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Abstract

The 2008 follow-up to the Kerner Commission Report of 1968 indicates that there is still much work to be done to address inequalities in such areas as education, employment, and health. Over the years, there has been a trend in the development of community-based organizations that focus on addressing institutional racism, which has been seen as a culprit in the pervasive, multi-sector inequities. Research studies have revealed that these organizations use a myriad of approaches ranging from individual approaches focused solely on education and information sharing, to more systemic approaches involving community mobilization, advocacy, and public and institutional policy change (Shapiro, 2002; Potapchuk, 2007). However, little is known about the impact of this work on institutions and the community at-large. With the influx of these organizations, there is a need expressed by funders of these efforts, and also by the community and the organizations themselves, to assess the effectiveness and impact of this work. While research conducted by the Aspen Institute and resources provided by the Annie E. Casey Foundation have made strides to build our knowledge base and support, there is a need for the development of a more comprehensive evaluation model along with an appropriate data collection instrument to obtain quantitative data. Spurred by the request from a local organization which provides a multi-pronged intervention approach to dismantle institutional racism, a community-based participatory research/evaluation approach was embarked upon by the Maya Angelou Center for Health Equities located at Wake Forest University Baptist Medical Center to develop a comprehensive evaluation model. This model was designed to assess the effectiveness and impact of this organization’s intervention approach.
This paper describes the development of the model used to design and execute a comprehensive evaluation plan and the process utilized to develop one of the quantitative data collection instruments, a retrospective post-then-pre test. The mixed-method approach selected for this model blends both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods that take into consideration the sensitivity of the subject and the richness of information shared by participants. At the time of this writing, both the model and data collection instrument are in the implementation phase of the evaluation plan. Thus, the focus of this paper is limited to the development process. To aid in building a knowledge base for the methods and approaches used during the development phase, limitations, challenges and implications for future research are discussed. Templates of the tools used are described and provided for replication purposes; thus, aiding in creating a culture of evaluation and improvement for addressing institutional racism.
INTRODUCTION

While individual racism and prejudice has been at the forefront of conversations about unequal treatment of people of color for over 40 years, institutional (also known as structural or systemic) racism has quietly laid the foundation for the sometimes overt and most often subtle, sustained unequal treatment of people of color (Barker, 2003; Barndt, 1991; Jones, 2000). Stokely Carmichael & Charles Hamilton (1967), further distinguished individual from institutional racism by stating that individual racism “consists of overt acts by individuals which cause death, injury or the violent destruction of property” and institutional racism is “less overt, far more subtle” and “originates in the operation of established and respected forces in the society and thus receives far less public condemnation.”

Other more recent definitions of institutional racism state that it is the combination of polices, practices, or procedures embedded in bureaucratic structure that systematically lead to unequal outcomes for groups of people (Barker, 2003; Brandt, 1991). The Aspen Institute defines institutional or structural racism as “a system in which public policies, institutional practices, cultural representations, and other norms work in various, often reinforcing ways to perpetuate racial group inequity” (Aspen, 2004). For the purposes of this paper, the term "institutional racism" will be utilized.

Recent history and effects of institutional racism in the United States

During the summer of 1967, several riots in Detroit and Newark resulted in President Lyndon B. Johnson calling forth the National Advisory Commission on Disorder – the Kerner Riot
Commission. This commission was to analyze the cause of the riots and determine what could be done to prevent further riots. The summary report, clearly stated that “Race prejudice has shaped our history decisively; it now threatens to affect our future. White racism is essentially responsible for the explosive mixture which has been accumulating in our cities since the end of World War II (Kerner Report, 1968).” The recommendations of this report focused on enacting programs, policies and procedures that would reduce the disparities experienced in poverty, education, employment, income and wealth, and housing. However, after forty years, it seems that the goals have not been achieved as there has been little or no improvement (Kerner Report, 2008; Berry, 2008).

More recently, Thomas Perez (2010), assistant U.S. attorney general for civil rights, delivered a speech at the annual American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) King Day Celebration in which he stated, “In 2010, we have an African American president. And yet discrimination persists—both blatant discrimination and the dangerously subtle kind—in so many of our institutions, showing up in our schools, in our workplaces, in our health care system, in our financial system.” While some progress has been made, this summary demonstrates the continued pervasiveness of institutional racism and its impact on society even after several national attempts have been made to address it. This is further indication that there is much work to be done to eliminate institutional racism in the United States.

**Trends addressing institutional racism**

Over the years, several efforts have begun to address institutional racism. Several terms have evolved to describe these efforts: dismantling racism, undoing racism, and anti-racism are
common descriptors. These efforts may involve a variety of strategies and techniques to produce changes to policies, practices and programs within institutions that may intentionally or unintentionally prevent non-white individuals from receiving any services or the same high-quality of services. Intervention strategies tend to range from providing an individual approach through training, to community-level approaches through advocacy and awareness campaigns focused on topics related to institutional racism, such as diversity and multi-culturalism, anti-racism and white privilege (Aspen, 2004; Shapiro, 2002). Some initiatives involve a multi-faceted approach to address all levels: individual, community and organizational approaches.

In 2002, Dr. Ilana Shapiro produced a guide to help organizations, institutions, and individuals select the best “anti-racism” training program. The guide provides a comparison of 10 organizations on various aspects such as training method, intended outcome, and theory of change. While these organizations varied in their training approach and the support services they provide after the training, there is the common theme of the need for more rigorous evaluation to determine effectiveness and impact (Shapiro, 2002).

A few years later in 2006, Maggie Potapchuk of MP Associates, in consultation with the Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change and the National League of Cities (NLC), surveyed 58 initiatives focused on addressing race inequities within their communities in order to learn about their strategies and outcomes. The study sample consisted of 42 initiatives based on common characteristics such as whether they used multi-pronged strategies, engaged a critical mass of diverse community residents, and focused specifically on institutional or structural racism. This study revealed two relevant points: (1) The outcomes of these organizations are not definitive due to organizations being less than four years old and others not having begun to
evaluate their work; and (2) Recommends that "researchers could work with participants in the learning network to create structured learning processes and instruments for gathering data, qualitative information…. The goal would be to learn more about the impact of strategies, community readiness and capacities" (Potapchuk, 2007, pp. 14).

In addition, lessons about the longer-term outcomes and effectiveness of these initiatives are limited, due in part to the challenge of evaluating them, insufficient evaluation time frames, and inadequate guiding theories of change (Aspen Institute, 2006). While several reports have provided key findings to begin analyzing these programs and to begin to develop best practices which can enhance the quality and outcomes of these initiatives on a national level, more research and information sharing is needed. This information would help trainers working with these community organizations to articulate their program models, rigorously assess progress toward program goals, extract lessons from experiences, and apply the findings to ongoing activities. This will be challenging as the results, especially for preventive and proactive programs, often are intangible and incremental—and it’s hard to attribute effects to training programs when so many other contextual factors also influence changes. At a minimum, however, programs should clearly identify desired outcomes and find more accurate ways to measure progress (Shapiro, 2002). The literature review indicates that there is a growing need from funders, researchers and organizational leaders providing interventions that address institutional racism to conduct more rigorous, systematic, comprehensive evaluation of the various interventions.
One organization’s approach: The Institute for Dismantling Racism, Inc.

A local organization that provides intervention strategies that address institutional racism realized the need for a comprehensive evaluation plan. The organization’s board asked staff from the Maya Angelou Center for Health Equity at Wake Forest University Baptist Medical Center (MACHE) to lead the effort to design and implement a comprehensive evaluation model to assess the effectiveness and impact of the organization’s intervention strategy to address institutional racism.

The Institute for Dismantling Racism, Inc. (IDR) was established in 2004 to provide a venue to improve race relations and address social oppression. It educates, organizes, and supports people to develop anti-racist identity, culture and institutions to end oppression. IDR’s overall intervention approach consists of a multi-pronged approach to provide training and support for both individuals and institutions. At the core of IDR program services is the 2½ day Anti-Racism training model designed by Crossroads Ministries which was one of the organizations included in Shapiro’s guide to anti-racism trainings (Shapiro, 2007). The training is open to all, especially to those with responsibilities for social justice or cultural diversity initiatives in the public and private sector, particularly religious, educational or other community-based organizations. In the intensive 2½ day training, participants begin to understand racism, the dynamics of its negative impacts on society and the need to eradicate it from their institution. Upon completion of the initial training, individuals receive additional support through individual relationship-building and coaching sessions (one-on-one’s), caucusing (group dialogue sessions), and other educational events such as thought-provoking film series and discussions. In addition, individuals within an institution or organization can form an internal “transformational” anti-
racism team to further analyze its own institution or group. Ongoing capacity-building training is provided to assist with developing an analysis of institutional racism; the strategies to plan and carry out specific actions that dismantle personal, cultural and institutional racism within their own institution or group; and skills to lead their institutions towards long-term and permanent transformation.

Trainers from Crossroads Ministries, IDR’s partner organization, generally provide the training to participants attending IDR’s 2 ½ day Anti-Racism training. Upon completion of the training, participants are asked to complete a post-test survey which focuses primarily on the effectiveness of the trainers, the training and the facility. While this information has been used to assist in minor process improvements to the training such as training delivery pace, time allotted for breaks, and facility accommodations, this instrument is not intended to assess changes in behavior, attitude, and beliefs which may take some time after the training for participants to realize. In addition, this survey does not address other services offered by IDR to individuals upon completion of the training such as the one-on-ones, caucusing and organizational team support.

As indicated in Shapiro’s Guide few training programs addressing institutional racism offer an approach to address institutional policies and challenge the status quo internally. IDR has taken the individual Crossroads training model coupled with ongoing support to further foster individual growth and intrapersonal group support (Shapiro, 2002). To better understand the intervention strategies employed by IDR, a flowchart diagram is provided below in Figure 1. The social ecological theory can easily be applied to IDR’s intervention strategy. Individual
change initiated by attending the 2 ½ day Anti-racism training is a catalyst for the formation of transformational anti-racism teams within institutions and organizations. Institutions, naturally resistant to change, generally have to have many individuals from their organization to attend the training. This number is referred by Gladwell as the “tipping point” and is seen, in this case, when enough employees or members of the organization begin to influence leadership to take action upon to begin the process of establishing an internal anti-racism team (2000). Once established within an organization, the aim is for relationships to develop within the anti-racism team (interpersonal) to foster trust and social capital internally. The anti-racism team would work within the institutions or organizations to analyze and change the policies, procedures, practices and cultures that support institutional racism within institutions and organizations. There is overlap during the anti-racism team formation and their ongoing work in which individual, interpersonal, organization and institutional levels are all present. An assumption yet to be proven by evaluation efforts is that without the interpersonal level, anti-racism teams falter and lose momentum. To learn more about IDR’s theory of change, its logic model is provided in Appendix A.

**Figure 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 ½ day Anti-racism training</th>
<th>Changes in perception, behavior, attitudes and beliefs about institutional racism</th>
<th>Formation &amp; on-going work of institutional teams in organization/group</th>
<th>Systemic/organizational change via policies, practices, procedures, culture</th>
<th>Reduction or elimination of institutional racism occurring within multiple organizations</th>
<th>Changes occur within community as more organizations become anti-racist organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual level</td>
<td>Interpersonal level</td>
<td>Organizational level</td>
<td>Institutional/Community level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reduction or Changes occur
The need for a comprehensive evaluation model and instrument to assess an intervention to address institutional racism

While there have been evaluation efforts focused on such training programs, few have been comprehensive to include the multiple intervention strategies used by these organizations. In addition, several resources are available to assist organizations like IDR to evaluate the effectiveness and impact of their services (Racial Equity Tools); however, there is a need for a comprehensive, systematic approach which involves a mixed method evaluation design in order to assess both quantitative and qualitative data (Potapchuk, 2007; Shapiro, 2002).

Development of a comprehensive evaluation model

For a year and a half, project staff from MACHE has been engaging IDR board, staff and community members in the development of a model to evaluate the organization’s effectiveness and impact using a community-based participatory research/evaluation approach (CBPR/E). Through monthly team and individual meetings and literature review, a comprehensive evaluation plan was developed.

There are several models to use when designing a comprehensive evaluation plan. The CDC’s Framework for program evaluation consists of six major steps: (1) Engage stakeholders; (2) Describe the program; (3) Focus the evaluation design; (4) Gather credible evidence; (5) Justify conclusions; (6) Ensure use and share of lessons learned (CDC, 2005). As previously mentioned the focus of this paper is on the development stages which consist of engaging stakeholders, describe the program (see previous section pages 8-10) and focusing the evaluation design.
The overall goal of this project was to utilize the Community-Based Participatory Research/Evaluation (CBPR/E) approach to:

1. Develop a comprehensive evaluation plan to determine the effectiveness and impact of an intervention consisting of training and technical assistance to individuals and in group settings.
2. Demonstrate the use of mixed methodology in a one group, retrospective post-then-pretest evaluation explanatory multi-phase design.
3. Design and implement an evaluation instrument which can be used in similar capacity-building interventions to address institutional racism.

**Engaging Stakeholders**

In typical methodologies, researchers control the direction of the study, make scientific decisions, and own the products of the research. CBPR, on the other hand, equitably involves community participation in all phases of the research process and acknowledges that community members are the experts (Minkler & Wallerstein, 2003; Zukoski & Luluquisen, 2002).

According to NIH (2011), intentionally involving community and academic partners as research collaborators may improve the quality and impact of research by:

- More effectively focusing the research questions on health issues of greatest relevance to the communities at highest risk;
- Enhancing recruitment and retention efforts by increasing community buy-in and trust;
- Enhancing the reliability and validity of measurement instruments (particularly survey) through in-depth and honest feedback during pre-testing;
- Improving data collection through increased response rates and decreased social desirability response patterns;
- Increasing accurate and culturally sensitive interpretation of findings;
- Facilitating more effective dissemination of research findings to impact public health and policy;
- Increasing the potential for translation of evidence-based research into sustainable community change that can be disseminated more broadly.
For IDR staff, this approach will help them to:

- Increase relevance of intervention approaches and thus likelihood for success;
- Target interventions to the identified needs of community members
- Develop intervention strategies that incorporate community norms and values into scientifically valid approaches;
- Improve funding opportunities by gathering data to demonstrate program effectiveness and impact;
- Build skills and knowledge to develop and implement an evaluation plan.

While the CBPR process is a tool to build partnerships to meet the needs of the organization and can foster sustainability, there are challenges to authentic use of this process. The challenges such as time to coordinate multiple team members, community residents and organization’s skill level and capacity, and the potential for conflict (Zukoski & Luluquisen, 2002) tend to deter researchers from using this approach. Titteron and Smart argue that the benefits of this approach outweigh the challenges; however it is incumbent upon researchers to understand these challenges and work together with community organizations to address them early (2008). Since CBPR/E is in alignment with the values and goals of IDR to provide an inclusive, transparent and capacity-building approach to its work, this approach will be used to develop the model and survey instruments.

Ensuring proper infrastructure such as team structure and roles, decision-making methods and other considerations to ensure the process runs smoothly is important for CBPR to be successful. MACHE staff facilitated the process which involved key individuals from IDR’s staff, board and stakeholders who bring their skills and expertise to the table. A group of individuals representing the IDR board and its network partners, anti-racism team and other community
residents comprise the IDR Evaluation Team facilitated by MACHE staff. This diverse team is a vital component of the comprehensive evaluation plan and is critical to ensuring CBPR/E and the evaluation protocol are consistently applied throughout the process. This team met several times during the course of the year to assist by reviewing and providing feedback on study protocol materials such as survey instruments, email communications, etc. and to ensure community residents were aware of the survey and the importance of their participation to increase response rate. A list of key individuals who would need to stay abreast of the evaluation plan’s progress was developed. These individuals did not attend regular meetings; but were updated on key milestones and were provided an opportunity to provide feedback. In addition, a matrix was developed early in the process to identify the needs and expectations of the organization (IDR) and research/evaluation staff (MACHE) to ensure equity and transparency. (See Appendix B for an example).

We utilized a collective leadership approach involving the researchers, evaluators and individual stakeholders of the organization to contribute their skills and expertise from their sector to complete tasks. This is not a new concept as interdisciplinary team concepts have been used over the years to ensure skills and knowledge from multiple disciplines were included to solve issues. However, collective leadership incorporates building relationships to the team approach while working on the project (Meehan, 2010; Nienow, 2010). This approach is likened to Peter Senge’s concept of “shared leadership” in which individuals engaged in a learning organization become designers, stewards and teachers (1990).
In order to determine the best design and evaluation method to use, the team decided upon the hypotheses, goals and objectives of the overall comprehensive plan evaluation plan which is discussed in the following sections.

**Focusing the Evaluation Design**

Focusing the evaluation design consisted of a series of team meetings with follow-up communication through email to elicit feedback. This process resulted in the cycles of development and revision of the hypotheses, goals, and objectives. The overall target audience, evaluation design, method, and questions were also determined.

**Target Audience**

Individuals who participate in the intervention provided by IDR begin by attending the 2½ day Anti-racism Workshop where they learn the historical context, language and definitions. This common understanding then prepares individuals to become engaged in other aspects of the intervention such as the monthly caucus meetings and one-on-one follow-up sessions. An overall outcome is for individuals from an organization or institution to form an anti-racism/organizational team to begin the process of addressing policies and procedures within their institution.

To ensure that training participants have had time to reflect on what they learned in the training, it was decided that an eligibility requirement would be for participants to have had the training at least 3-4 months prior to the evaluation. While not a requirement, this time may also allow participants to have engaged in a one-on-one and at least one community caucus.
Hypotheses, goals and objectives

In December 2010, the evaluation team began the process of designing the evaluation model by first determining the overall purpose and the hypotheses, goals and objectives for IDR’s comprehensive evaluation plan. This process continued to be clarified and fine-tuned in early 2011. As previously mentioned, IDR conducts a brief post-test survey immediately after the 2 ½ day Anti-Racism training in which the results are used to provide feedback about trainer style and delivery and facility appeal. While there are a few questions that assess effectiveness of the training and delivery, this survey does not address impact of the training, follow-up support or changes in behavior, beliefs, and attitudes which may take time to realize. The hypothesis is that individuals who attended the 2 ½ Day Workshop and subsequent support opportunities have experienced a significant level of change in their behavior, attitude, perception and beliefs regarding institutional racism.

Table 2: IDR Comprehensive Evaluation Model Goals and Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Evaluation Goals (Primary Questions)</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. How many of the individuals attending the training produce a relevant action or a plan to take action within their institutions and/or within their community?  
2. To what extent are organizations making changes/enforcing their policies, procedures and practices to move toward an Anti-racist organization? | The data collected from the post-survey will be used to  
• Improve the 2 ½ day Anti-racism training and technical support, if needed.  
• Strengthen IDR’s strategic and action plan  
• Provide evidence that IDR is meeting its goals and objectives  
• Share results with training participants, community partners and funders  
• Seek additional funding opportunities and collaborations |
Design and method

After securing agreement on the purpose of the evaluation through the hypotheses, goals, and objectives, the evaluation design and method for IDR’s overall evaluation was determined by the team. Based on the hypotheses, goals, and objectives described previously, a comprehensive evaluation approach was chosen. This approach involves collection and analysis through a compilation of process, outcome and impact data from a variety of sources determined appropriate for measuring the effectiveness and impact of a program intervention (Issel, 2004; CDC, 2005). In addition, a widely-used evaluation framework developed by Donald Kilpatrick was applied as it also encompassed a multi-level, comprehensive approach to evaluating training programs after they have occurred. While Kilpatrick’s approach has been widely used to evaluation organizational training programs, his 4 levels are also congruent with the evaluation objectives for IDR’s intervention (Kilpatrick, 1998; Rouse, 2010; Grice, 2010).

- Level 1 – Reaction or effectiveness of the training seen through changes in attitudes and beliefs;
- Level 2 – Learning or skills learned;
- Level 3 – Behavior – how are these skills transferred into the organization or group;
- Level 4 – Results – what changes have occurred in the individual and organization or group

Werner and DeSimone (2009) argue the addition of two levels which can be included in Level 4. These levels are: return on investment - does the investment in training translate to overall profitability or growth of the organization or group, and social impact - how has the organization improved the community. The overall comprehensive evaluation plan will address all of these levels utilizing multiple data collection methods.
In addition, a concurrent mixed-method for data collection is being used to obtain both quantitative and qualitative data from participants. The purpose of using the concurrent approach is to allow the qualitative data to address questions that may arise while collecting the quantitative data. Therefore, the qualitative data will be used to further explain the initial data collected (Creswell & Clark, 2003; Issel, 2002; CDC, 2005). The overall evaluation method will consist of two phases:

- Phase I: secondary and quantitative data collection methods
- Phase II: qualitative data collection methods such as focus groups and in-depth interviews

Triangulation will be used for validation of data and methods by having multiple researchers and data collection methods used to corroborate findings. A transformative - based framework is applied to help evaluate and analyze underrepresented or marginalized groups. For the purposes of this evaluation, several groups based on race/ethnicity, socioeconomic, gender, profession, etc. will be studied to address individual perceptions, behaviors, and attitudes towards institutional racism (Creswell & Clark, 2003).

**Evaluation questions**

Another key component of the evaluation design was to identify the questions the evaluation proposes to answer. A systematic approach was taken to ensure the needs of the stakeholders involved in the process were met. Questions were identified to address the goals and objectives of the overall evaluation plan. The evaluation will answer a variety of **process and outcome questions** related to the delivery and content of IDR’s program services such as the 2 ½ day Anti-racism training, one-on-ones, and caucusing. The following is a list of the overall evaluation questions to be addressed.
1. To what extent do individuals who have attended the 2½ day Anti-racism training change in their knowledge, attitudes, perceptions and beliefs regarding institutional racism to produce a relevant action or a plan to take action within their institutions and/or within their community?

2. To what extent did participants feel one-on-ones were beneficial?

3. How many individuals who received the one-on-ones continued their involvement with other IDR related activities?

4. To what extent did participants feel the IDR and their organization-hosted caucusing meetings were beneficial?

5. How many individuals who attended IDR and their organization-hosted caucus meetings continued their involvement in other IDR related activities? Did caucusing promote further engagement?

6. How have individuals changed in skills and knowledge based on the content shared during the training?

7. Have changes occurred in individuals’ perception, beliefs and attitudes?

8. What institutional policies, practices or procedures have been changed/developed/enforced by the institutions that have sent individuals to the trainings?

9. What is the “tipping point” number of individuals from one institution needed to attend the workshop in order for a plan/action to occur?

A table was created to display the linkage between the evaluation questions and data collection methods and linked back to the evaluation objectives (See Appendix C). As previously mentioned, the focus of this paper was to provide the details of the development of an evaluation model and the survey instrument used to collect primary quantitative data. The next section provides the details to the development of one of the survey instruments.

**Development of a survey instrument**

During Phase I of the IDR comprehensive evaluation plan, quantitative data is being collected using a survey instrument (the IDR Post-Intervention Survey) developed by using the CBPR/E approach, the core values of the community organization (IDR), and findings from the secondary research. To provide a framework for this survey instrument development, ten steps were
identified and are listed below. The development phase was comprised of the first five steps followed by the implementation phase steps. This paper will focus only on the development process (Steps 1-5) of the survey instrument used in Phase I of the comprehensive evaluation plan.

**Development Phase**
1. Identify the need for a survey
2. Select survey methodology
3. Identify the target audience and sample
4. Identify and create the questions
5. Pilot the survey

**Implementation Phase**
6. Determine the survey collection method: Online
7. Collect and compile the data
8. Analyze the data
9. Develop the report/evaluation finds
10. Share the report/evaluation finds to various stakeholders

1. **Identify the need for a survey**

As previously mentioned, there is a need to have a better understanding of the effectiveness and impact of IDR’s services. As part of the comprehensive evaluation plan using mixed methods, the team has decided to collect quantitative data first by using a survey. IDR currently does not conduct any such data collection methods.

2. **Select survey methodology**

The comprehensive evaluation will rely on the use of a retrospective post-then-pre-test design. In this design participants use a survey instrument given after the intervention to assess the effectiveness and impact after the intervention and then reflect on their perceived level of effectiveness and impact before the intervention (Howard, 1980; Howard et al., 1981; Klatt & Taylor-Powell, 2005). This design differs from the post-test only design which is appropriate as
well in that participants are also asked to answer questions to reflect on their perceived levels of effectiveness and impact before the training. There are several reasons for using the retrospective survey design. One reason is to take into consideration the need for participants to have an understanding of the language and concepts associated with dismantling racism. In addition, using the retrospective design instead of the traditional pre-test and post-test can address response shift bias. Response shift bias occurs when a person may overestimate their knowledge about the subject before the intervention which can result in either no or minimal change when compared to the post-test (Klatt & Taylor-Powell, 2005). However, there are disadvantages associated with retrospective designs such as history, maturation, and testing effect which can impact an individual’s response to certain questions. History and maturation is an issue because some of the participants initially took the IDR 2½ day training as far back as 2004. During this time period, many events and personal growth may have occurred which can impact responses. Testing effect can also impact responses because participants are given the concepts about institutional racism before the survey is given (Issel, 2002). A review of the literature indicates an increasing trend in the use of retrospective post-then-pre-test instruments; however, more research is needed to build a best practice (Issel, 2002; Klatt & Taylor-Powell, 2005; Howard, 1980; Howard et al., 1981).

3. Identify the target audience/sample

We used the organization’s database comprised of individuals who have attended the 2½ day Anti-racism training since 2004; approximately 700 individuals. As previously mentioned, the team had decided to allow participants at least 3-4 months after completion of the training before being asked to participate in the evaluation. Therefore, everyone who had attended the 2½ day
training prior to August 2010 was eligible to participate in the research study. The questionnaire was sent to approximately 500 participants.

4. Identify and create the questions for the data collection method

During literature review, several survey instruments were identified that could contain questions relevant to the goals and objectives of this evaluation. However, due to the lack of evaluations conducted to assess the effectiveness and impact of a dismantling racism intervention, most of the questions were created by the key stakeholders and evaluation team members.

Several survey instruments and literature were identified that contained potential questions to include in the IDR Post-Training Survey. Several questions were selected from the Racial Climate and Reaction to Racism survey which were listed in the 2002 Behavior Risk Factor Survey (as cited in Childs, 2004, p. 22). It is assumed that these questions had been tested for validity and reliability which make them ideal to include. Other instruments such as the Institutional Racism Scale, the Social Support Questionnaire for Racial Situations and Thompson Racial Reaction Scale (Jones, 1996; Seaton, 2003) were considered but the questions did not seem appropriate based on our evaluation objectives. Another source of questions came from a study conducted by Julie A. Cothern to assess the root cause of prejudice and racism which looked at the impact of person’s age, size of the community in which the person grew up and currently live, education, and ethnic background. It ascertained that a person’s age and education does positively impact a person’s level of prejudice and that where a person grew up and currently lives have no impact (2009).
The remainder of the questions on the survey were developed by the evaluation team to provide answers to the evaluation questions (See Appendix: C). Tailored questions for this survey were created using a collaborative approach in which each stakeholder provided a list of questions to be considered for the survey based on their needs and their points of interest as it related to institutional racism. A matrix was developed by the evaluation team to provide a systematic approach for compiling the various questions and sort items based on the evaluation questions to be answered by the survey. The matrix contained the following columns:

- Overall evaluation questions
- Key stakeholder name
- Potential survey
- Type of survey question (A=Attitude; B= Behaviors; Bf= Beliefs; K=Knowledge; P= Perceptions; S= Skills)
- Type of result: O=outcome; P=process
- Data collection method: S=survey; FG=focus group; I= interview

This framework tool was also used to prioritize questions and to ensure that questions fit the most appropriate data collection method. For example, most open-ended questions were assigned for focus groups and/or individual interview questions due to the time needed to reflect, recall, and discuss the topic.

The questions were categorized into sections based on the following outline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1:</th>
<th>Introductory workshop. Year attended 2 ½ day Anti-racism workshop and if attended similar workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 2:</td>
<td>Perceptions of skills, knowledge, behavior, and attitudes <strong>PRE</strong> 2 ½ day anti-racism training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3:</td>
<td>Perception of skills, knowledge, behavior, and attitudes <strong>POST</strong> 2 ½ day anti-racism training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4:</td>
<td>Effectiveness and participation level of technical support: one-on-one’s; Caucus meetings (IDR-hosted &amp; on-site organization hosted); Anti-racism teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5:</td>
<td>Perceived consequences of racism and institutional racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6:</td>
<td>Demographic Section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Special considerations were given to ensure IDR’s values and principles were used when
developing the questions. For example, the question and response options: “What is your
ethnicity? Hispanic, Latino or Spanish speaking or Non-Hispanic,” was included to mirror the
question found on the Census 2010. However, during one of the pilot tests of the survey, several
Hispanic/Latino individuals shared the confusion associated with this question and response
options provided. Thus, the question was removed. The survey consisted mostly of closed-ended
questions to gauge an individual’s change in behavior, perception, attitude and beliefs with a few
open-ended questions. The open-ended questions were included to allow for the individual to
explain a “Yes/No” response, if desired.

Pilot testing the survey

Pilot testing the survey allows an opportunity for the evaluators to test the survey with a small
group of individuals before disseminating the survey to the target audience. This step is very
important because feedback is obtained on specific aspects of the survey instrument to improve
the overall quality of the questions, format, and length which can ultimately impact the response
rate and survey results (CNCS; Taylor-Powell, 2008).

A pilot test of IDR’s post intervention survey was conducted twice using the paper version and
once after the survey was converted to the online version. The first two pilot tests involved the
IDR board and the Anti-racism team members. These groups were ideal as it was assumed they
had participated in IDR’s services and had in-depth knowledge of the subject. Another pilot test
of the survey was conducted with the evaluation team once the survey questions were entered
into the online survey system. The evaluation team included both individuals who had responded during the previous pilot tests and new individuals. The main purpose of this pilot test using the online version was to ensure the questions were accurately transferred from the paper version to the online system.

1. Accuracy: Will the survey elicit the types of information intended to answer the overall evaluation questions?
2. Readability: Are the questions in the survey easy to understand? Are the questions phrased correctly and sensitive to various cultural translations?
3. Length of time: Is the survey too long which may deter participants from completion?

As a result of this pilot test, a few elements of the survey were eliminated or changed such as the rewording of questions and removal of questions not in alignment with overall evaluation goal and objective.

After the pilot test was conducted and necessary changes were made to the survey design and content, the survey was ready for dissemination to the target population. At the time of the writing of this paper, the survey has been disseminated and is in the process of being completed by the IDR training participants as intended. As previously mentioned, this paper is focused on the development of the evaluation model and of the survey instrument.

**Challenges and lessons learned**

During the development of both the evaluation model and quantitative survey, several noteworthy challenges occurred which provided an opportunity for lessons learned. Both of these challenges are important for all stakeholders to be aware of when embarking on such a project. We’ll also discuss recommendations for future evaluation efforts for similar anti-racism intervention efforts.
The overall challenge associated with the development of an evaluation model stems largely from the use of the community-based participatory approach which requires an evaluator to have a certain set of skills, time to build relationships and trust. The CBPR approach takes researchers and evaluators out of their comfort zone. Instead of simply creating and presenting the evaluation plan and instrument to the stakeholder; using CBPR places the evaluator and researcher in a facilitation role that should engage organization staff, board members and stakeholders in the development process. Engaging community members in the development process requires them to also learn the process, which will in turn, build their skills and knowledge in evaluation design. Thus, researchers and evaluators must possess certain skills in order to use CBPR successfully. For example, a lesson learned is that such skills as group facilitation, negotiation, and communication in a manner that engages participants are essential to CBPR.

This process also takes more time than it probably would take the evaluator to develop the model and instrument without engaging the organization. The end result of using CBPR is an evaluation plan and tool that meets the community organizations’ needs and has their buy in from the beginning. A lesson learned is that a by-product of CBPR is it builds social capital and results in the building of skills and cross-sharing of knowledge for everyone involved.

The length of time this process takes may make it challenging to keep everyone fully engaged in the process. However, using action-oriented agendas, timely updates, and follow-up to all team members as well as creating a time during the meetings to share announcements, network, and celebrate accomplishments can improve regular participation. Conflicting schedules and being pulled to work on other projects which may prevent everyone from attending each meeting may
be unavoidable; however, it is important to keep open lines of communication and transparency through the process.

Titterton and Smart (2008) indicate that the “advantages outweigh disadvantages and researchers must be aware of how to address them when using CBPR. Success can occur when several key components are attended to such as being inclusive in the planning process and willing to negotiate the agenda with the organization; allowing sufficient time for skill building and transfer of knowledge; providing training and resources to staff and residents involved in the process; and encouraging open feedback/dialogue. Because there are a wide variety of approaches to CBPR, it is necessary to understand the skills researchers need to utilize CBPR in an effective way that doesn’t dis-empower or harm community members. There is a need for standardization of evaluation of CBPR methods and infrastructure (Faida et al., 2007)

Conclusion

It is evident from the literature that there is a need for a more rigorous evaluation of interventions that address institutional racism. The goal of this paper was to present an evaluation model and survey instrument that can be used for evaluating similar anti-racism training and support programs. Although this model and instrument are in the implementation stage during the writing of this paper, refinements to the model still occur to ensure it accurately reflects the needs of the organization. As mentioned previously, the biggest challenge encountered is executing the evaluation development process in a manner that actively engages organization staff and key stakeholders to ensure the evaluation and instruments accurately reflect the values and beliefs of the organization. The community-based participatory evaluation approach seems to be the best
approach. However, if researchers and evaluators are authentic in their approach and listen to the stakeholders, the capacity of the organization can be built as board and staff become more knowledgeable about evaluation development and implementation.

The goal of this collaboration is to build the knowledge base and tools that can be replicated with other organizations similar to IDR. The next step is to continue to document the remainder of the IDR evaluation model and instrument implementation and development during the different phases with hopes of publishing and presenting the results to share knowledge and experiences. The table below provides the components of this evaluation model.

Table2: Overall Evaluation Design Component Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Audience:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Individuals that have participated in the 2 ½ day Anti-racism training from 2004 to August 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Design: Retrospective Post-then-Pre non-experimental design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluation occurs after the intervention has occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participants are asked to assess the effectiveness and impact of the intervention AFTER some level of participation; then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participants are asked to retrospectively assess effectiveness and impact of intervention BEFORE participation in the intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No control group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Method: Mixed Method, Concurrent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I (quantitative)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secondary data collection: Post training survey (Crossroads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Primary data collection: Post survey (IDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase II (qualitative)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interviews and focus groups with Anti-racism teams and other groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interviews and focus groups with key individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary quantitative data collection instrument: |
- Retrospective Post-then-Pre Intervention survey
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Appendix A: Preliminary LOGIC MODEL FOR IDR Training and Technical Assistance 12/20/10

**Inputs**
- Crossroads
  - Workshops
  - Guidance
- Funders/Sponsors (KBR, WFU/WFUBMC, etc) ($)
  - Funding
  - Facilities
- Institutions & individuals ($)
- IDR, Inc. (staff, board, attendees)
  - Expertise in:
    - Technical assistance
    - Information dissemination
- IDR Evaluation Team
  - IDR staff, board
  - MACHE staff (facilitator)

**Activities**
- Introduction to Anti-racism workshop
  - Introduce concepts
- 2 ½ Day Anti-racism workshop
  - Key concepts
  - Apply to own org
- Tech Assistance: One-on-one’s, caucusing, Individual consultation
- ART Team formation, training and TA

**Outputs**
- Attend
- Interest in 2 ½ Day Anti-racism Workshop
- Attendees gain:
  - New knowledge
    - Institutional racism
  - New skills
    - One-on-ones
    - Power analysis
  - Take Action
    - Form ART teams
    - Change institutional Policy

**Outcomes**
- Short
- Intermediate
- Long
- Increase in # of Intro to anti-racism workshops
- Increase in # who attend 2 ½ Day Anti-racism workshops
- Increase in # who receive 1:1 within 1 - 2 months of attending 2 ½ workshop
- Increase in # of institutions to form ART teams
- Increase in # that attend Caucusing or host caucusing within institution

**Impacts**
- More Institutions are Antiracists
- Resources to sustain IDR and ART teams
- Stronger Partnerships
- More Effective IDR process
Appendix B: IDR Evaluation Project Partners Roles and Benefits Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles and Benefits to project partner</th>
<th>IDR Evaluation Team</th>
<th>Researcher/Evaluator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversee evaluation design, implementation and analysis</td>
<td>Review and approve of all survey instruments and protocol</td>
<td>Funds to support % effort ofWFUBMC – PHS staff to assist with various aspects of evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise and train staff and interns as needed</td>
<td>Updated directory of training participants</td>
<td>Use of computer and workspace for data entry and analysis using SPSS software &amp; qualitative data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete necessary documentation and materials</td>
<td>Assist with securing interns from or volunteers from community</td>
<td>Approximately 200 copies of survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison between partners; evaluation team and researchers/evaluators</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey Redcap usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive evaluation of IDR 2 ½ day Anti-racism training to make improvements</td>
<td>Partnership with community organization that is working with WFU and WFUBMC on workforce diversity</td>
<td>Goodwill in community by providing service to well-known and sustainable organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications/poster/abstract of results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build leadership and evaluation skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Objectives</td>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Data Collection Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. To determine the overall effectiveness of the 2 ½ day Anti-racism training.       | 1. To what extent do individuals attending the 2 ½ day Anti-racism training change in their knowledge, attitudes, perceptions and beliefs regarding institutional racism to produce a relevant action or a plan to take action within their institutions and/or within their community.  
2. To what extent are organizations making changes/enforcing their policies, procedures and practices to move toward an Anti-racist organization. | Post-test survey, Focus group & interviews |
| 2. To determine the level of participation and effectiveness of the individual (one-on-one) follow-up interviews with IDR staff and board after the training. | 1. To what extent did participants feel the individual (one-on-one) follow-up interviews were beneficial?  
2. How many individuals who received the individual (one-on-one) follow-up interviews continued their involvement in other IDR related activities?  
3. How can this activity be improved? | Post-test survey, Focus group & interviews |
| 3. To determine the level of participation and effectiveness of the IDR and organizational hosted Caucus meetings. | 1. To what extent did participants feel the IDR and organizational hosted caucusing meetings were beneficial?  
2. How many individuals who attended IDR and organizational hosted Caucus meetings continued their involvement in other IDR related activities? (Did this promote further engagement?)  
3. How can this activity be improved? | Post-test survey, Focus group & interviews |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. To what extent did individual skills and, knowledge about institutional racism change? | 1. How have individuals changed in skills and knowledge based on the content shared during the training?  
2. Have changes occurred in individuals’ perception, beliefs and attitudes? | Post-test survey |
| 2. To what extent did individual perceptions, beliefs, behavior and attitude change as a result of individuals having attended the 2 ½ day Anti-racism Training and other support venues? |                          |                          |
| 3. To what extent have changes occurred within the organization? | 1. What institutional policies, practices or procedures have been changed/developed/enforced by the institutions that have sent individuals to the trainings?  
2. Is there a “tipping point” number of individuals from one institution needed to attend the workshop in order for a plan/action to occur? | Post-test survey, Focus group & interviews |
| 4. To what extent have changes occurred within the community          |                          |                          |