or trustees. As one interviewee said, "most of us have a story about being talked off the ledge, or talking someone else off!"

A recent example is how the group helped each other in responding to the current economic crisis. Members' responses were informed not only by what they are doing now, but by reports from those who were in this job in 2002 about what they did in responding to the previous economic downturn and its aftermath … and recovery.

Three specific examples of impact from the LPE Group were offered:

(1) A conflict of interest policy was requested by one foundation's CEO, so the Lead Program Executive from that foundation sent an e-mail to the group, asking for input about how they handled similar requests, and for real examples. The result was a written policy developed in a much shorter period of time, reflecting a consensus of good practice in the field. This is a strategy that has been repeated many times in the Group's history, on topics ranging from evaluation to due diligence.

(2) At one LPE Group meeting, several members shared their experience with the Center for Effective Philanthropy's grantee perception report process, when it was still quite new in the world of philanthropy. They also shared with the Group the actual summary report for their foundation. While several of the members were skeptical about the value of this process or wanted to do it only on their own, after seeing the sample reports and engaging in a back-and-forth discussion with users, supporters and other resisters, several additional LPE Group members decided to participate. In particular, through the group discussion, they came to recognize the value of being able to compare their foundation's results with those of other funders.

(3) As a follow-through to that discussion, one member's foundation decided to put their grantee perception report up on their website. Another member noted this, and when their foundation went through the CEP process they did the same, increasing their transparency and opening up a new channel of communication with grantees and other stakeholders.

Those interviewed emphasized that examples like this are what keep the Group together. They did note that the Fall 2008 meeting in Seattle was not as well attended, in part because of general nervousness about what was happening in the economy. The next meeting of the Group (March 2009) was well-attended. Continued participation, they note, is also an indication that the LPE Group is continuing to have impact on its members and their foundations.

The LPE peer network's membership includes several who are part of a group of foundation executives who are meeting regularly with the Obama administration. This also is an example of the Group's impact, since these meetings represent an opportunity to shape public policy related to philanthropy.

Leadership Development Funder Affinity Network

It is difficult to talk about impact of the Leadership Development Funder Affinity Network because no accountability function was created for this peer network. Participants, who represent about 30 foundations that have made investments in leadership development, continue to come to the meetings, which is an indirect indication of impact.

And there have been increases in the amount of member funding focused on leadership development, coming out of the work the Network members did together, which may be the closest thing to an indicator of impact. No specific examples of impact were identified.

Long-Term Funders Exchange

Those interviewed asserted that the Long-Term Funders Exchange facilitated a more open dialogue and sharing of learning across the member foundations that existed previously. Before, funders knew of each other, but only from

a distance that made learning difficult. Now the regular contact organized around funding interests in comprehensive community change initiatives has had a number of impacts on the ability of the member foundations to do this difficult work.

The learning process was painful at times, it was reported. Learning required transparency, and foundations are not organizations that easily respond to requests for transparency. As peers engage in dialogues around a common agenda and a set of results they are trying to achieve, there is a loss of perceived autonomy - and this can be difficult for some members.

The change process plays out through a series of meetings, as well as linkages that go beyond the meetings themselves. This does not happen without some tension and difficulty. It also takes time for impact to happen - if members had walked away even a year into the process, there would not have been an honest exchange and nothing would have come of it.

One of the impacts of this peer network is to get a larger perspective on this work, such as that given by Casey's Ralph Smith in some early remarks on the history of comprehensive community change work. His analysis positions three generations of the work: the first generation "pioneers" (Ford, Casey); the second generation (Skillman, The California Endowment), and third generation of newer members of the group.

The first generation of work is summarized in a number of written pieces, which form "necessary reading" for all newer members. Impact on perspective and shaping of contemporary work comes out of this. This body of work then helps more recent members of the group become more strategic, learning from what didn't work for the "pioneers" and how they corrected or changed course.

It also helps to connect with ideas that can seem quite amorphous - keeping a "bite size" learning approach as well as expanding out to the more global issues and how they apply to individual neighborhoods. The learning impact of that interactive process is clear; as one interviewee put it, "when I leave the meetings I have pages and pages of notes that I'm following up on."

Part of the value of the group is keeping the membership relatively homogeneous, in order to encourage open dialogue among peers with similar job roles and funding interests. There was a meeting in California that expanded the group in some different directions. One interviewee felt that this resulted in a less-authentic conversation (because people weren't quite as trusting with "folks different than them" in the room),

Two specific examples of impact were offered:

(1) One of the member foundations was struggling with how to properly use an organized Theory of Change as part of a comprehensive community change initiative and its evaluation. Discussion at one of the early meetings of the group helped put this into a much sharpened context, so that the member could return to home base and more easily write up this part of the initiative's plan. In fact, it also created the right intellectual ground to think about the foundation's overall strategic plan.

(2) At a meeting in San Diego, the group talked intensively about the larger economy and its influence on neighborhoods and children. Out of this work at least one member foundation changed its approach considerably, and brought in presenters from the group meeting to the foundation, where presentations were made both to staff and to a local funder group. Now that local group has a committee on neighborhood and economics, and the whole community of funders has a much more productive process for intervening in these complex circumstances.

National Rural Funders Collaborative

No specific example of impact was available for this peer network, other than the obvious one - the Collaborative has helped its members get considerable funding "out the door" to rural communities and nonprofits. This is the common area of interest for the funders that belong to the Collaborative.

The Collaborative primarily serves as a funding pool. It also has had some impact on the national infrastructure of philanthropy, because it helped to re-establish a rural funders affinity group as part of the Council on Foundations. The Neighborhood Funders Collaborative now operates this affinity group.

PRI Makers Network

The purpose of the PRI (Program Related Investment) Makers Network is help increase foundations' use of PRIs to provide flexible financing for organizations or projects that might not be able to access traditional loans, loan guarantees, and equity investments. It provides a forum for networking, professional development, collaboration and outreach to funders, including those not currently making PRIs or other social investments.

Its diverse membership comes from more than 90 foundations across the country. Members pay dues based on their level of annual PRI activity. The Network initially was operated by the Neighborhood Funders Group, but is now coordinated by Philanthropy Northwest, with a new program director recently hired in Seattle. One indication of the impact of the PRI Makers Network is that there has been an increase of member foundations, despite the introduction of a membership fee (starting at $250 for one year for the "PRI curious," and going up to $5,000).

Another indication is that there has been good attendance at the Network's conferences - 80 people attended the first one at Stanford in 2006, and 150 people came to the second one in New Orleans in 2008. Intensive trainings (called the PRI Institute, and held every six months) offered by the Network are consistently oversubscribed for the 30 available slots each time.

Impact of the Network also can be seen in its partnership with the Foundation Center to create and manage a database of investments. When it started there were 1,400 transactions in the database; the Network recently refreshed the data, and almost 1,700 transactions are now in place (these include both additional activities of investors already in the database, and new investors).

This database now contributes to the PRI Directory published by the Foundation Center. Previously the Center needed to use 990s to do this, but now can draw upon the PRI Makers database, which is more detailed. This database might also be adapted for future use in more formal evaluation of the impact of the PRI Makers Network.

Separate from the PRI Makers Network, but building off its work, a "More for Mission" campaign has been launched by several Network members, also providing evidence of impact. This activity promotes mission investing and challenges foundations to adopt these practices, including but not limited to PRIs.

The goal of the campaign is to increase mission investment commitments by $10 billion over the next five years. It aims to help foundations build capacity so they have the tools to be able to better align their investments with the mission of the organization. Many PRI Makers Network members have signed on to the campaign - the two activities are complementary in that the

Network focuses on education and practical application, while the campaign is oriented to advocacy and development of infrastructure needed for mission investing. The resource center for the campaign is located at the Institute for Responsible Investing of Boston College.

Results: Synthesis for 19 Peer Networking Activities A total of five activities have developed a formally-defined evaluation strategy - Children and Family Fellows Alumni Network, Language Access Network (in process), Leadership in Action Program, TARC Peer Matching and Urban Child Welfare Leaders Group. All of the five are Casey-coordinated peer networking activities. Four of these five have an ongoing database element - the PRI Makers Network also has one, which could be readily adapted for evaluation purposes (see summary chart in Appendix B).

In all, specific examples of impact were provided for 13 of the 19 Casey peer networking activities (identified in Appendix B). The examples were relatively specific, ranging from personal skill development for peer network members, to information-sharing about innovative programs, to making changes in organizational strategy, to instituting broader policy change and community impact. Those interviewed for the remaining six could not identify specific examples, though each asserted that the activity did have impact on its identified environment.

Both Casey-coordinated and Externally-coordinated peer networking activities offered examples. Some of the most notable impact examples mentioned earlier are repeated here:

* *Community Foundations Exchange*: the Milwaukee Community Foundation acted as a catalyst to bring together a community strategy for family economic success for the city of Milwaukee

* *Language Action Network*: more than 1,700 documents related to LAN were placed on the Migration Policy Institute's website, including a set of master contracts to use as examples for local contracting; information on how to deal with unions, information on how to recruit bilingual staffs cost-effectively, etc. More than 115,000 pageviews were generated in the first year.

* *Leadership in Action Program*: LAP was started in Maryland in 2002, at which point 49% of kindergartners entering school were assessed as being fully ready to learn. As of April 2009, that percentage has risen to 73% (due to other policy and program changes as well as to LAP).

* *TARC Peer Matching*: A match between San Antonio and Fairfax County, Virginia enabled participants to bring back a model for performance-based budgeting that has dramatically changed the way in which San Antonio works with providers of social services, both for initial contracting and ongoing project management. This peer match was so successful that an agency in Los Angeles visited San Antonio in order to learn from them what they had implemented from the Fairfax County program.

* *Urban Child Welfare Leaders Group*: A child welfare agency director learned at a Group meeting about how the Las Vegas agency has "turbocharged" their family search effort in the first hours that a child comes into protective custody, and followed up to get more input. The result was direct impact on implementation of a similar program in the inquiring agency's jurisdiction.

* *Casey/CSSP Alliance for Race Equity in Child Welfare*: Peer networking activities led to the passage of legislation on disproportionality in Washington state, as a direct result of peer networking through the Alliance with Michigan and Texas.

* *Lead Program Executives Group*: A conflict of interest policy was requested by one foundation's CEO, so a LPE member sent an e-mail to the Group, asking for input about how they handled similar requests, and for real examples. The result was a written policy developed in a much shorter period of time, reflecting a consensus of good practice in the field. This is a strategy that has been repeated many times in the Group's history, on topics ranging from evaluation to due diligence.

Three more general findings have emerged from this study:

1 - These peer networking activities are sustainable: they have run regularly for as long as 17 years (the three longest-running started in 1992, 1997 and 1999 respectively); the funder peer networks in which Casey is a participant and co-sponsor go back as far as 2001.

2 - Sustainability sometimes goes well beyond Casey's involvement: for instance, the Community Foundation Exchange members found so much benefit from this peer network that they decided to pick up their own costs for continuing after the Exchange formally ended. All of the externally-coordinated activities are functionally independent of Casey, in some instances because a separate organization is coordinating them.

3 - These peer networks provide resources to their members: one, the Children and Family Fellows Alumni Network, has a small grants program for local projects members want to undertake (resource provision also is cited above as a good practice of peer networking).

Implications and Recommendations Ten implications emerged from this study, each of which is presented here with an associated recommendation for further action.

1 - Overall, the evidence of impact is limited for 19 peer networking activities in which the Annie E. Casey Foundation has been involved. It is strongest for the five activities that have a defined evaluation strategy, such as the Children and Family Fellows Network and for the Technical Assistance Resource Center Peer Matching program. Examples of impact are available for the other peer networks, but they are often fairly isolated, at least in terms of contributing to an overall portrait of the ways in which the peer network has improved the quality of life for vulnerable children and their families in communities.

Recommendation: Examples of impact can be gathered for each of the peer networking activities that do not now have them.

2 - Several impact evaluation approaches have emerged that have potential for further use:

* *examples of impact* that offer subjective but clearly-presented observations about what impact a peer networking activity had, at the individual, organizational or community level

* *written case studies* about peer networking activities, using a standardized format, with data-gathering and writeup (ideally done by a third party)

* *peer networking databases*, assembling together information about both process and impact over time, including examples of impact and case studies where available

Recommendation: These approaches can be discussed at the planned consultative session, and compared with approaches being used by others in peer networking, and in the larger social networking field.

3 - Impact evaluation to date has been focused almost entirely on immediate outcomes (observable, data-based reports on things that happened directly as a result of peer networking). Intermediate and long-term outcomes of peer networking are only more rarely documented. Study of these longer-term impacts of peer networking is needed to help estimate the true cost-benefit of this approach, beyond the subjective reports of participants who report finding the experience of value and "voting with their feet" to continue participating.

Recommendation: Approaches to measuring intermediate and long-term impact can be identified from the larger literature on peer networking and social networking, along with the several instances in which some data have been gathered for Casey activities. These approaches can then be discussed at the planned consultative session, including a consideration about how they might be integrated into more formal evaluation designs.

4 - Such study will be challenged by the underlying methodological difficulty common to interventions that take place in complex environments. Outcomes like change in policy or improvement in quality of life for vulnerable children and their families are virtually never the result of any one action.

Separating out to what degree peer networking determined some observed outcome, as opposed to all the other factors at work, is almost never possible. Inferences, guesses and estimates can be made, but only controlled research can provide an empirically sound answer to questions about impact at this level - and such controlled research is rarely possible and usually too expensive to conduct even if it is technically feasible.

Recommendation: This methodological complexity can be discussed at the planned consultative session, and possibilities for further study discussed, such as identifying one Casey peer networking activity for which a more rigorous evaluation might be possible.

5 - The planned consultative session also will be a first opportunity to address other difficult methodological questions, such as what markers of impact can be identified when intermediate or long-term outcomes are essentially beyond any feasible scope of evaluation. Could some set of common criteria be developed for measuring process (peer networking operation) and impact (immediate outcomes, and markers for intermediate or long-term outcomes) across the entire range of Casey's peer networking activities? If so, how would these measures align with assessments done by other funders of their peer networking activities, so that a wider range of comparison is possible?

Recommendation: These larger issues should be identified as a key aspect of the agenda for the planned consultative session.

6 - Learning about the process of peer networking, and the perceived value of these activities to participants, communities and funders, is quite feasible. In addition to the research and convening activities reported here, the Annie E. Casey Foundation has sponsored other learning opportunities. For example, the Foundation hosted a consultative session for funders in June 2008 about how Casey has focused on "results, residents and data" in its implementation of *Making Connections*, and on how an Action-Learning Network might be developed to provide the peer networking and knowledge resources to continue supporting the work as *Making Connections* transitions into its next stage of community-run operations.

Beyond Casey's own initiative, the likeliest topic of interest to participating funders is how to build capacity of a local partnership to sustain a community agenda over time, using approaches such as peer networking. Subsequently a series of webinars was scheduled by Casey (the first was held in November 2008) to discuss these topics, and Casey hopes to build a community of practice around this topic.

Recommendation: Results from the two HIRI studies, the webinars just mentioned, and other data sources, can be summarized and presented as part of the discussion at the planned consultative session. Also, findings from this work can inform development of the Action-Learning Network and other emerging components of the next phase of *Making Connections*.

7 - Technology-based approaches to peer networking are becoming increasingly important, reflecting the extraordinary growth of social networking and related communications technology.

In fact, this growth is not limited just to the younger populations - membership in Facebook is increasing most rapidly amongst people 35-50 years of age, for example. And these approaches are cost-effective - a factor of particular importance in these recessionary times. Impact of peer networks might be increased by integrating technology-based solutions, e.g., combining an in-person meeting of a network with an online capability, so that participants can communicate on their laptops or mobile devices at the same time they are in the room together.

Recommendation: At least one expert in social networking and related technology-based approaches can be invited to participate in the planned consultative session, to provide a perspective on these topics.

8 - Both phases of this research, focused on process and impact, raise questions about how peer networking activities are managed. As one interviewee put it, "at Casey, we don't do a good enough job getting clear about what network management means - some capacity needs to be built on our end about how to determine and then get what we want out of a peer network." This includes setting up an infrastructure for gathering data about process and outcomes, and then bringing together key stakeholders to assess the results and ask the "big picture" questions - such as, what impact should a peer network have to be considered successful?

Including process and impact evaluation as part of peer network management has been done most successfully for the TARC and Children and Family Fellowship programs, as discussed here. But even for these two activities, the gathering and use of evaluative data is not as systematic as it could be. Moreover, Casey has done little in the way of meta-analysis to this point, bringing together evaluative data from all its peer networking activities in order to compare and contrast results. This study and its predecessor are two very modest efforts in that direction, and the planned consultative session will help to set the course for the future in this regard.

Recommendation: Findings from this study and from the results of the planned consultative session can be shared with Casey staff, to identify what changes in peer networking management might be desirable, and whether it would be of value to conduct the meta-analysis suggested here.

9 - There also are some administrative issues for Casey and other funders related to peer networking. For instance, in Casey's overall internal evaluation and management process, there is an annual reporting process about return on investment, as well as a descriptive analysis of activities. But these annual reports don't present

separate analysis for peer networking activities, according to those interviewed for this study. A refinement in Casey's reporting procedures along the lines discussed here would make it easier to use the annual reporting system as a tool for increasing understanding about the impact of peer networking.

Recommendation: As part of the follow-up to the planned consultative session, Casey staff could explore how its regular reporting procedures could be refined in order to report more fully on peer networking and its impact.

10 - Finally, some overall questions about the impact of peer networking need to be considered as Casey and other funders shape process and impact evaluation systems for these activities:

- What connects people together in a network?

- How does learning and sharing happen in the network?

- Does the network take action as a network?

- What is considered network action as opposed to individual action?

- What are considered the outcomes of a network?

Recommendation: At the planned consultative session, interests of Casey and other funders in making the commitment to broader study along these lines could be explored.

Acknowledgments

Like its predecessor, this study originated in discussions with Annie E. Casey Foundation Executive Vice-President Ralph Smith - focused on the challenges of measuring impact from peer networking and how Casey's experiences might contribute. Study results are intended to fit into the Foundation's larger efforts to promote the dissemination of knowledge and good practices of peer networking, both in the philanthropic and nonprofit sectors.

Thanks are due to the Foundation's Connie Dykstra, who served as program officer for this second study, and to Christina Lyerly and Lisa Harrison for assistance in coordinating complicated schedules. At the HIRI end, administrative and research support were ably provided by Terri Ruddiman and Julaine Konselman.

Finally, thanks are given to all the interviewees for this study - Casey staff as well as two foundation leaders who provided additional input. Their help was invaluable in bringing clarity to the very complicated subject of peer networking impact, which will continue to be of interest both to the Annie E. Casey Foundation and to the Human Interaction Research Institute.

Appendix A.
INTERVIEWEES

Casey-Coordinated Peer Networking

Child Welfare Training Directors Group - Clarice Bailey
Children and Family Fellows Alumni Network - Donna Stark. Barbara Squires
Community Foundation Exchange - Ira Barbell
Family Strengthening Awards - Miriam Shark
Language Access Network - Irene Lee
Leadership in Action Program - Donna Stark
Making Connections Local Coordinators Network - Patrick Corvington, Sherri Killins, Donna Stark
Making Connections Resident Leadership Network - Patrick Corvington, Sherri Killins, Donna Stark
Making Connections Social Network - Audrey Jordan
National Partners Network - Miriam Shark
TARC Peer Matching - Juanita Gallion
United Way Training Program - Miriam Shark
Urban Child Welfare Leaders Group - Abel Ortiz, Lindsay Mason

Externally-Coordinated Peer Networking

Casey/CSSP Alliance for Race Equity in Child Welfare - Frank Farrow
Lead Program Executives Group - Ralph Smith (Maureen Smyth - Mott Foundation)
Leadership Development Funder Affinity Network - Donna Stark
Long-Term Funders Exchange - Ira Barbell, Frank Farrow (Tonya Allen - Skillman Foundation)
National Rural Funders Collaborative - Miriam Shark
PRI Makers Network - Christa Velasquez, Roger Williams

Appendix B . Impact of Peer Networking at the Annie E. Casey Foundation

Casey-Coordinated Peer Networking	Examples of Impact	Database	Evaluation Strategy
Child Welfare Training Directors Group	Yes	No	No
Children and Family Fellows Alumni Network	Yes	Yes	Yes
Community Foundation Exchange	Yes	No	No
Family Strengthening Awards	No	No	No
Language Access Network	Yes	Yes	Yes
Leadership in Action Program	Yes	Yes	Yes
Making Connections Local Coordinators Network	No	No	No
Making Connections Resident Leadership Network	No	No	No
Making Connections Social Network	Yes	No	No
National Partners Network	No	No	No
TARC Peer Matching	Yes	Yes	Yes
United Way Training Program	Yes	No	No
Urban Child Welfare Leaders Group	Yes	No	Yes
Externally-Coordinated Peer Networking			
Casey/CSSP Alliance for Race Equity in Child Welfare	Yes	No	No
Lead Program Executives Group	Yes	No	No
Leadership Development Funder Affinity Network	No	No	No
Long-Term Funders Exchange	Yes	No	No
National Rural Funders Collaborative	No	No	No
PRI Makers Network	Yes	Yes	No

The Annie E. Casey Foundation

701 St. Paul Street Baltimore, MD 21202 410.547.6600 410.547.6624 fax www.aecf.org