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### Performance Measures

Summaries from Primary Data
Partner Reporting Forms (January - September 2018), Focus Groups, Key Informant Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COO Performance Measure</th>
<th>Summary statement of findings, including limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How much did we do?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of local residents attending and participating in seminars, trainings, workshops, or events.</td>
<td><strong>Policy &amp; systems partners</strong> held 40 capacity building workshops, trainings, and seminars, reaching <strong>1,661 people</strong>, which may include duplicates. These types of events included advocacy trainings, briefings/educational sessions on policy issues such as housing, anti-hunger, nutrition, tax reform, environmental justice, and college information sessions. Eleven of these events were related to economic opportunity; five were related to housing; 31 were related to community connections; 10 were related to health (the total is &gt;40 because some events had more than one focus area).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people participating in community engagement, service and civic participation, including volunteering,</td>
<td><strong>Place-based and cultural community partners</strong> held 28 capacity building workshops, trainings, and seminars, reaching <strong>1,716 people</strong>, which may include duplicates. Seven of these events were related to economic opportunity, 18 were related to community connections; 4 were related to health; zero were related to housing (the total is &gt;28 because some events had more than one focus).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BDS**
### Performance Measures

**Summaries from Primary Data**

**Partner Reporting Forms (January - September 2018), Focus Groups, Key Informant Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring and community organizing by purpose of activity.</th>
<th>duplicates. This includes a May Day march (5,000 reached) and a Families Belong Together Week of Action (10,000 reached). Thirteen of these activities were related to economic opportunity; seven were related to housing; 51 were related to community connections; five were related to health (the total is &gt;75 because some events had more than one focus).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place-based and cultural community partners held 70 civic participation events such as volunteering, mentoring, and community organizing, reaching <strong>11,619 people</strong>, which may include duplicates. Three of these events were related to economic opportunity; 61 were related to community connections; 12 were related to health; 0 were related to housing (the total is &gt;70 because some events had more than one focus).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of new leadership roles by residents.</th>
<th>264 residents in leadership roles:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>127 community liaison roles: community liaison works between residents, community organizations, and policy makers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 youth leader roles: young person involved in leadership cohorts, community organizing, and advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 advocacy roles: advocate works on community mobilizing, storytelling, and supporting particular causes or issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance Measures

**Summaries from Primary Data**

**Partner Reporting Forms (January – September 2018), Focus Groups, Key Informant Interviews**

| 9 school leadership roles: school leaders work with schools and school districts to advance policies and practices for marginalized students |
| 3 work group roles: work group participants work on issue-specific planning, budgets, and representation on various agendas and boards |
| 3 mentorship roles: professionals providing guidance and training to other professionals |

5 other: these roles were reported but not described in detail in the partner reports

| Number of organizational relationships developed that directly support goal achievement. |
| The partner reporting form asked partners to list the organizations that partners are working with, and if those partnerships were new or existing, and to describe the nature of those relationships. |

Policy & systems change partners identified 196 partnerships that directly support goal achievement. Place-based and cultural community partners (the original and new partners) identified 221 partnerships that directly support goal achievement. Partners indicated that relationships enhance their effectiveness and reach in their work. In particular, relationships with government staff and officials have furthered partners’ policy activities. Partners explicitly state a desire for more meaningful support from elected officials and government staff.
Differences in values and cultures were identified as a challenge to developing organizational relationships. Additionally, the time required to build relationships was identified as a constraint to partner capacity.

Limitations: Respondents were not consistently clear about whether or not partnerships were new or existing. These counts may double-count partnerships if COO partners both identified each other. There are also instances in which one partner identified another COO-funded partner but that was not reciprocated.

How well did we do it?

Primary and secondary drivers of goal achievement.

The most common factors that partners identified as being central to their success were relationships with other organizations and community members, having adequate and flexible funding to do their work as well as allocate funding or resources to their partners, and the skillsets of their current staff members and new staff they were able to hire. Other central factors include transparency and trust with partners, obtaining support from community leaders, lifting up community voices, and being faithful to their own organizational values.

Limitation: While partners described many factors that contributed to their success, this analysis only considers the factor if the partner explicitly identified them to be central factors in their report.
### Performance Measures
**Summaries from Primary Data**
**Partner Reporting Forms (January - September 2018), Focus Groups, Key Informant Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary and secondary barriers to goal achievement.</th>
<th>The most common factors that partners identified as being central barriers to their success were the ability to hire or retain staff and building relationships. Other central barriers include empowering community members for policy change, funding, negative public perceptions of homelessness, institutional racism, and the complex process involved with doing their work. Limitation: While partners described many factors that are barriers to their success, this analysis only considers the factor if the partner explicitly identified them to be central factors in their report.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of coalitions, progress toward self-identified goals.</td>
<td>Partners identified various benefits of participating in coalitions. They include, the ability for partners to implement their local priorities while aligning with county strategies; mobilizing constituents quickly; helping to cultivate allies for future endeavors even if the current issue of focus was not the priority for others in the coalition; and facilitating a reciprocal and mutual benefit for coalition members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of policies under development, proposed, in committee/hearing, voted on, adopted, implemented, etc.</td>
<td>See policy &amp; systems change spectrum Findings and trends from spectrum: • 12 partners reported 51 instances of developing organizational relationships with unlikely partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance Measures

#### Summaries from Primary Data

**Partner Reporting Forms (January – September 2018), Focus Groups, Key Informant Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Partners and Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing organizational relationships</td>
<td>16 partners, 91 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening organizational relationships</td>
<td>22 partners, 184 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing internal or external communication strategies</td>
<td>9 partners, 30 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in organizational practices</td>
<td>11 partners, 21 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing data collection or sharing procedures</td>
<td>7 partners, 14 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget commitments</td>
<td>8 partners, 28 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies under development</td>
<td>16 partners, 33 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies being proposed</td>
<td>13 partners, 31 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies in committee/hearing</td>
<td>7 partners, 21 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies being voted on</td>
<td>8 partners, 15 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies being implemented</td>
<td>5 partners, 10 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies being adopted</td>
<td>8 partners, 13 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations being written</td>
<td>1 partner, 3 instances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Measures  
Summaries from Primary Data  
Partner Reporting Forms (January - September 2018), Focus Groups, Key Informant Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Is anybody better off?</strong></th>
<th>6 partners reported on 9 instances of laws being written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions that solutions are being developed to overcome barriers to: housing, economic opportunity, health, community connections, and policy &amp; systems change objectives.</td>
<td>As described in the other evaluation measures, partners have shared many successes in developing solutions in each of the result areas but have also encountered a variety of barriers in their work. When asked how community members are able to live healthy and thriving lives, some partners noted that despite the challenges, it is possible because these communities are resilient and is the result of years of sustained advocacy and relationship building. Partners also described barriers that prevent them from developing solutions to persistent issues (such as immigration policy, housing stability, and community violence) include institutional racism, oppression, and overburdening partners and community members in serving leadership or advocacy roles. Limitation: These findings are based on the focus groups and interviews, and thus, are not fully representative of the entire COO initiative and partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived access to shops, goods and services, recreational amenities, community spaces and affordable health care.</td>
<td>Language, cultural, and transportation were common barriers cited to accessing neighborhood amenities and services. Partners spoke about how they help residents (often undocumented or immigrant and refugee communities) navigate the healthcare and housing systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Partner Reporting Forms (January - September 2018), Focus Groups, Key Informant Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions that primary concerns are being addressed through local government decisions and policy priorities.</th>
<th>Partners most commonly talked about how grassroots advocacy was an effective strategy for getting local government to respond to their primary concerns. For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

or get referrals for resources and services. Schools were also cited as a place where residents go to get connected to resources.

In one of the focus groups, participants described the challenges that residents face in seeking medical care for their families, including complexities with Medicaid and employer-provided health insurance and geographic disparities in where services and treatments are provided, especially for people who have special health care needs.

The Seattle Neighborhoods Service Center was noted as a valued community space because it serves as a flexible shared space where the community has autonomy over its uses. There was an expressed desire for more youth spaces.

Neighborhood amenities like restaurants and shops were talked about briefly in one focus group and recreational amenities were not mention in any of the focus groups and interviews.

Limitations: These findings are based on the focus groups and interviews, and thus, are not fully representative of the entire COO initiative and partners.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example, one partner described how residents felt like that had little power to affect change, but after speaking directly to City Council, they were successful in convincing them to invest more money in housing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners also spoke about how lack of funding is a barrier, and the perception that it needs to be a dire situation before local government will take action on an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation: These findings are based on the focus groups and interviews, and thus, are not fully representative of the entire COO initiative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident perception of community stability and cohesion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Displacement and evictions are forcing people to move and creating neighborhood instability. In times of need or crisis, people often turn to their families and cultural or social networks first for support. However, this is more difficult when cultural communities are becoming geographically dispersed. Still, partners described efforts to maintain community connections through faith-based groups or by preserving cultural identities such as in Africatown and Chinatown-International District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners and young adults also noted sources of stress that contribute to feeling of instability, such as crime and violence in the community, economic hardships, vulnerabilities to becoming homeless, political climate, and immigration policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Performance Measures  
| Summaries from Primary Data  
| Partner Reporting Forms (January - September 2018), Focus Groups, Key Informant Interviews |

| Young adults also shared community assets that they want to preserve, such as diversity and preserving restaurants, businesses, and buildings that have been in the neighborhood for a long time. |

| Limitation: These findings are based on the focus groups and interviews, and thus, are not fully representative of the entire COO initiative and partners. The only direct resident perspectives came from the young adult focus group. |

| Perceived safety in public spaces in community. |

| Prevalence of crime and shootings was commonly noted by partners. Other safety concerns cited by partners include fear of ICE, fear of walking at night, and unintended consequences of police involvement. |

| One example of how partners are working to improve perceptions of safety is the Corner Greeters program, which addresses crime hotspots to enforce positive interactions in the community. Through this program, they have also conducted safety surveys, gotten feedback on peoples' experiences and listened to community voices. |

| Limitation: These findings are based on the focus groups and interviews, and thus, are not fully representative of the entire COO initiative and partners. |

| Other |
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| Types of barriers to accessing housing assistance. | Partners noted that the communities they serve have been denied rental opportunities for safe, affordable housing because of racial, income, and disability discrimination. Residents are hesitant to seek out housing assistance, report bad landlords, or request repairs because of fear (of eviction, retaliation, ICE) or they do not understand their rights as tenants. These issues are commonly experienced among immigrant communities and communities of color. Partners also described a general lack of quality, affordable housing stock and the increasing cost of housing as barriers.  
Limitations: These findings are based on the focus groups and interviews, and thus, are not fully representative of the entire COO initiative and partners. |