

making a meaningful difference



90 Broad Street
Suite 1200
New York, New York 10004
212-425-8833
www.metisassociates.com

NYC Center for Economic Opportunity Independent Evaluation

October 2009

Evidence of Organizational Change:

Qualitative Assessment of the
NYC Center for Economic Opportunity's
Impact on New York City Agencies and
Provider Organization

SUBMITTED TO:
NYC Center for Economic Opportunity

metis associates

October 2009

Evidence of Organizational Change:

Qualitative Assessment of the
NYC Center for Economic Opportunity's
Impact on New York City Agencies and
Provider Organizations

SUBMITTED TO:

New York City Center for Economic Opportunity

AUTHORED BY:

Susanne Harnett
Stan Schneider
Manuel Gutiérrez
Donna Tapper
Kathleen Agaton



90 Broad Street
Suite 1200
New York, New York 10004
212-425-8833
www.metisassociates.com

metis associates

Foreword

The Center for Economic Opportunity (CEO) is committed to evaluating its programs and policies and has contracted with Westat and Metis Associates in order to inform decision-making within CEO and the sponsoring agencies. Westat and Metis have developed a collaborative team approach in the planning, design, and implementation of various types of evaluations including impact, outcome, and implementation studies. This study of organizational change was conducted by Metis staff.

The study interviews were conducted by senior Metis staff including Susanne Harnett, who also is the principal author of this report, Stan Schneider, Manuel Gutiérrez, Donna Tapper, and Kathleen Agaton.

We would like to acknowledge the cooperation of the study respondents. All of the individuals who were contacted for the study agreed to be interviewed and generously offered their time and their ideas. We also appreciate the help provided by the staff of CEO who assisted with gaining entrée to the respondent group.



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iii	III. Concluding Thoughts	21
I. Introduction	I	Appendices	
A. Background	1	Study Sample	
B. Study Design	2	List of Respondents	
		List of Acronyms	
II. Findings	4	Interview Protocols and Consent Forms	
A. Respondents' Perceptions of the Impact of CEO	4		
1. What was the impact of CEO's placement in the Mayor's Office?	4		
2. How did CEO impact agencies and provider organizations?	7		
3. What larger (cross agency) impacts has CEO had?	13		
B. Respondents' Feedback on Implementation Successes and Challenges	14		
1. What challenges have CEO programs encountered?	14		
2. What changes did respondents suggest to the program models?	16		
3. How do agency staff perceive the capacity of provider organizations?	17		
4. How satisfied are agency staff with CEO overall and with their interactions with CEO staff?	18		
5. What potential new directions would agencies and providers like CEO to take?	19		

Executive Summary

In December 2006, Mayor Bloomberg established the Center for Economic Opportunity (CEO) to implement, monitor, and evaluate new anti-poverty strategies in New York City (NYC). CEO's mission is to reduce the number of people living in poverty in NYC through the implementation of innovative, results-driven initiatives. CEO's approach to poverty reduction is fundamentally innovative, in that it includes both significant financial commitments and highly targeted, performance based interventions. As of fall 2009, approximately 40 programs for young adults, the working poor, and families with young children have been funded through CEO. The programs build on the strengths of individuals and communities and focus primarily on education, employment, and work supports.

CEO is housed in the Mayor's Office and collaborates with approximately 20 city agencies to develop and implement programs. Most programs are not traditional social welfare programs and the anti-poverty programs are implemented by agencies that generally do not define their primary mission as poverty-related (such as the City University, the Department of Small Business Services, and the Department of Correction).

As a major Mayoral priority, CEO represents a commitment to the poverty issue, new programming and resources, and a focus on accountability. Participating agencies were encouraged to offer new ideas, take risks, implement quickly, and measure what works. CEO and agencies monitor program performance; and external evaluators, Westat and Metis Associates, conduct program evaluations. To date, many programs are demonstrating strong participant benefits and have been identified as

promising; several programs lacked measurable outcomes and have been discontinued.

CEO's approach to poverty reduction is based on the recognition that potential solutions will require the coordination of the "city's policies, programs, and public/private partnerships in the areas of education, health and human services, housing and community development, workforce development, economic development, consumer protection, and criminal justice."¹ This approach includes elements of systems thinking, which organizational theorist, Peter Senge, refers to as the "cornerstone" of any learning organization. According to Senge, systems thinking necessitates an understanding not only of the whole problem, but also of its parts and the inter-relationships between the parts and the whole. Senge argues that one of the reasons that organizations are unsuccessful in enacting change is because they apply simplistic frameworks to complex problems.²

In spring 2009, CEO contracted its external evaluators, Westat and Metis, to undertake a study of CEO's impact. Specifically, CEO was interested in learning more about how the sponsoring agencies, service providers, and key stakeholders regarded their programs, how those programs and involvement with CEO may have affected the agencies and service providers, and how CEO may have begun to affect a larger systems change within the city. In order to address these questions, a series of interviews were conducted in spring 2009. The evaluators interviewed a total of 34 respondents, including 25 agency staff, six external service providers, and

¹ Executive Order No. 117, City of New York, Office of the Mayor, June 13, 2008.

² Senge, P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Dimension: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday Currency.

three other key stakeholders (including mayor's office staff with oversight responsibility for multiple agencies, such as staff from the budget office).³ The interview data were transcribed and analyzed for recurring themes; findings are described below.

Findings

Respondents' perceptions of the impact of CEO

During the interviews, respondents were asked to comment on their perceptions of the impact of CEO from a few different lenses, including: the placement of CEO in the Mayor's Office, changes on the practices and culture of participating organizations as a result of CEO, and the larger cross-agency impacts that CEO has had.

Placement of CEO in the Mayor's Office

- **Visibility.** Nearly all of the respondents indicated that their projects received more visibility, which has resulted in several positive outcomes for them; for example, interviewees reported that the attention has led to a better understanding of the work that they do, has helped to facilitate outreach and recruitment for their programs, and has helped to leverage the highest quality services.
- **Resources: Flexible Funding and Influence.** CEO's location in the Mayor's Office has enabled projects to try innovative strategies that (in many cases) would not have been supported by other

funds. Furthermore, its strategic placement in the Mayor's Office has facilitated the troubleshooting of problems, and has helped make connections across agencies and resolve problems so that programs can accomplish their goals more quickly.

- **Constraints.** Notwithstanding the positive aspects of CEO's placement in the Mayor's Office, a few respondents did note that there were some negative aspects, such as a "publicity embargo," which prohibited organizations from publicizing their work without approval, and periodic urgent requests for data.

Impact on agencies and provider organizations

During the interviews, respondents elaborated in detail about the impact that CEO has had on their organizations. Some of the changes have had immediate and obvious impact on organizations.⁴

- **Addition of staff members to the organization.** The majority of respondents indicated that they hired new staff. These new employees have been beneficial to the organizations in various ways. For example, they have added to the diversity of the staff (in terms of age, ethnicity, gender, and other demographic characteristics) as well as prior professional experiences (corporate, government, and non-profit) and have brought in new ideas, and ways of approaching problems. Additionally, some new staff have specific content knowledge, which has allowed agencies to develop expertise in particular areas.
- **Addition of new services or expansion of existing services.** The CEO programs have allowed organizations to serve more individuals or different populations than those they have been

³ Gathering CEO program participant feedback was considered beyond the scope of the current evaluation and, therefore, was not included in the evaluation plan. However, it is important to note that feedback from program participants is gathered regularly through interviews, surveys, and focus groups conducted for specific program evaluations, and this feedback has been instrumental to improving program implementation and identifying unmet participant needs.

⁴ Note that "organization" refers to both agency and provider organizations

able to serve in the past. Furthermore, CEO programs have been a vehicle for agencies to try new and innovative strategies and to test what works, which has allowed for exciting, original approaches to combating poverty.

- **Changes in organization culture.** Many of the interview respondents also noted that CEO has resulted in changes to the culture of their organizations, allowing heightened focus on issues or particular populations, fostering better collaboration and cooperation within the organization, and even encouraging them to expand their missions and improve the internal climate.
- **Replication of practices within the organizations.** There was a fair amount of evidence of potential long-term changes to the organizations, as many of the individuals who were interviewed are considering integrating unique aspects of their CEO programs into new and existing initiatives and some already have concrete plans to do so.
- **Changes in operational systems.** It is also notable that there was some evidence of CEO's impact on organizations' operational systems, such as their data and evaluation, accountability, and management practices, although many agencies reported that they had strong operational systems prior to CEO.

Larger cross-agency impacts

- **Cross-agency collaboration.** We found that CEO has resulted in a high volume of collaborations between agencies, which has led to better coordination of services and, ultimately, more and higher quality services for participants.
- **Replication of programs or strategies within and outside of NYC.** Respondents explained that they and their colleagues have

shared their work in various contexts and have been contacted by individuals throughout (and outside) the country. As a result, there are a number of programs and strategies from CEO that are being replicated or are planned to be replicated outside of NYC.

Respondents' Feedback on Implementation Successes and Challenges

In order to gain better perspective on the implementation of the CEO programs, respondents were asked about their perceptions of the successes and challenges of their particular programs to date. Specifically, they were asked to elaborate on the challenges they have encountered and the changes that they would like to make to their program models; additionally, agency staff were asked to comment on their satisfaction with CEO, as well as on their perceptions of the capacity of provider organizations. Lastly, all respondents were asked about what new directions or additional innovations they would like CEO to address.

Challenges

- **Compressed start-up timeline.** Several respondents pointed out that the compressed start-up timeline was difficult, particularly for programs that were brand new.
- **Other significant challenges that were noted included:** selecting and meeting appropriate targets, identifying qualified staff members, recruiting and retaining participants, ensuring sufficient funding, locating a sufficient number of providers with the capacity to implement the programs, and ensuring that initiatives are sufficiently integrated into agency work so that they are sustained over time.

Suggested changes

Many of the changes to their CEO program models that respondents suggested during the interviews were designed to address these challenges.

- **Tweak the program models.** While respondents acknowledged that their programs have been evolving over time, some suggested that the models could be further tweaked to better serve participants' needs and meet the intended outcomes.
- **Deepen or expand the work that they are currently doing.** Some programs would like to expand or replicate their work by adding components, increasing implementation timelines, and making more connections with other CEO programs.

Capacity of provider organizations

Overall, agency staff were fairly positive about the capacity of the external provider organizations. Many respondents believed that the providers have exceeded their expectations and praised the connections that the providers have with the communities which, they acknowledged, is critical in eliciting change in the communities. A few agency respondents did note, however, that there was inconsistency in capacity across providers. Additionally, providers tend to be weak in the area of data collection in general, and some have had difficulty adjusting their service delivery models to the specific CEO program and data needs. Furthermore, some agencies found that there are an insufficient number of providers located in particular neighborhoods, as well as those that focus on specific domains, such as job readiness and adult literacy.

Satisfaction with CEO

As part of the interview process, agency commissioners and key agency staff were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with CEO overall and with the manner in which CEO staff interacted with them. In general, respondents' satisfaction levels were very high overall and they had positive things to say about CEO.

- **CEO overall and CEO staff are very responsive, supportive and encouraging.** Many respondents noted that they have been quick to respond to issues, have been hands on, and have taken actions that have resulted in resolving problems and ensuring smooth service delivery.
- **CEO overall and CEO staff encourage innovation and learning.** According to respondents, the CEO staff also encourage innovation and learning and have successfully brought together resources and diverse partners.

New Directions

Respondents did have important feedback on potential new directions that CEO could take in the future.

- **Focus on adolescent and adult literacy.** Several respondents noted that more programs should focus on adolescent and adult literacy, as this represents an important unmet need and can be a roadblock to individuals' participation in several of the CEO programs.
- **Expand role in coordination of services.** Interviewees would like to see CEO expand their role in coordination of services even more than they have in the past, by perhaps having "CEO



specialists” who are familiar with all the programs and could make referrals or by hosting more meetings and conferences.

- **Expand role in facilitation of processes.**

Similarly, a few respondents suggested that CEO might be able to expand their role in the facilitation of processes, such as the expedition and prioritization of agency contracts and hiring.

- **Other suggestions pertained to deepening evaluation work that has already been started, readying the marketplace for populations who complete some of the CEO programs, and tracking innovations in other cities and sharing this information with key program staff.**

Overall, this evaluation found that the work of CEO and its staff was very well received by the organizations. Some changes that agency and provider staff noted were immediate and obvious, such as the addition of new programs and staff and the expansion of services. Others were more subtle but equally as important and with potential for long-term change, such as transformations in the culture and in staff’s perceptions of the mission of the organizations. Furthermore, nearly all staff who we interviewed expressed pleasure and enthusiasm for the opportunity to participate in CEO. Their responses indicated that they recognize that this work has the potential to bring substantive changes both within

and outside NYC and they understand that they are part of a larger whole, interconnected and striving toward a common, broad goal.

In part, staff’s satisfaction with the program was due to the qualities of the CEO staff. These qualities include not only passion and knowledge but also capacity, as they are ideally situated in the Mayor’s Office where they have more opportunity to break down bureaucratic processes and clear roadblocks than they would if they were located elsewhere. It is also due, in large part, to the way CEO approaches its mission. Because poverty is a systemic problem, it requires a systemic solution. Too often, change that is implemented by any organization does not reach the necessary level to eradicate the problem because the complexity of the issue and the interrelatedness of factors are not recognized. Evidence from this evaluation suggests that the complex and innovative strategies that CEO has implemented to meet their mission to reduce poverty may have the power to enact systemic change. The best evidence of this is in the inter-agency collaboration that the work has engendered. When the agencies have the opportunity to collaborate, their work is inevitably stronger, as there is sharing of best practices, ideas, and possibilities may emerge. Moreover, the replication of practices and programs inside and outside of NYC allows the work to affect a greater number of individuals, thereby further coordinating and adding power to the attack on poverty.

I. Introduction

A. Background

In December 2006, Mayor Bloomberg established the Center for Economic Opportunity (CEO) to implement new anti-poverty strategies in New York City. CEO's approach to poverty reduction is fundamentally innovative, in that it includes both significant financial commitments and highly targeted, performance based interventions. CEO's strategy involves:

- Breaking the cycle of intergenerational poverty by investing in human capital development.
- Giving the working poor a toolbox of programs and supports that will help them move up the economic ladder and out of poverty for the long term.
- Offering youth who are out of school and unemployed, and those who have a history of incarceration, better chances to gain the skills and work experience they need to succeed.
- Intervening early in the lives of children ages 0–5 to break cycles of poverty.
- Breaking down silos within government to promote new ways of collaborating, increasing efficiency, and making better use of limited resources.
- Using data and evaluation to improve programs and allocate resources based on measurable results.
- Sharing lessons learned and advocating on a national level for strategies shown to make a difference.⁵

As of fall 2009, approximately 40 programs for young adults, the working poor, and families with young children have been funded through CEO. The programs build on the strengths of individuals and communities and focus primarily on education, employment, and work supports.

CEO is housed in the Mayor's Office and collaborates with approximately 20 city agencies to develop and implement the programs. Most programs are not traditional social welfare programs and the anti-poverty programs are implemented by agencies that generally do not define their primary mission as poverty-related (such as the City University, the Department of Small Business Services, and the Department of Correction).

As a major Mayoral priority, CEO represents a commitment to the poverty issue, new programming and resources, and a focus on accountability. Participating agencies were encouraged to offer new ideas, take risks, implement quickly, and measure what works. CEO and agencies monitor program performance; and external evaluators, Westat and Metis, conduct program evaluations. To date, many programs are demonstrating strong participant benefits and have been identified as promising; several programs lacked measurable outcomes and have been discontinued.

CEO's approach to poverty reduction is based on the recognition that potential solutions will require the coordination of the "city's policies, programs, and public/private partnerships in the areas of education, health and human services,

⁵ Center for Economic Opportunity. *Early Achievement and Lessons Learned*. City of New York: New York City Center for Economic Opportunity, January 2009.



housing and community development, workforce development, economic development, consumer protection, and criminal justice.”⁶ This approach includes elements of systems thinking, which organizational theorist, Peter Senge, refers to as the “cornerstone” of any learning organization. According to Senge, systems thinking necessitates an understanding not only of the whole problem, but also of its parts and the interrelationships between the parts and the whole. Senge argues that one of the reasons that organizations are unsuccessful in enacting change is because they apply simplistic frameworks to complex problems.⁷

CEO asked Westat and Metis, the external evaluators of a number of CEO programs, to undertake a study of the impact of their work, including how sponsoring agencies, service providers, and key stakeholders regard their programs, how those programs and involvement with CEO may have affected the agencies and service providers, and what kind of larger systems change may have begun across the city. The study was based on a series of interviews, which were conducted over a four-week period from May to June, 2009.

B. Study Design

The external evaluators worked collaboratively with CEO staff to design the study and all associated instruments. The resulting qualitative study, which used a systems change perspective, was designed to obtain information about the effect or contribution of CEO with regard to the following topics:

- Its placement in the Mayor’s Office;
- Programs and staff of participating agencies and providers;
- Changes in practice;
- Innovation;
- Replication and/or adaptation;
- Participation in a citywide anti-poverty initiative and collaboration; and
- Satisfaction.

The evaluation team developed interview protocols for the three respondent groups—agency commissioners and key agency staff, external service providers, and other key stakeholders (including mayor’s office staff with oversight responsibility for multiple agencies, such as staff in the budget office).⁸ Following review by CEO, the protocols and consent forms (see appendix) were submitted to and approved by Metis’s and Westat’s Institutional Review Boards.

Sample Selection

Respondents were selected by Metis in consultation with CEO. Sample selection began with a list provided by CEO of 50 potential respondents representing 13 sponsoring agencies and three city offices. These individuals were categorized by sponsoring agency, type (agency staff, external providers, and key stakeholders), and whether they were responsible for one or more than one CEO program. The initial list included 38 agency staff,

⁶ Executive Order No. 117, City of New York, Office of the Mayor, June 13, 2008.

⁷ Senge, P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Dimension: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday Currency.

⁸ Gathering participant feedback was considered beyond the scope of the current evaluation and, therefore, was not included in the evaluation plan. However, it is important to note that feedback from participants is gathered regularly through interviews, surveys, and focus groups conducted for specific program evaluations, and this feedback has been instrumental to improving program implementation and identifying unmet participant needs.

seven external providers, and five key stakeholders. More than half (28) were responsible for a single CEO program and 22 were responsible for multiple CEO programs. Based on this information, Metis selected a sample of 34 respondents, including 25 agency staff, six external service providers, and three other key stakeholders. Every agency listed was represented by at least one respondent and approximately 25 CEO programs were represented. Further details about the distribution of the sample and a list of respondents are included in the appendix.

Interviews

Prior to conducting the interviews, CEO staff provided Metis with background information about the various programs and their own perceptions of CEO's impact in the various program areas. Further background was gleaned from CEO's two annual reports and from the different program reviews conducted previously by Westat and Metis.

The respondents were asked by CEO to participate in the study. Following notification by CEO, Metis contacted each respondent to schedule an in-person interview. The consent notice and interview

protocol were shared with each respondent at the time of scheduling. All 34 respondents (100%) were interviewed. Most interviews were with individual respondents; in a few cases, other agency or program representatives also participated in the interview at the request of the respondent.

Because it was necessary to identify agency- or program-specific effects, confidentiality of responses was not promised except for those questions relating to sponsoring agencies' satisfaction with CEO and its staff, and external providers' satisfaction with the sponsoring agency.

Analysis

The interviews were recorded, with permission of the respondents, and transcribed for analysis. Each of the five interviewers reviewed and summarized their transcriptions for analysis. All responses were summarized by question and then content analyzed for themes that emerged from the data. The project team held joint meetings to discuss emerging themes and synthesize findings.



II. Findings

In this section, the findings from the 34 interviews are described. Two main topics are explored: respondents' perceptions of the impact of CEO and their feedback on implementation successes and challenges. Within the topic of "impact," three main questions are addressed: 1) What was the impact of the CEO's placement in the Mayor's Office; 2) How did CEO impact agencies and provider organizations; and 3) What larger (cross agency) impacts has CEO had. Within the topic of "feedback," five key questions are considered: 1) What challenges have CEO programs encountered; 2) What changes did respondents suggest to the program model; 3) How satisfied are agencies with provider capacities; 4) How satisfied are agency staff with CEO; and 5) How would agencies and providers like CEO to deepen or expand their work. In most cases, information gathered from agency and provider respondents is presented together. However, where differences in results between agencies and providers are relevant, this information is provided separately.

"It...helps to get things done when people know that City Hall and the Mayor's Office is interested in it and will be looking at it. Having that nexus to the center of power does help get done what you want to get done."

A. Respondents' Perceptions of the Impact of CEO

I. What was the impact of the CEO's placement in the Mayor's Office?

One of the key, unique aspects of CEO is that it is located within the Mayor's Office, and is directly overseen by Deputy Mayor Linda Gibbs. Respondents from agencies and provider organizations discussed the impacts of having CEO placed in the Mayor's Office on their individual programs, as well as on their organizations overall. Following are some of the main themes that were addressed in their responses.

• Visibility

Nearly all of the individuals who were interviewed indicated that their projects received more visibility as a result of being part of a mayoral initiative overall. This visibility occurred in the form of press releases, mayoral visits to program sites, and national and international attention and interest in specific strategies. According to the program personnel who we interviewed, having additional visibility had further positive benefits. For example, respondents reported that as a result of the increased visibility:

- **The public has a better understanding of the work that they do.** Press releases and news articles served to "get the word out" about the work that is done by various agencies and providers,

allowing for the general public to be more informed. For example, staff from the Department of Small Business Services (SBS) reported that attention from City Hall helped bring Workforce1 Career Centers and the entire workforce development system into public view.

- **The attention helped facilitate outreach and recruitment for programs.** Several respondents mentioned that the excitement that was generated by being part of such a large-scale and visible initiative helped them to recruit participants who were eligible for their services.
- **It helped to leverage the highest quality services.** A few agency representatives indicated that the visibility of CEO allowed them to get the most from their providers, as well as to garner support at the highest levels of the agencies. Furthermore, it helped to accelerate the speed with which programs were up and running. For example, an agency staff member pointed out, “The Mayor’s Office has really given [this CEO program] the cache to get off the ground and to move.”

• Resources

Additionally, CEO’s location in the Mayor’s Office allowed projects access to a variety of resources. For example:

- **Flexible Funding.** Several interviewees perceived the funding for programs as fundamental to their capacity to implement programs and noted that other funding sources would not allow them to do the same work or try innovative strategies like the ones they are using. For example, both the CUNY Prep and Young Adult Internship Program (YAIP) programs implemented models outside of those that would have been supported

“A lot of government money comes to you with a program model already attached to it—with a lot of sets of conditions, and not really a lot of room to innovate it or adapt it to your local circumstance. Funding from the Mayor’s Office did a lot of things...but one of the things it did [for us] was to create an opportunity that probably wouldn’t have otherwise existed.”

by Workforce Investment Act (WIA) funds. For School Based Health Centers (SBHCs), CEO funding was the first new funding in over a decade, and it allowed comprehensive reproductive health services to finally become a cornerstone for SBHCs. Furthermore, a few agency respondents noted that having the CEO funds is giving them the opportunity to leverage more funds in the future. It gives them time to apply for more funds from other sources when the CEO funds run out. Also, it allows them to show preliminary outcomes for programs, which may increase the likelihood of future funding.

- **Influence.** Many respondents elaborated on how supportive CEO staff members were to their programs. They described CEO staff as involved and immediately responsive. For example, one agency respondent said, “This is not a typical funder relationship. This is ongoing dialogue.” Others indicated that CEO has provided more technical assistance and direction on the focus of their projects than they get from other funding sources. This led to a push to examine the work,

“CEO and the Mayor’s Office have been able to bring a lot of players into [the] business of trying to help poor people. That, in some respects, is the best thing about CEO.”

to be more transparent, and to ensure high quality outcomes. As one individual pointed out, “Programs that didn’t work were changed or dropped. Those that did were expanded.”

In addition, several respondents noted that this work has strengthened their agency’s relationships with the Mayor’s Office and also has been instrumental in allowing staff from the Mayor’s Office to better understand their specific work. In some cases, the structure resulted in oversight by more than one Deputy Mayor, and, as one agency staff member pointed out, this can have very positive results. According to this respondent, having oversight by more than one Deputy Mayor has resulted in “more advocates,” more resources, and more individuals who know the work. Furthermore, another agency staff member explained that having multiple Deputy Mayors involved alleviates the “siloeing” that can sometimes occur in government and ensures greater cooperation among all parties.

– **Troubleshooting and facilitation of processes and links.** A few respondents pointed out that CEO staff’s connection and understanding of NYC greatly helped their projects troubleshoot roadblocks and access the resources they need. For example, CEO was able to link several projects (including, for example, the Nursing Career Ladders RN and LPN programs) with

the Human Resources Administration (HRA) to facilitate their participants’ quick access to welfare benefits and, therefore, to reduce their barriers to full program participation. Also, CEO staff have been able to provide some troubleshooting when it comes to the Mayor’s Office of Contracts (MOC) and Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and some of the other agencies, in order to eliminate obstacles that stand in the way of implementation or improvement. Furthermore, as described in more detail later in this report, CEO facilitated networking between agencies (such as those providing services to disconnected youth) in order to better ensure that these populations are adequately served.

• **Constraints**

While the large majority of respondents indicated that the placement of CEO in the Mayor’s Office only had positive impacts, a few did remark on the limiting aspects of its placement.

- **Publicity Embargo.** Because of the high visibility and implicit political nature of CEO, organizations were unable to publicize information or findings about their programs until the language was cleared by the Mayor’s Office. This prohibited organizations from marketing and publicizing their work in ways in which they were accustomed and was a source of tension at times.
- **Urgent Requests.** The Mayor’s Office had periodic urgent demands for data or information about the programs when it was needed for their office. These requests seemed unreasonable to some organizations and required them to drop what they were doing and respond immediately to the requests.

2. How did CEO impact agencies and provider organizations?

During the interviews, respondents elaborated in detail about the impact that CEO has had on their organizations. These impacts ranged from the most immediately apparent (such as the addition of new programs and staff) to those that were more subtle (such as better collaboration within the organization and expansion of their mission statements). Below are main themes that emerged from the interviews regarding the impact that CEO has had on participating organizations.

• Addition of staff members to the organization

Implementation of the CEO programs required most organizations to hire more staff members to work directly with the new or expanded programming. At least one individual we interviewed noted that the ability to hire new staff when there were hiring freezes in their organization was particularly helpful.

Respondents were asked how many new staff they hired and also were asked to rate the quality of these staff members, using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1=very low and 5=very high. Table 1 displays respondents' reactions to these questions. Respondents from nearly all organizations that we interviewed indicated that they did hire new staff and, overall, they rated these staff as being high to very high in quality.

Table 1 New Staff⁹

Total number of respondents who indicated that they hired new staff	Total number of respondents that did not hire new staff	Mean # of Staff Hired	Rating of the quality of staff (1=Very Low; 5=Very High)		
			N	Mean	Range
27	3	9.26	23	4.36	2–4.75

The fact that respondents were so positive overall in their ratings of the staff that they hired for CEO programs suggests that these individuals are making positive contributions to their organizations. In fact, many of the individuals we interviewed further elaborated on the impact that these individuals have had. For example:

- A staff member from SBS reported that CEO resulted in the addition of 21 people to a relatively small agency of only 200 employees. According to this individual, these staff members “made a huge contribution to the agency and changed the landscape of the Workforce Development Division.”
- Likewise, staff from Grant Associates, a provider under contract to SBS, reported that CEO has significantly changed the culture of their organization because it is now much larger with the addition of staff for their CEO programs. This organization has about 105 employees and approximately one-quarter to one-third of them work on CEO programs. These interviewees further elaborated that the CEO programs have allowed them to hire different types of staff than those who would normally be in the workforce development profession, which has resulted in greater diversity of background (in terms of their

⁹ The mean displayed in Table 1 is weighted according to the number of staff for whom respondent provided ratings. Note that there was some overlap in the staff members that respondents rated that was impossible to isolate. Additionally, some individuals gave ranges, rather than specific numbers and a few did not respond to the question.

age, ethnicity, gender, and other demographic characteristics) throughout the organization, which has subsequently brought about new thoughts, ideas, and ways of approaching problems.

- A staff member from the Department of Health and Mental Health (DOHMH) indicated that the Healthy Bodegas Initiative allowed them to hire staff members who have specific, targeted expertise. Therefore, these individuals are able to support the agency in other aspects of their work, such as projects involving supermarkets, green carts, and similar initiatives. Furthermore, this respondent explained that an additional value of having these staff members is that the organization as a whole is better able to connect with the community.

While the large majority of respondents reported that the hiring of staff was positive overall for their organizations, a few noted that there were some challenges associated with the additional staff. For example,

- Respondents from a handful of organizations noted that there has been significant turnover of staff, which has put some stress on the programs.
- Others noted that they have had leadership challenges within the programs and have had to make changes.
- Furthermore, a couple of respondents noted that the staff that they have hired are very new and have little work experience, which has created challenges for them.

• **Addition of new services or expansion of existing services**

Perhaps most notably, CEO allowed organizations to add new programs or to expand programs that were already underway. In fact, the Office of Financial Empowerment (OFE), whose broad mission is to “educate, empower, and protect low-income consumers in the financial market place” was literally created within the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) as a result of CEO. Some of the CEO programs that were described were newly developed as a result of CEO, such as Teen ACTION, the Young Adult Internship Program, the Nursing Career Ladder RN and LPN programs, the Model Young Adult Literacy Program, the Model Education programs, LIFE Transitions, the SBS Sector Centers, NYC Justice Corps, Employment Works and CUNY ASAP. Others, such as CUNY Prep, Education Expansion on Rikers Island, School-Based Health Clinics, Healthy Bodegas, and Getting Out and Staying Out (GOSO) were expanded as a result of the CEO funding.

The addition of new services or expansion of existing services has enabled organizations to serve more individuals or different populations. For example:

- The Education Expansion on Rikers Island program has allowed the Department of Education (DOE) and the Department of Correction (DOC) to provide education to older students. While they had previously focused on individuals up to 21 years old, they now are able to focus on those up to age 24.

- The YAIP program has enabled Department of Youth and Community Development (DYCD) and its providers to assist disconnected youth who are interested in getting internships at any time during the calendar year, rather than just those who are interested in summer employment.
- As a result of its involvement in Opportunity NYC, Groundwork (a provider organization), has expanded its services outside of its catchment area. This represents a significant expansion for the organization.
- CUNY Prep was able to expand their evening program as a result of CEO funds, which has allowed them to serve older students, as well as those who cannot attend during the school day for various reasons.
- CEO enabled DYCD to develop pre-GED programs for disconnected youth, a population that has been very underserved.
- As a result of CEO, the Nursing Career Ladders was developed as a hospital-based program, creating a synergy between the nursing students and hospital staff.

Furthermore, the CEO programs enabled organizations to try strategies that had not previously been tried and to test what works. For example,

- As mentioned earlier, YAIP and CUNY Prep tried models that were not bound by the constraints of WIA funding.
- The CUNY ASAP model enabled CUNY to examine the impact of a cohort design, a full-time attendance requirement, and a strong advisory program on community college retention.

“We’re testing some program models here that may really have an impact on the way people think about doing service programs for people involved in the criminal justice system and we wouldn’t have the chance to do that without CEO.”

- A number of approaches to asset building and financial literacy are being tested. For example, the \$aveNYC pilot pays incentives to individuals who deposit a portion of their Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) refunds and do not withdraw them for at least a year. Another OFE initiative—the Financial Empowerment Center Pilot—offers community-based financial counseling and coaching services.
- The NYC Justice Corps program took an innovative approach to handling re-entry in that the program has a goal of serving both the individual and the community.

• **Changes in organizational culture**

Many of the interview respondents expressed that the CEO programs resulted in changes to the culture of their organizations. The culture changes took various forms, from a changed or heightened focus in their work, to more collaboration within their organizations, to a change in job perceptions. Below are some examples of these kinds of changes.

- *Changed or heightened focus on specific work or populations*
 - CUNY ASAP allowed CUNY to focus more on the graduation rates of students in their

“The CEO programs have helped SBS to think about going after better jobs, not just the ‘low-hanging fruit’ jobs, and getting better matches on higher salaries.”

community colleges. Furthermore, CUNY Prep gave them new ways of thinking about college access.

- Education Expansion changed the DOC’s and DOE’s thinking about recruitment strategies for educational programs on Rikers Island. There is now also more focus on transitioning and transferring students from Rikers into adult education post-release than there had been in the past.
- CEO has also pushed SBS to focus on training people for higher paying jobs, rather than just any jobs.
- OFE has increased DCA’s focus on low-income and working families, including issues that are important to them, such as debt collection work and predatory lending practices that exploit the poor.
- The Young Adult Literacy Program has allowed DYCD to focus on the 16–24 year old demographic within the larger adult literacy initiative. This focus will result in changes to their new adult literacy Request for Proposals, which they will be releasing shortly.

– Better collaboration/cooperation within the organization

- The CUNY ASAP program has fostered heightened dialogue across the agency. For

example, the project requires ongoing communication between the Office of Academic Affairs, other offices at CUNY Central, and each of the community colleges.

- SBS has worked more closely with their internal Business Development Division, collaborating on using research and labor market data and planning for services.
- The LIFE Transitions program engendered more collaboration within the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). According to staff from this program, because there is a different discharge planning program for children with mental health issues, there has been a great deal of collaboration between the director of that program and the director of the LIFE Transitions program.

– Change in job climate

According to some of the individuals we interviewed, the additions in programming, as well as changes to existing programs, fostered some changes in staff’s perceptions of their job and the climate of the organization. For example,

- A respondent from DOC pointed out that his staff may be more likely to view their job as changing life outcomes for people who spend time in jail than they have been in the past because of CEO programs.
- Furthermore, he pointed out that Employment Works has engendered a sense of hope among staff at Department of Probation (DOP).
- SBS staff have thought more about how they can develop services that are relevant to different types of business customers and different types of job seekers.

- Some respondents noted that the program has brought about an atmosphere of innovation in the organization.
- At least one individual remarked that there is now more urgency to the work of their organization.

• Replication of practices within the organizations

Many of the individuals who we interviewed are considering integrating unique aspects of their CEO programs into new and existing initiatives. Some already have concrete plans to do so. For example:

- CUNY is integrating elements of the ASAP program (such as the cohort design, the requirement for full-time study, and the comprehensive advisement aspects) into a new community college that is currently in the planning stage.
- Administration for Children's Services (ACS) is integrating Youth Financial Empowerment (YFE) into their Residential Bed Reduction Effort. They are also discussing how to integrate the financial education curriculum into the practice of the agency overall.
- DOHMH is using its Healthy Bodegas staff to train community groups (such as schools, churches, hospitals, recreation centers, youth groups, and PTAs) to adopt bodegas and to lead their own projects.
- SBS is opening two more Sector Centers and is investing in the sector approach in all of their Workforce1 Career Centers. They also are implementing the Career Advancement Program and community outreach in all Centers.

“There was a sense of despair for years that no one cared about people on probation. The agency felt responsible for them but had no resources to help them. Now [with Employment Works] staff feels we have that tool.”

- DYCD is adapting aspects of the YAIP program to a new Fatherhood Initiative involving non-custodial fathers. They are also adding some lessons learned from the CEO programs to their other programs (such as monthly meetings with providers).
- DOC is working on replicating the Rikers Island Education Expansion's occupational and career training with younger students and also expanding offerings to females.
- Good Shepherd Services (a YAIP provider) will be using a tool developed for YAIP to ensure that internships result in measurable learning experiences with other programs.
- Groundwork (a provider for Teen ACTION and Opportunity NYC) hosted a community social networking event for Opportunity NYC that they deemed very successful and are, therefore, replicating across multiple programs.

• Expansion of their missions

While most individuals we interviewed indicated that their CEO programs were well aligned with the missions of their organizations, a few expressed that the programs were an impetus to expanding their missions. For example:

“CEO programs really expand what our vision of our [DOC’s] mission can be.”

- DOC’s mission is technically the “care, custody, and control of inmates” but according to program personnel we interviewed, their CEO work allows them to focus on what happens when people are returned to the communities. Likewise, the CEO projects enable DJJ to address prevention measures (through their focus on reasons why youth do not attend school), along with re-entry issues.
- CEO projects also have encouraged agencies to articulate connections that their work has to poverty. For example, CUNY staff pointed out that the link between degree completion and reduction of poverty is well documented and that connection should not be forgotten. Furthermore, staff at DOHMH noted that though their work does not reduce poverty per se, it helps to alleviate the ramifications of poverty.

• Changes in operational systems

The majority of our interviewees indicated that their agencies already had strong operational systems prior to CEO involvement. However, a few remarked that the CEO programs have led to changes in the ways their organizations operate. Some examples of the kinds of changes that occurred are described below:

– Data and evaluation practices

- Staff from Healthy Bodegas noted that CEO reporting is more process focused and has led

them to more systematically track process objectives as well as outcome objectives.

- The Rikers Island Education Expansion program requires that staff members collect more student specific data, rather than just aggregate data, as has been done in the past.

– Accountability practices

- The Opportunity NYC program required Groundwork to focus on short-term targets, in addition to their annual targets. The staff of this program found that it boosted confidence levels to celebrate targets on a more regular basis, so they have replicated this strategy across multiple programs.
- The Employment Works program has necessitated more accountability of staff in terms of referrals and case management. According to a staff member from DOP, this program has required DOP staff “to be more aggressive and hopefully more supportive managers of people under their supervision.”

– Management practices

- DOP developed an assessment tool for probationers to determine if they were eligible for services. Staff from Employment Works shared this tool with partner providers, who have used it in other contexts.
- At least one respondent reported that the management reports that are required for CEO are now used in other aspects of the organization.

“The SBS and DOP relationship definitely exists because of CEO and that is a good thing.”

3. What larger (cross agency) impacts has CEO had?

If CEO's mission is to reduce poverty, then it requires the kind of change to individual organizations described above that is already underway. However, many families have needs that cut across multiple agencies and these services have not always been coordinated in a way that is most beneficial for individuals. Therefore, to truly meet its mission, CEO's impact must cast a wider net—across agencies and on NYC overall. Furthermore, to promote even greater change, the net should be cast beyond NYC—on other US cities and states. Below are examples of the types of impacts that respondents described that may be considered evidence of the beginnings of systems change:

- **Cross-agency collaboration**

CEO has engendered a very high volume of collaborations among agencies. Below are a few examples of connections that have been made:

- CEO has hosted a series of quarterly meetings to discuss disconnected youth, in which representatives from various agencies (including, among others, DYCD, ACS, DOE, NYC Libraries, DOHMH, DOC, CUNY, and DJJ) are in attendance. According to staff from these agencies, the meetings have been instrumental in coordinating services for this vulnerable youth population. A respondent from DJJ reported that the meetings have been very important because the agencies are serving many of the same youth and “are beginning to think of them as a pool rather than a series of needs.” Likewise, a staff member from ACS described the series of meetings as an opportunity to find out what others are doing and what their issues are. According to this

respondent, the meetings are evolving and are now beginning to allow them the venue to refer children into other programs.

- The Rikers Island Education Expansion Program fostered more collaboration between the DOC and the DOE. According to a respondent from DOC, these programs have fostered greater awareness of and emphasis on this important work across the DOE.
- Health and Hospitals Corporation (HHC) worked with HRA to assist their participants with welfare benefits and increased their collaboration with CUNY colleges.
- SBS also collaborated with OFE at DCA. Furthermore, SBS is collaborating with DOP for the Employment Works program.

- **Replication of programs or strategies across NYC agencies**

The increased collaboration described above has resulted in replications of some aspects of programs across agencies. For example:

- The DOE's Access GED Model is based on the CUNY Prep model.
- SBS launched a training program for LPNs with LaGuardia Community College.
- HRA is interested in replicating the sector approaches used by SBS.

“Just knowing what others are doing helps to create collaborative decisions about ways of getting things to happen more expeditiously.”

- **Replication of programs or strategies outside of NYC**

The impact of CEO is evident even outside of NYC. For example:

- New York State is conducting an EITC mailing for the rest of the state and Maryland is coordinating one for the entire state as well. Furthermore, according to staff at the Department of Finance (DOF), other cities (such as Los Angeles) and states (such as Virginia, Texas, and Kentucky) have expressed interest in doing similar mailings.
- In addition to NYC, Cities for Financial Empowerment (CFE) has 9 other member cities—San Francisco, Seattle, San Antonio, Savannah, Miami, Chicago, Providence, Los Angeles, and Newark.
- SBS shared their NYC Training Guide nationally through the Workforce Investment Board as a promising practice. Furthermore, New York State is currently considering replicating the model for the entire state where all of the workforce investment areas would use a model similar to that outlined in the Training Guide.
- NYC Justice Corps and Employment Works have shared their work at the Corps Network Conference and other providers have incorporated aspects of their approach to case management and their focus on workforce development. Specifically, some non-NYC programs in attendance at the Corps Network Conference have adopted the practice of using performance based contracts as is done in the NYC Justice Corps and Employment Works programs.

- The Board of Directors at GOSO has created a template for replicating GOSO programs. As a result, they have had visits from government officials in California and Kentucky. Additionally, the mayor of Newark has expressed interest in replication in that city.

B. Respondents' Feedback on Implementation Successes and Challenges

I. What challenges have CEO programs encountered?

During the interviews, respondents described the challenges that they have encountered in implementing their CEO programs. While some challenges were unique to individual programs, a few key themes emerged from our review of all responses. These are described below:

- **Compressed start-up timeline**

Several of the respondents (particularly those who were associated with newly developed programs) described challenges related to the timeline for initiating a program. In some cases, the programs were developed completely from scratch and all of the systems had to be put in place within a very short time period. One interviewee described the timeline as “unrealistic” and remarked that they had to move very quickly to create their plan, get staff on board, recruit participants, and to start meeting goals on “day one” of implementation. Another program director explained that she was not part of the program during the start-up period

but still sees the “fall out” from a start up period that was too compressed. Likewise, an agency staff member commented that her team wanted to rise to the mission of CEO; they desired a quality design and did not want to just “throw something together.” However, they did not have adequate time to give it the attention they felt it deserved.

• **Selecting and meeting program targets**

Some of the interviewees reported that selecting the appropriate program outcomes and meeting them has been a challenge for their programs. One respondent noted that CEO has a small window of time to show outcomes, even though the changes are long-term. This individual worries that his team did not select the right outcomes to demonstrate the impact that CEO expects to see. Likewise, an individual from a provider organization explained that goals and outcomes for participants in her program can be so difficult to reach that she sometimes “hounds her staff,” which is frustrating for everyone. In these situations, according to this respondent, “You can stop viewing the participant as a person and instead see them as a number. You can lose sight of the fact that this participant may just not be ready to reach that goal.”

• **Staffing issues**

As described earlier, some programs encountered challenges with their staffing. These difficulties came in the form of high turnover, inexperienced and naïve employees, and the limited capacity to find qualified individuals. Some programs also had difficulties with their leadership and experienced turnover before stabilizing.

• **Recruitment and retention of participants**

A few respondents indicated that their programs had difficulty recruiting participants who met all of the income and program qualifications (i.e., were academically prepared for the rigor of the programs). Additionally, some respondents noted that they were unable to retain participants for long enough to make an impact in the expected areas. In a similar vein, at least one respondent noted that engaging young people who are not mandated to participate in their program has been a particular challenge.

• **Funding**

A few interviewees stated that they do not have enough resources for their programs (though they have tried to use them strategically). Others stated that the lack of a guarantee of funding from year to year creates a challenge for longer-term planning and implementation.

• **Provider capacity**

Some agency respondents noted that they have had difficulty identifying a sufficient number of providers who have capacity to implement their CEO programs. (More information on agency respondents’ perceptions of the capacities of provider organizations is provided later in this report.) While agencies were positive overall about the provider capacities, some noted that there was inconsistency across the available providers and noted that there were some weak areas (such as data collection, ability to adjust to different models) and a need for more concentrated skills in areas such as job readiness and adult literacy.

- **Ensuring that the initiatives are integrated into agency work and sustained over time**

Some interviewees, particularly the key non-participant stakeholders (who may have a wider view of CEO's impact) expressed concern that the programs may not become integrated into the larger agency work. One respondent remarked that the programs may be "marginalized in the agencies" and could be considered "a nice little experiment that will go away when the money goes away." A few interviewees acknowledged that large agencies have many other pressing, day-to-day problems to address and may not be able to let these programs enter the core of their work. One respondent said, "Too much else... is on everyone's plates—and this is a pimple on the toe of a large agency. Not everyone realizes that this is a really important thing..."

2. What changes did respondents suggest to the program models?

Interviewees also had the opportunity to address the changes that they would like to make to their program models. Again, some of these changes were unique to individual programs. However, there were some commonalities across respondents' answers, as described below:

- **Tweak the program models**

Several programs described slight changes that they would like to make to their models, some of which are accommodations that needed to be made because they did not have sufficient time to plan the model during the start-up period. For example:

- CUNY ASAP would consider allowing students to participate regardless of the major in which they were interested. Also, they would admit double exempt students (i.e., students who required some remediation in order to be ready for college-level work), rather than only those who were triple exempt (i.e., had no need for remediation).¹⁰
- YAIP would consider opening the program to more participants outside of the targeted community districts.
- The LIFE Transitions program would ensure better differentiation of workshop instruction (including the creation of new materials to meet the needs of all of their learners) and would expand support services to families of participants.

- **Deepen or expand the work that they are currently doing**

Several programs would like to expand their work, which would be accomplished in a variety of ways. For example:

- The Nursing Career Ladders LPN program would like to add a component to support nurses in the year following graduation.
- Several programs, including LPN (DOE side), Young Adult Literacy, and YFE, would like to increase their numbers of staff.

¹⁰ The original 1,132 ASAP students were required to complete any developmental coursework prior to September 2007; approximately half took a remedial summer course. A new cohort of 450 students will start ASAP in fall 2009, most will begin the program with the need for one remedial course.

- CUNY Prep would like to expand or replicate their program in a systematic way. That is, similar programs with particular specialties would be created in each of the five boroughs.
- OFE would like to test a lot more of what is happening on the ground with the network of the approximately 60 financial education providers around the city—evaluating their services as well as impacts.
- The SBS program hopes for a longer funding period in order to demonstrate greater impacts for its clients.
- A couple of programs (including LIFE Transitions and NYC Justice Corps) noted that they hope to make even better use of the synergy created by CEO and would increase the number of referrals to other CEO programs that they are able to make.

• **Adjust outcomes to make them more realistic**

A handful of programs, including Healthy Bodegas, indicated that they would like to (or have already) adjust the initial outcomes that they set in order to make them more realistic.

3. How do agency staff perceive the capacity of provider organizations?

Key agency staff members who work with external service providers were asked to rate the extent to which they perceived that these organizations have the capacity to implement the CEO programs. Respondents used a scale of 1 to 5, where 1=very low and 5=very high to rate the providers' capacity.

Table 2 shows that agency staff rated the providers just above a 4, on average, indicating that they felt the providers have high capacity to do this work overall.

Table 2 **Agency Staff Ratings of Service Provider Capacity¹¹**

Rate the capacity of available service providers to implement each of your CEO-funded programs. (1=Very Low; 5=Very High)		
N	Mean	Range
22	4.09	3–5

Agency staff had many positive comments about the capacity of their providers. For example, staff from DYCD reported that the providers have largely “exceeded expectations.” Additionally, staff from DOC and DOP praised the providers’ “credible connections” to the community and explained that their record of service with the neighborhoods has been instrumental in eliciting change in these communities.

Notwithstanding the positive comments, some agency staff members pointed out that there is room for growth among provider organizations. For example, a few respondents noted that there is unevenness in the capacities among the organizations with which they work, describing it as “spotty” and adding that some geographic areas have fewer providers that are interested or have the capacity to do the work. Furthermore, agency staff pointed out a few specific areas of growth for provider organizations, such as the capacity to collect data and to be flexible enough to adapt materials and activities based on population and program needs. Additionally, agency staff perceive that there is a need to increase providers’ capacity to implement job readiness and adult literacy programs.

¹¹ Note that the results shown in Table 2 include ratings from more than one staff member from the same agency. These ratings are treated separately in this analysis. Additionally, some individuals gave ranges, rather than specific numbers and a few did not respond to the question.

4. How satisfied are agency staff with CEO overall and with their interactions with CEO staff?

Agency commissioners and key agency staff were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with CEO overall and with the manner in which CEO staff interacted with their agencies.¹² As shown in Table 3 below, using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1=very low and 5=very high, on average, respondents rated their satisfaction with CEO overall and their interaction with CEO staff as being high to very high.

Table 3 Satisfaction with CEO¹³

Rate your level of satisfaction with CEO Overall. (1=Very Low; 5=Very High)			Rate your satisfaction level with the manner in which CEO staff interacts with your agency (1=Very Low; 5=Very High)		
N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range
18	4.30	2.5–5	17	4.49	2.5–5

Respondents had many positive things to say about CEO overall and their interaction with CEO staff. Sometimes these comments overlapped. For example:

- **CEO overall and CEO staff are very responsive, supportive and encouraging**

Several respondents commented on how responsive, supportive and encouraging CEO has been. For example, one respondent said that CEO is willing to hear out any issue, problem, or new way of doing things. When issues have arisen, according to another respondent, CEO brings together the

best thinkers around the table to respond to the issue. Yet another respondent reported that CEO is “able to amplify the work and get you what you need to make it happen.” On the flip side, however, there were a couple of respondents who reported that they did not receive a lot of feedback or follow up from CEO.

The great majority respondents applauded CEO staff for being supportive and responsive, describing staff as outstanding, phenomenal, terrific, wonderful, accommodating, thoughtful, and always on the ball. Examples of how CEO staff have been supportive include: always responding to questions; being available and willing to discuss any issue on the table; showing a genuine interest in the program; being helpful in resolving issues in a way that meets needs on both sides; being flexible and understanding when it comes to challenges; and being a partner to the agency when conflicts arose with partners.

- **CEO overall and CEO staff encourage innovation and learning**

A number of respondents reported that their satisfaction with CEO overall stems from CEO’s encouragement of innovation. CEO pushes agencies to think outside the box to help their target populations. One respondent appreciated the ability to try new things and to evaluate what they are doing.

Similarly, a few respondents commented on how CEO staff encouraged them to think about

“[CEO staff] are smart, they take the time to ask questions to better understand things, they are very hands on and really help the program.”

¹² Respondents were promised that their responses would not be identified individually or with their agency in this section of the interview.

¹³ Some individuals gave ranges, rather than specific numbers and a few did not respond to the question.

“The staff have been incredibly helpful. They are very hands on and very responsive. They probably would have been that way if they had been in Alaska but their responsiveness is reflective of ...the Mayor’s approach to all matters. They are very responsive and they take education and poverty measures very seriously.”

and document best practices and share learnings within and outside the agency, including pushing them to think about data elements and tracking.

Additional themes arose related to satisfaction with CEO overall and interaction with CEO staff, respectively.

- **CEO focuses on poverty and brings together resources and diverse partners to focus on poverty**

When expanding on their satisfaction with CEO overall, many respondents commented on the fact that CEO directly addresses poverty (including how CEO is redefining poverty), and that it brings together resources and “allies” to focus on poverty. CEO also brings together diverse partners to work toward a common goal. According to one respondent, CEO has the ability to connect and break silos.

- **CEO staff are great to work with**

Several respondents extolled the overall positive relationship they have with CEO staff, citing that they “get along well” and that CEO staff are “easy to work with” and “very professional.” According to one respondent, they have a very good, collegial relationship with CEO.

5. What potential new directions would agencies and providers like CEO to take?

Agency and provider respondents described some potential new directions that they would like CEO to take in the future. Some of these directions involve the deepening of work that CEO has already begun and some are additional innovations that they would like CEO to consider. Following is a list of several of the most consistent themes that emerged from the interviews.

- **Focus on adolescent and adult literacy**

Several respondents noted that improving literacy among the adolescent and adult populations is critical to addressing poverty. Having poor literacy skills is a roadblock to participation across several of the CEO programs, including CUNY ASAP, CUNY Prep, YAIP, LIFE Transitions, and the Nursing Career Ladders LPN and RN programs. Individuals who we interviewed described the problem as a “huge” and “desperate” unmet need and felt CEO should focus on more programs that are specifically geared toward this problem.¹⁴

- **Expand role in coordination of services**

Many of the interviewees described CEO’s coordination of services as one of its most beneficial aspects. They saw the working groups and connections that have been made across agencies as just beginning to make larger impacts and hope to continue and deepen this work in the future. One respondent suggested that this work could be expanded by having a “CEO Specialists” who understood all the programs and could connect

¹² It should be noted that CEO currently funds a dozen young adult literacy programs hosted by community-based organizations under contract to DYCD and the NYC public libraries.

participants across CEO programs. For example, when participants' families visit them in juvenile detention, there could be individuals who would talk to them (and/or resources available) about other CEO programs for which they might be eligible.

In the same vein, one participant suggested that CEO could host meetings or conferences where providers and policy makers come together to discuss the issues. This individual pointed out that the world of the provider is often separate from the world of the policy maker and this can be problematic. Furthermore, it would be helpful to hear from the participants themselves in this context.

- **Expand role in facilitation of processes**

Respondents also appreciated CEO's role in facilitating processes and reducing "red tape" in order to eliminate roadblocks for participants and enable programs to move forward more quickly than they would be able to otherwise. A few respondents suggested that CEO might be able to expand their role regarding the expedition and prioritization of agency contracts and hiring.

- **Deepen the evaluation work for programs that was begun previously**

A number of respondents reported that they would have liked even more support from CEO with evaluation. In fact, when asked how CEO could be more helpful, a few respondents expressed a desire for more clarity regarding evaluation (e.g., purpose of data collection, how results will be used, how programs will be evaluated for refunding, and more communication regarding evaluation process and expectations). Furthermore, they hoped to have more in-depth evaluation information that would allow them to examine their work

in a thoughtful way and could inform next steps with the programs.

- **Ready the marketplace for populations who complete programs**

Respondents from a few programs, such as YFE, CUNY Prep, and NYC Justice Corps, suggested that CEO focus their attention and resources on the next set of needs that their participants will have when they complete the programs. For example, participants from these programs have needs around housing and employment. Also, personnel from the NYC Justice Corps suggested that CEO should focus on opportunities that will arise from the emerging green market.

- **Track innovations in other cities**

A few respondents suggested that CEO should monitor innovations that other cities put into place in order to reduce poverty and its effects and share best practices with staff from CEO programs. For example, a respondent from DOC described an innovative program called the High Point Intervention, which aims to eliminate open air drug markets and violence by involving family members and community leaders. This initiative is aligned with CEO's mission and has shown promising results.

"What stands in the way for so many of these young people...is that they can't read and write at a high enough level to get a decent internship or to stay out of trouble. It's so much easier to act out than to admit that you don't know how to read."

III. Concluding Thoughts

Overall, this evaluation found that the work of CEO and its staff was very well received by the organizations. Some changes that agency and provider staff noted were immediate and obvious, such as the addition of new programs and staff and the expansion of services. Others were more subtle but equally as important and with potential for long-term change, such as transformations in the culture and in staff's perceptions of the mission of the organizations. Furthermore, nearly all staff who we interviewed expressed pleasure and enthusiasm with the opportunity to participate in CEO, recognizing that this work has the potential to bring substantive changes both within and outside NYC.

In part, staff's satisfaction with the program was due to the qualities of the CEO staff. These qualities include not only passion and knowledge but also capacity, as they are ideally situated in the Mayor's Office where they have more opportunity to break

down bureaucratic processes and clear roadblocks than they would if they were located elsewhere. It is also due, in large part, to the way CEO approaches its mission. Because poverty is a systemic problem, it requires a systemic solution. Evidence from this evaluation suggests that the complex and innovative strategies that CEO has implemented to meet their mission to reduce poverty may have the power to enact systemic organizational change. The best evidence of this is in the inter-agency collaboration that the work has engendered. When the agencies have the opportunity to collaborate, their work is inevitably stronger, as there is sharing of best practices, ideas, and possibilities may emerge. Moreover, the replication of practices and programs inside and outside of NYC allows the work to affect a greater number of individuals, thereby further coordinating and adding power to efforts to reduce poverty.



Appendices

Study Sample

Table A-1 **Respondent Group and Program Responsibility**

Respondent Group	N Respondents (unduplicated)	N Different Respondents with Responsibility for	
		Multiple Programs	Single Programs
Agency Staff	38	14	24
External Providers	7	3	4
Other Key Stakeholders	5	5	–
Total	50	22	28

Table A-2 **Sample by Agency and Type of Respondent**

Agency	Respondent Group						Total N Interviews
	Agency Staff		External Providers		Other Key Stakeholder		
	N Individuals	N Interviews	N Individuals	N Interviews	N Individuals	N Interviews	
CUNY	8	4	1	1			5
SBS	5	3	1	1			4
DOE	2	2	–	–			2
DOC	3	3	2	1			4
DJJ	2	1	1	1			2
DOHMH	4	2	–	–			2
DYCD	4	4	2	2			6
Libraries	3	1	–	–			1
ACS	1	1	–	–			1
HHC	1	1	–	–			1
DCA	2	1	–	–			1
HRA	2	1	–	–			1
DOF	1	1	–	–			1
OMB					2	1	1
MOCS					2	1	1
DM Walcott					1	1	1
Total	38	25	7	6	5	3	34

List of Respondents

Erika Ahdoot, Associate Executive Director of Programs, NYC Department of Youth and Community Development

Nina Aledort, Assistant Commissioner, NYC Department of Juvenile Justice

Paula Bailey, Vice President, Grant Associates/DB Grant

Sabrina Baronberg, Deputy Director of Physical Activity and Nutrition Program, NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

Eve Cagan, Director of Planning for Health Promotion Disease Prevention, NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

Bill Chong, Deputy Commissioner, NYC Department of Youth and Community Development

Margaret Cohen, Senior Director, Workforce Planning and Development, NYC Health and Hospitals Corporation

Vaughn Crandall, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, NYC Department of Correction

Susan Dalmas, Director of Adult Literacy Programs, Queens Borough Public Library

Michael Dardia, Deputy Budget Director, NYC Office of Management and Budget

Robert Doar, Commissioner, NYC Human Resources Administration

Diane Edelson, Senior Vice President, Grant Associates/DB Grant

Richard Fish, Senior Advisor for Community Development, NYC Department of Youth and Community Development

Lisa Flores, NYC Mayor's Office of Contracts

Lianne Friedman, Chief Operating Officer, Office of Adult and Continuing Education, NYC Department of Education

Tracy Garcia, Director, Teen ACTION, NYC Department of Youth and Community Development

Alan Gartner, Chief of Staff to Deputy Mayor Walcott

Catherine Gaul, Assistant Commissioner, NYC Department of Small Business Services

Mark Goldsmith, Executive Director, Getting Out and Staying Out

Derrick Griffith, Founding Director/Principal, CUNY Prep

Martin Horn, Commissioner, NYC Departments of Correction and Probation

Angie Kamath, Deputy Commissioner, NYC Department of Small Business Services

Ali Knight, Director, NYC Justice Corps, Prisoner Reentry Institute, John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Dominique Jones, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Youth Development, NYC Administration for Children's Services

Donna Linderman, University Director for ASAP, City University of New York

Tim Lisante, Deputy Superintendent, NYC Department of Education

Sister Paulette LoMonaco, Executive Director, Good Shepherd Services

Cathie Mahon, Executive Director and Assistant Commissioner, Office of Financial Empowerment, NYC Department of Consumer Affairs

Sam Miller, Assistant Commissioner of Communications and Government Affairs, NYC Department of Finance

John Mogelescu, Senior University Dean for Academic Affairs, City University of New York

Jeanne Mullgrav, Commissioner, NYC Department of Youth and Community Development

Dorian Nicolletti, Program Director, Italian American Civil Rights League

Adam Rabiner, Director of the Young Adult Internship Program, NYC Department of Youth and Community Development

Stephen Tosh, Executive Director/CEO, Phipps Community Development Corporation

Robert Walsh, Commissioner, NYC Department of Small Business Services

Ari Wax, Assistant Commissioner, NYC Department of Correction

LaShawn Williams, Director of Training and Development, NYC Health and Hospitals Corporation



List of Acronyms

ACS	Administration for Children's Services
CFE	Cities for Financial Empowerment
CUNY ASAP	The City University of New York's Accelerated Study in Associate Programs
DCA	Department of Consumer Affairs
DJJ	Department of Juvenile Justice
DOE	Department of Education
DOC	Department of Correction
DOHMH	Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
DOP	Department of Probation
DYCD	Department of Youth and Community Development
EITC	Earned Income Tax Credit
GED	General Equivalency Diploma
GOSO	Getting Out and Staying Out
HHC	Health and Hospital Corporation
HRA	Human Resources Administration
LPN	Licensed Practical Nurse
OFE	Office of Financial Empowerment
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
RFP	Request for Proposal
RN	Registered Nurse
SBS	Department of Small Business Services
SBHC	School Based Health Centers
WIA	Work Investment Act
YAIP	Young Adult Internship Program
YFE	Youth Financial Empowerment



Study of CEO Impact

Consent Notice for Agency Staff

New York City's Center for Economic Opportunity, or CEO, has funded approximately 40 initiatives aimed at reducing the number of people living in poverty in New York City (NYC). Metis and Westat are research firms selected by CEO to evaluate many of CEO's programs.

CEO works with numerous City agencies and external service providers to plan and implement their programs. As a result, CEO is interested to learn how their programs are regarded, and how their involvement has affected the agencies and service providers with whom they work. In order to examine these issues, Metis is conducting interviews with staff at agencies and service providers that work with CEO, as well as with key stakeholders who are not directly participating in CEO's programs.

We appreciate your willingness to participate in an interview for this study. Participation is voluntary, and the interview will last approximately one hour. You may skip any question that you do not want to answer. You may terminate the interview at any time.

The data collected through the interviews will be written up in a report to CEO. The report or a version of the report may also be available to the public. In order to reflect specific findings and accomplishments, Metis will need to identify respondents or their agencies/organizations in our reporting to CEO. Thus, with the exception of the final section, which focuses on satisfaction with the CEO Initiative, this interview will not be anonymous. For the final section of the interview, your answers will be aggregated with those of all other respondents.

If you have questions about us or the project you may contact:

Stan Schneider, Metis Associates
(212) 425-8833
sschneider@metisassoc.com

Please print and sign your name below to indicate your consent for this interview.

(Print name)

(Sign name)

Study of CEO's Impact on Agencies

Interview Protocol (For Agency Commissioners and Key Agency Staff)

Respondent Name: _____

Agency: _____

Agency's CEO Programs: _____

Title of Respondent: _____

Years in Current Position: _____ Years at Agency: _____

Introduction:

Hello, I am _____, from Metis Associates. Metis and Westat are research firms selected by The Center for Economic Opportunity, or CEO, to evaluate many of CEO's programs. As you probably know, CEO has funded approximately 40 initiatives across numerous sponsoring agencies aimed at reducing the number of people living in poverty in New York City (NYC).

CEO's work to date has included program planning and design, collaboration with City agencies to provide program oversight, selection of evaluation firms who are currently conducting evaluations of CEO programs, and working with agencies to collect and use data to improve services and client outcomes. Because CEO works with many City agencies, they are interested to learn how their involvement has affected agencies and how agencies regard their programs. In order to examine these issues, we're conducting interviews with staff at agencies that work with CEO.

We anticipate that this interview will last about one hour. Our questions will focus on seven topics: your agency's involvement with CEO, the effects of CEO on your agency's programs and staffing, changes in agency practices, innovation, replication/adaptation, collaboration, and satisfaction with CEO. The data collected through the interviews will be written up in a report to CEO. The report or a version of the report may also be available to the public. In order to reflect specific findings and accomplishments we will need to identify respondents or their agencies. We encourage you to be candid during the interview; however, with the exception of the final section, which focuses on satisfaction with the CEO Initiative, this interview will not be anonymous. For the final section of the interview, your answers will be aggregated with those of all other respondents.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

We would like to ask your permission to record this interview. The recording is for note-taking purposes only and will not be shared with CEO. May we record the interview?

Let us begin.

We understand that your agency operates the following CEO program(s): *[read list above]*. Is that correct?



Involvement with CEO

1. To what extent (if any) has the CEO Initiative's placement in the Mayor's Office affected your CEO program(s), for example the resources, troubleshooting, and/or visibility of the program(s)? Please explain your answer.
2. To what extent (if any) has the CEO Initiative's placement in the Mayor's Office affected your agency overall, or programs in your agency that are not funded by CEO? Please explain your answer.

Program(s) and Staff

3. To what extent (if any) has the CEO Initiative been a vehicle for: implementing new programs within your agency, adding new elements to existing programs, or strengthening programs at your agency?

Has the CEO Initiative:

- Led to increased program accountability? If so, does this increased level of accountability exist only in your CEO programs, or has it spilled over to your agency's other programs as well?
- Provided assistance that has led to program expansion or strengthening in your CEO programs? Please explain. What about in your agency's other programs, or in the agency overall?

4. How many new staff did your agency hire for CEO-funded programs with the additional resources from CEO? What are their titles or roles? How have these staff contributed to your agency and/or contributed to agency capacity? What is your assessment of the overall quality of the new staff? Using a 5-point scale, please rate their overall quality. The scale is: Very Low (1), Low (2), Moderate (3), High (4), or Very High (5).

5. If your agency uses external service providers to implement your CEO-funded program(s), what is your assessment of the capacity of available service providers to implement anti-poverty programs such as yours? Using the same 5-point scale, please rate the capacity of available service providers to implement each of your CEO-funded programs. The scale is: Very Low (1), Low (2), Moderate (3), High (4), or Very High (5).

For each program:

- Overall rating of provider's(s') capacity. Please explain your rating.
- Are there a sufficient number of high-quality providers to implement your current CEO program? If not, what is lacking?
- Are there a sufficient number of high-quality providers to implement an expanded version of the program? If not, what is lacking?
- What, if anything, has your agency or CEO-funded program done to build provider capacity?

6. What constraints are agencies under that the CEO Initiative or CEO-funded programs help to address? For example, have CEO funds expanded the types of services that can be offered under existing funding streams? Are there other examples of constraints that CEO has helped to address?

7. For each of your CEO-funded programs, if you could make any changes that you wanted to the program model, what are the top two or three changes you would make? Please specify to which program(s) you are referring.

Changes in Practice

8. To what extent and how do the CEO programs relate to your agency's mission? Please explain.

9. To what extent (if any) has involvement with the CEO Initiative and implementation of a CEO-funded program(s) altered your agency's culture or management style? Please explain your answer.

In what way (if any) has it affected:

- Data and evaluation practices?
- Program management?
- Accountability?
- *If any of the above has been impacted:* do these changes affect only CEO-funded programs, or do they affect other programs as well?
 - *If they affect other programs:* how has staff on non-CEO programs reacted to these changes?

10. Can you provide examples of how, if at all, the CEO Initiative and implementation of a CEO-funded program(s) have influenced your agency in terms of:

- Agency policies and practices
- Target populations
- Resource allocation priorities
- Staffing patterns or staff development
- Service-integration across programs and/or across agencies
- Decision-making processes
- *If examples are provided of any of the above:* do the changes affect only CEO-funded programs, or do they affect other programs, as well?
 - *If they affect other programs:* how has staff on non-CEO programs reacted to these changes?

11. What is the biggest challenge, if any, that your agency faced in terms of changing or adapting your work in order to meet CEO's reporting or other requirements?

Innovation

CEO seeks to support innovative and results-driven solutions to poverty. They define innovation as developing new program models or adopting evidence-based programs.

12. What is innovative about your CEO funded project(s)?

13. To what extent (if any) has the CEO Initiative facilitated innovative approaches by your agency to combating poverty? Please explain your answer.

- *How* has the CEO Initiative facilitated innovation?
- Do you see this innovation as something that can be continued without additional funding from CEO? Explain your answer.

14. Are there any additional innovative ideas that you would like CEO to consider?

Replication/Adaptation

15. Are there elements of your CEO program(s) or program model(s) that are **currently being adapted or replicated** in other programs? If no, why not?

If yes:

- What element or elements of programs are being adapted/replicated?
- How are they being adapted/replicated, and at what scale?
- Is this being accomplished with or without new resources? What sources?

16. Are you **planning to adapt or replicate** any elements of your CEO program(s) or program model(s)? If no, why not?

If yes:

- What element or elements of programs are you planning to replicate or adapt?
- How do you plan to adapt or replicate, and at what scale?
- Will this be accomplished with or without new resources? What sources?

17. Are there lessons learned from your involvement with CEO or from your CEO-funded program(s) that are being applied to other programs in your agency? If so, please describe.

Participation in Citywide Anti-Poverty Initiative/Collaboration

18. To what extent (if any) has the CEO Initiative contributed to inter-agency collaboration and coordination? Please explain your answer.

- Can you provide any specific examples of inter-agency relationships that have been created or strengthened as a result of the CEO Initiative?
- To what extent have the relationships you just described yielded specific results? Please explain.

19. Prior to the CEO Initiative, did you think of the work being done by your agency as directly impacting poverty? In what ways (if any) has the CEO Initiative's focus on poverty shaped the way your agency sees its work? Has it affected the goals, mission, or priorities of your agency?

20. To what extent (if any) is there value to your agency in participating in the CEO Initiative's citywide anti-poverty agenda? Please explain your answer.

21. Has your involvement with the CEO Initiative brought new attention or visibility to your work? If yes, please describe.



Feedback/Satisfaction – Interviewer should remind respondent that this section is anonymous

22. Using the same 5-point scale as earlier, rate your level of satisfaction with the CEO Initiative overall. Is your satisfaction level Very Low (1), Low (2), Moderate (3), High (4), or Very High (5)? Please explain your answer.

23. Again, using the same 5-point rating scale, rate your satisfaction level with the manner in which CEO staff interact with your agency. Is your satisfaction level Very Low (1), Low (2), Moderate (3), High (4), or Very High (5)? Please explain your answer.

24. Overall, what is the greatest benefit of the CEO Initiative to your agency?

25. What is the most challenging aspect of the implementation of the CEO Initiative?

26. In what ways, if any, could the CEO Initiative be more helpful to your agency?

Wrap-Up

27. What question(s) did we *not* ask you that we should have? Is there anything else you would like to tell us about CEO or your programs?

Thank you for your time today and for sharing your thoughts about CEO and how it has affected your agency/organization.

Study of CEO Impact

Consent Notice for External Service Providers

New York City's Center for Economic Opportunity, or CEO, has funded approximately 40 initiatives aimed at reducing the number of people living in poverty in New York City (NYC). Metis and Westat are research firms selected by CEO to evaluate many of CEO's programs.

CEO works with numerous City agencies and external service providers to plan and implement their programs. As a result, CEO is interested to learn how their programs are regarded, and how their involvement has affected the agencies and service providers with whom they work. In order to examine these issues, Metis is conducting interviews with staff at agencies and service providers that work with CEO, as well as with key stakeholders who are not directly participating in CEO's programs.

We appreciate your willingness to participate in an interview for this study. Participation is voluntary, and the interview will last approximately 45 minutes. You may skip any question that you do not want to answer. You may terminate the interview at any time.

The data collected through the interviews will be written up in a report to CEO. The report or a version of the report may also be available to the public. In order to reflect specific findings and accomplishments, Metis will need to identify respondents or their agencies in our reporting to CEO. Thus, with the exception of the final section, which focuses on satisfaction, this interview will not be anonymous. For the final section of the interview, your answers will be aggregated with those of all other respondents.

If you have questions about us or the project you may contact:

Stan Scheider, Metis Associates
(212) 425-8833
sschneider@metisassoc.com

Please print and sign your name below to indicate your consent for this interview.

(Print name)

(Sign name)

Study of CEO's Impact on Agencies

Interview Protocol (For External Service Providers)

Respondent Name: _____	
Service Provider: _____	
Service Provider's CEO Programs and Sponsoring Agencies: _____	

Title of Respondent: _____	
Years in Current Position: _____	Years at Organization: _____

Introduction:

Hello, I am _____, from Metis Associates. Metis and Westat are research firms selected by The Center for Economic Opportunity, or CEO, to evaluate many of CEO's programs. As you probably know, CEO has funded approximately 40 initiatives across numerous sponsoring agencies aimed at reducing the number of people living in poverty in New York City (NYC).

CEO's work to date has included program planning and design, collaboration with City agencies to provide program oversight, selection of evaluation firms who are currently conducting evaluations of CEO programs, and working to collect and use data to improve services and client outcomes. CEO is interested in learning how their involvement has affected agencies and service providers with whom they work, and how agencies and service providers regard their programs. In order to examine these issues, we're conducting interviews with staff at agencies and organizations that work with CEO.

We anticipate that this interview will last about 45 minutes. Our questions will focus on five topics: the effects of CEO on your organization's programs and staffing, changes in organizational practices, innovation, replication/adaptation, and satisfaction with CEO programs and with the agency that sponsors your CEO program(s). We understand that your experience with CEO is mainly through the sponsoring agency.

The data collected through the interviews will be written up in a report to CEO. The report or a version of the report may also be available to the public. In order to reflect specific findings and accomplishments we will need to identify respondents or their organizations in our reporting to CEO. We encourage you to be candid during the interview; however, with the exception of the final section, which focuses on satisfaction, this interview will not be anonymous. For the final section of the interview, your answers will be aggregated with those of all other respondents.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

We would like to ask your permission to record this interview. The recording is for note-taking purposes only and will not be shared with CEO or agencies. May we record the interview?

Let us begin.

We understand that your organization is implementing the following CEO program(s): *[read list above - naming program and agency sponsor]*. Is that correct?

Program(s) and Staff

1. To what extent (if any) has the CEO Initiative been a vehicle for: implementing new programs within your organization, adding new elements to existing programs, or strengthening programs at your organization?

Has the CEO Initiative/sponsoring agency:

- Led to increased program accountability? If so, does this increased level of accountability exist only in your CEO programs, or has it spilled over to your organization's other programs as well?
- Provided assistance (through the sponsoring agency) that has led to program expansion or strengthening in your CEO programs? Please explain. What about in your organization's other programs, or in the organization overall?

2. Did your organization hire new staff for CEO-funded programs? If so, how many? What are their titles or roles? How have these staff contributed to your organization and/or contributed to organizational capacity? What is your assessment of the overall quality of the new staff? Using a 5-point scale, please rate their overall quality. The scale is: Very Low (1), Low (2), Moderate (3), High (4), or Very High (5).

3. What constraints are organizations under that the CEO Initiative or CEO-funded programs help to address? For example, have CEO funds expanded the types of services that can be offered under existing funding streams? Are there other examples of constraints that CEO has helped to address?

4. For each of your CEO-funded programs, if you could make any changes that you wanted to the program model, what are the top two or three changes you would make? Please specify to which program(s) you are referring.

Changes in Practice

5. To what extent and how do the CEO programs relate to your organization's mission? Please explain.

6. To what extent (if any) has involvement with the CEO Initiative and implementation of a CEO-funded program(s) altered your organization's culture or management style? Please explain your answer.

In what way (if any) has it affected:

- Data and evaluation practices?
- Program management?
- Accountability?
- *If any of the above has been impacted:* do these changes affect only CEO-funded programs, or do they affect other programs, as well?
 - *If they affect other programs:* how has staff on non-CEO programs reacted to these changes?



7. Can you provide examples of how, if at all, the CEO Initiative and implementation of a CEO-funded program(s) have influenced your organization in terms of:

- Organizational policies and practices
- Target populations
- Resource allocation priorities
- Staffing patterns or staff development
- Service-integration across programs and/or across service providers
- Decision-making processes
- *If examples are provided of any of the above:* do the changes affect only CEO-funded programs, or do they affect other programs, as well?
 - *If they affect other programs:* how has staff on non-CEO programs reacted to these changes?

8. What is the biggest challenge, if any, that your organization faced in terms of changing or adapting your work in order to meet CEO's reporting or other requirements?

9. Prior to the CEO Initiative, did you think of the work being done by your organization as directly impacting poverty? In what ways (if any) has the CEO Initiative's focus on poverty shaped the way your organization sees its work? Has it affected the goals, mission, or priorities of your organization?

10. Has your involvement with the CEO Initiative brought new attention or visibility to your work? If yes, please describe.

Innovation

CEO seeks to support innovative and results-driven solutions to poverty. They define innovation as developing new program models or adopting evidence-based programs.

11. What is innovative about your CEO funded project(s)?

12. To what extent (if any) has the CEO Initiative facilitated innovative approaches by your organization to combating poverty? Please explain your answer.

- *How* has the CEO Initiative facilitated innovation?
- Do you see this innovation as something that can be continued without additional funding from CEO? Explain your answer.

13. Are there any additional innovative ideas that you would like CEO to consider?

Replication/Adaptation

14. Are there elements of your CEO program(s) or program model(s) that are **currently being adapted or replicated** in other programs? If no, why not?

If yes:



- What element or elements of programs are being adapted/replicated?
- How are they being adapted/replicated, and at what scale?
- Is this being accomplished with or without new resources? What sources?

15. Are you **planning to adapt or replicate** any elements of your CEO program(s) or program model(s)?
If no, why not?

If yes:

- What element or elements of programs are you planning to replicate or adapt?
- How do you plan to adapt or replicate, and at what scale?
- Will this be accomplished with or without new resources? What sources?

16. Are there lessons learned from your involvement with CEO or from your CEO-funded program(s) that are being applied to other programs in your organization? If so, please describe.

Feedback/Satisfaction – Interviewer should remind respondent that this section is anonymous

17. Using the same 5-point scale as earlier, rate your level of satisfaction with the agency that sponsors your CEO program. Is your satisfaction level Very Low (1), Low (2), Moderate (3), High (4), or Very High (5)? Please explain your answer.

18. Overall, what is the greatest benefit of your CEO program(s) to your organization?

19. What is the most challenging aspect of the implementing CEO programs?

20. In what ways, if any, could the sponsoring agency be more helpful to your organization?

Wrap-Up

21. What question(s) did we *not* ask you that we should have? Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your CEO programs or the sponsoring agency?

Thank you for your time today and for sharing your thoughts about CEO and how it has affected your organization.

Study of CEO Impact

Consent Notice for Key Stakeholders

New York City's Center for Economic Opportunity, or CEO, has funded approximately 40 initiatives aimed at reducing the number of people living in poverty in New York City (NYC). Metis and Westat are research firms selected by CEO to evaluate many of CEO's programs.

CEO works with numerous City agencies and external service providers to plan and implement their programs. As a result, CEO is interested to learn how their programs are regarded, and how their involvement has affected the agencies and service providers with whom they work. In order to examine these issues, Metis is conducting interviews with staff at agencies and service providers that work with CEO, as well as with key stakeholders who are not directly participating in CEO's programs.

We appreciate your willingness to participate in an interview for this study. Participation is voluntary, and the interview will last approximately 15 - 20 minutes. You may skip any question that you do not want to answer. You may terminate the interview at any time.

The data collected through the interviews will be written up in a report to CEO. The report or a version of the report may also be available to the public. In order to reflect specific findings and accomplishments, Metis will need to identify respondents or their agencies/organizations in our reporting to CEO. Thus, this interview will not be anonymous.

If you have questions about us or the project you may contact:

Stan Schneider, Metis Associates
(212) 425-8833
sschneider@metisassoc.com

Please print and sign your name below to indicate your consent for this interview.

(Print name)

(Sign name)

Study of CEO's Impact

Interview Protocol (For Key Non-Participant Stakeholders)

Respondent Name: _____

Title of Respondent: _____

Years in Current Position: _____

Introduction:

Hello – I am Stan Schneider, President of Metis Associates. Metis and Westat are research firms that have been selected by The Center for Economic Opportunity, or CEO, to evaluate many of the CEO's programs. As you know, CEO was established by the Mayor to implement, monitor, and evaluate New York City's anti-poverty agenda. CEO is interested to learn how their initiatives have affected the City and City agencies, and how their programs are regarded. In order to examine these issues, we are conducting interviews with a number of key staff at the agencies that work with CEO, as well as with key stakeholders who are not operating CEO programs.

The data collected through the interviews will be written up in a report to CEO. The report or a version of the report may also be available to the public. In order to reflect specific findings and accomplishments, we will need to identify respondents or their departments/agencies in our reporting to CEO. We encourage you to be candid during the interview; however, this interview will not be anonymous. We anticipate that this interview will last 15- to 20-minutes.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

We would like to ask your permission to record this interview. The recording is for note-taking purposes only and will not be shared with CEO. May we record the interview?

Let us begin.

Interview Questions:

CEO's mission is to reduce the number of people living in poverty in New York City through the implementation of results-driven and innovative initiatives. To accomplish their goals, CEO's work is based on a few key concepts:

- The work is targeted to several key populations (young adults, working poor, young families);
- The work generally focuses on employment and education strategies;
- CEO has a strong emphasis on measuring results and accountability
- CEO is interested in new/innovative approaches

1. How well do you think CEO is accomplishing its goals and key concepts?

- To what extent and how do you see your organization/agency/department as contributing to these goals?

2. What do you consider to be the greatest benefit(s), or potential benefit(s), of the CEO Initiative? Why? Can you provide specific examples of CEO programs that you believe best exemplify these benefits?
3. What do you consider to be the most challenging aspect(s) of the implementation of the CEO Initiative? Why? Can you provide specific examples that you believe best exemplify these challenges?
4. To the best of your knowledge, to what extent (if any) has the CEO Initiative contributed to collaboration and coordination among agencies and service providers in New York City? Please explain your answer.
 - Can you provide specific examples of relationships that have been created or strengthened as a result of the CEO Initiative?
 - To what extent have the relationships you just described yielded specific results? Please explain.
5. To what extent (if any) do you believe that the CEO Initiative's placement in the Mayor's Office has benefitted the CEO Initiative? How has it done so? To what extent (if any) has placement in the Mayor's Office been challenging to the CEO Initiative?
6. To what extent do you believe CEO programs are important to New York City? In what way(s)?
7. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the CEO Initiative or your viewpoint about how it has affected the City and/or City government?

Thank you for your time today and for sharing your thoughts about the CEO Initiative.