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The Institute of Public Policy was created to enhance knowledge and understanding of public policy issues relevant to policymakers and Missouri citizens. It does this through training, research, direct support to policymakers upon request, and related activities.

This report provides a brief look back at the Institute’s first ten years, summarizes the Institute’s activities for fiscal year 2011–2012 (July 1-June 30), and outlines the future direction of the Institute. During the year, Bart Wechsler was named the Dean of the Truman School of Public Affairs, David Valentine retired to the role of Senior Fellow and director of the Missouri Legislative Academy, and Brian Dabson became Director of the Institute on July 1, 2012. These and related developments will have a positive impact on the trajectory of the Institute, a point that will be discussed at length in this report.

In the late 1990s, University of Missouri leadership began discussions that led to a significant new commitment to public affairs education, research, and public service. The stakeholders identified an array of services that the Institute could provide to the state legislature, state administrative agencies, and local governments. These included orientation programs, leadership training, decision support (research and information), conferences, a speaker series, and a university-government exchange program.

During these initial discussions, internal and external stakeholders expected the new Institute to provide policy analysis, research, and technical assistance for public officials. This was an extremely broad vision, a vision that presented both opportunities and challenges to the development of the Institute, a point that we will return to below.

The Institute began operations in the fall of 2000 as a unit within the newly created Truman School of Public Affairs. The Institute’s activities in the first two years were relatively modest, reflecting the challenges of any startup organization, but Institute activities ramped up in the 2003-2004 academic year, as additional staff were added to the organization.

---


2The creation of the Institute was recommended in Recommendations from the Stakeholder Advisory Committee of the Missouri Institute of Public Policy, Gary Stangler, Chairman, February 7, 2000. It can be found in Institute of Public Policy, Truman School of Public Affairs, University of Missouri - Columbia Five Year Review, March 9, 2007.
By its five year center review, during the 2006-2007 academic year, the Institute’s trajectory was set: it would be largely self-funded through grants and contracts by public and nonprofit entities. Grant-funded research is, of course, a type of public service; although not the type of service envisioned by those who participated in the development of the Institute. Unfunded public service remains important, but it was not as central to the activities of the Institute as those involved in its creation had envisioned or, indeed, for financial reasons, as those working in the Institute had hoped.

In the years following its creation, the Institute emerged as an active grants research and evaluation organization, expanded staff to acquire people with the skills necessary to conduct and report on its research, implemented a strategy for the translation of academic research for policymakers, and established a web and public service presence.

**Five Year Review of the Institute, 2007**

The Institute was required to undergo a review by an external review committee in 2007. The review team examined the Institute’s self-assessment³, and interviewed faculty and staff before submitting a report to the chancellor, provost and the Truman School⁴. The team’s evaluation of the Institute’s first five years was very positive:

> “The Institute has grown over the last six years, its upbeat and entrepreneurial young staff have worked flexibly on projects and developed skills to accommodate the increased workload and the variety of skills needed for the projects.”

The team made six recommendations covering Institute/Truman School relations, the Institute’s linkage with policymakers, and increased university funding. Overall, the review team’s recommendations were sound and the Institute adopted four of the five recommendations under its control; the fifth has been on hold due to capacity limitations.

**Planning for the Future: 2012 – 2017**

The enhanced status of the Truman School of Public Affairs as a college of the University of Missouri, the appointment of Dr. Bart Wechsler as its Dean, and the appointment of Brian Dabson as the Institute’s director, represent an important opportunity for charting the future course for the Institute of Public Policy.

There is an expectation that the Institute will channel more of its energies into pursuing its founding mission to enhance knowledge and understanding of public policy issues relevant to policymakers and Missouri citizens. The objective of the Institute is to be the primary source of independent, nonpartisan, evidence-based public policy analysis for Missouri.

³See Institute of Public Policy, Truman School of Public Affairs, University of Missouri-Columbia, Five Year Review, March 9, 2007.

⁴The review team’s recommendations were contained in a memorandum to Dr. Wechsler, dated April 29, 2007. The School responded to the recommendations in response to the Recommendations of the External Review Team, Institute of Public Policy, Truman School of Public Affairs, October 23, 2007.
This will require the development of two parallel strategies:

- Enhancing the overall capacity of the University of Missouri to address critical public policy issues. This means expanding and deepening relationships across the campus, and providing opportunities for engaging faculty and students from many departments with the work of the Institute.

- Building trust and confidence in the capacity of the University of Missouri to provide policy-relevant research and analysis. This means expanding and deepening relationships with leadership in state and local government and in nonprofit organizations across Missouri, through convening, training, policy briefings, and timely information.

A prospectus for this next phase was published in the fall of 2012.

### Brian Dabson Named New IPP Director

Brian Dabson became the Director of the Institute on July 1, 2012.

Brian Dabson has been a Research Professor in the Truman School since 2004. He is also the Director of the RUPRI Rural Futures Lab, Board Chair of the RUPRI Center for Rural Entrepreneurship, and a member of the Community Development Advisory Council of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. He was previously with the Rural Policy Research Institute (RUPRI) in the capacities of President & CEO and Vice President & COO.

Dabson has over 35 years of experience in public, private, and nonprofit sectors on both sides of the Atlantic. Recognized nationally and internationally for his work on entrepreneurship development, particularly in a rural context, he has given many keynote presentations and consulted across the United States, Europe, Australia, and India. He is also a frequent speaker and writer on rural policy and the implications of global forces on rural America.

Before 2004, he was President of CFED (formerly Corporation for Enterprise Development), a Washington DC-based national nonprofit organization dedicated to expanding economic opportunity through asset-building, entrepreneurship, and economic development. He held that position for 13 years. At the same time, he served two terms as President of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development’s (OECD) Forum on Social Innovations.

Before joining CFED in 1992, he was for nine years, the Managing Director of a European consulting and research organization specializing in economic development, training, and employment issues. Prior to that he worked for 13 years in metropolitan and city governments in Liverpool and Glasgow.
This section presents information about the Institute’s external activities, including grant activity, a description of its publications, and a summary of the local government training program. It also provides information about Institute funding, its staff, and Policy Research Scholars.

**Applied Research/Grants & Contracts**

Applied research is the lifeblood of the Institute, without it, the Institute would be unable to engage in most of the public service activities reported here. But applied research is also important in its own right. Applied research enables the Institute and the School to contribute to the information used by state agencies, local governments and nonprofit organizations to improve programs and the delivery of services to Missouri citizens. During FY 2012, for example, the Institute provided training, evaluation and related services to two state departments (the Missouri Department of Corrections and the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services) and 131 local governments and non-profit organizations. Much of that work has involved evaluation of program implementation at the local level. The Institute not only provides an evaluation of program delivery, but also coaching in evaluation. Many local organizations are not experienced in evaluation, have limited appreciation of its importance, and are not aware of how to use evaluation to improve or to justify their programs. The Institute’s evaluation approach is designed to enhance their evaluative capacity, thereby enabling them to accomplish these objectives.

The number of grant applications and the number of grants received per year have been fairly consistent for the last five years, as shown by Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Submitted</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Awarded</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding for the Institute**

Figure 1 presents the Institute’s revenue sources for FY 2008 through FY 2012. Most revenue sources have remained fairly constant over the entire period and while grant and contract revenues fluctuate year to year, the overall trend has been upward.

The mission enhancement funds are valuable to the Institute but they primarily fund the management of the Institute. Consequently, funding for public service activities is minimal.

---

1Mission Enhancement: University monies provided to the Truman School to support public service.

2Research Incentive Funds (RIF): The University retains a percentage of the total of each grant for university expenses; a portion of that is returned to the organization that conducted the research; TSPA rate: Monies paid to IPP staff for support provided to the Truman School such as work with the Global Scholars program and teaching.
Institute reports provide policy-relevant information that informs public policy, enhances data available to decision-makers, and simultaneously meets a variety of Institute, School and University objectives. Reports bring academically-based policy research into the public realm, thereby increasing the quality of information available to decision-makers. Publications based on Institute grants and contracts serve to educate the public about specific policy arenas while those based on evaluation research assist the general public, the affected policy community, and policy-makers in understanding the importance and use of evaluation data. All of this, of course, increases the visibility of the Institute, School, and University and contributes to the recognition of the University as a source of objective public policy analyses.

**Report Distribution**

The Institute published 44 web reports between July, 2007 and June 30, 2012. All reports are published on the Institute’s website and many are distributed to interested individuals/groups on a case-by-case basis. A typical report is distributed to approximately 50 individuals/organizations, including:

- Members of legislative committees of jurisdiction (30 to 40 members);
- Legislative staff and the legislative library;
- State administrative offices responsible for the program under review;
- Associations interested in the subject (e.g. teachers, school administrators, and veterans groups);
- University administrators and Truman School faculty; and
- Media (when the topic is of broad public interest).

Some reports generate wide national and state interest such as Stallmann and Johnson’s report *Economic Development Incentive Programs: Some Best Practices* (Report 13-2011). Other reports, such as Grissom and Keiser’s *The Impact of Principal Race on Teachers* (Report 05-2011), are of interest to specific legislative committees and policy-related interest groups. Finally, some reports are of interest to a small number of individuals and organizations. An example is *Constitutional Amendments, Statutory Revision, and Referenda Submitted to the Voters by the General Assembly or by Initiative Petition* (02-2011). This report is used by national organizations, such as Ballotpedia, and by those interested in trends and votes on specific Missouri ballot issues.
Institute Reports in the Media

Six of the eight Institute publications in FY 2011-2012 received press coverage. The most widely covered of these are:

- **The Impact of Principal Race on Teachers**, Jason Grissom (Truman School) and Lael Keiser (Truman School and Political Science).
- **The Path to Successful Reentry: The Relationship Between Correctional Education, Employment, and Recidivism**, Jake Cronin, Institute of Public Policy.
- **The Impact and Implications of Term Limits in Missouri**, David Valentine, Institute of Public Policy.
- **Internet Sales and Use Tax Issues in Missouri**, Ying Huang, John Kosash, and Andrew Wesemann, graduate students in the Truman School of Public Affairs.

The MU News Bureau tracks media coverage for Institute reports. Two reports, mentioned previously, received international coverage and all have received national coverage. The most significant of these was Stallmann and Johnson’s report on economic development incentive programs that was referenced in at least 231 radio, television and print articles. The MU News Bureau indicates that, according to its tracking, of all research publicized during the year, this was the most widely reported. Overall, at least 300 media outlets covered these five reports and the Missouri Internet sales tax report was also covered on 66 MissouriNet radio stations, as of early May, 2012.

“Many new, inexperienced legislators do not fully understand many of the complex issues for which they must make policy. They are so busy learning how to do their jobs before their term limit expires that they do not have time to adequately research each issue. This often results in legislators relying on lobbyists to educate them on issues, and while most lobbyists do not try to deliberately mislead legislators, the legislators may only get one side of multi-faceted issues.”

- David Valentine, a research associate professor in the Truman School of Public Affairs, discussed term limits of Missouri state legislators with the St. Louis Beacon, Columbia Daily Tribune, and dozens of media outlets throughout the state.

“Giving incentives is like standing up at a football game. If one person stands to see better, it blocks the view of several behind, so they stand and this causes additional standing. In the end everyone is standing and no one’s view of the game is improved. As long as the majority of states are competing by giving incentives, other states will likely be left out if they do not.”

- Judith Stallmann, professor of community development extension, agricultural and applied economics, and rural sociology in the College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources and a professor in the Truman School of Public Affairs, discussed government economic incentive programs in a story that ran on CBS News, the Associated Press, the Washington Post, and dozens of other national media outlets.
In FY2011–2012, much of the Institute’s grant activity came from evaluation and grant renewals. These grants included:

- Missouri Department of Corrections: funding management and evaluation of the Community Reentry Funding Initiative;
- Missouri Arthritis and Osteoporosis Program;
- Phoenix Programs, Inc.;
- Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services: evaluation of organizational capacity for rape prevention and education; and
- Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services: evaluation of several teen programs providing comprehensive sex education.

Following are summaries of four of these projects.

**Missouri Department of Corrections Community Reentry Management and Evaluation**

**Team:** Emily Johnson, Christian Arment, Jake Cronin, and Dr. Sean Nicholson-Crotty

The Missouri Department of Corrections (DOC) launched the Community Reentry Funding Initiative in 2009 to support local offender reentry efforts in communities throughout the state. The fourth round of funding under this initiative is coming to an end with a fifth round in the planning stages. Through four rounds of funding, more than $8.2 million have been distributed to 44 different organizations around the state in support of offender reentry services. In all, more than 17,000 offenders in 45 different counties received services through these various organizations.

The Institute has served as the funding manager and evaluator of the Community Reentry Program since 2009. In the funding management role, the Institute provides technical support to the awardees, addresses issues related to recruitment and referrals, reviews and compiles quarterly and final reports, and monitors financial reports and expenditures. In the role of evaluator, the Institute provides process evaluation and initiative-wide impact analysis. The process evaluation assesses each funded organizations’ achievements in meeting their output and outcome objectives.

The initiative-wide impact analysis measures reoffense for individuals on probation or parole who are served by community reentry funding.

**Table 2: Outputs of Community Reentry Funding Initiative 2010-2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Service</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>No. of Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>4,704</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Essentials</td>
<td>42,124</td>
<td>2,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>28,022</td>
<td>2,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>37,147</td>
<td>1,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>9,438</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>11,984</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>66,939</td>
<td>2,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>7,317</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit measurements are predetermined by the Institute and then collected by each awardee (Ex. Transportation = 1 ride, Mental Health = 1 hr counseling, Housing = 1 night of housing).**
The Institute completed the evaluation and analysis of the third round of funding in January, 2012. The results of the analysis were presented to DOC and shared with awardees in an effort to improve offender reentry services. Table 2 shows the units of service provided by all awardees and the number of offenders who received each service type.

Additionally, the Institute utilizes participating clients’ individual data to illustrate the impact of the initiative on re-offense rates. The results suggest that simply being a client of any of these organizations significantly reduces re-offense rates as compared to other offenders in the state. Specifically, the results show that being a participant in the program decreases the risk of re-offense by 3.9% from the matched sample rate of 15.5%. This means that 3.9% fewer of awardees’ clients reoffended when compared to a similar group from the larger population, which is a statistically significant difference.

Round 4 of the initiative is currently underway. The map below (Figure 2) shows all organizations that are currently funded and are providing services to Missouri offenders.

Summary reports for the project can be found on the Institute’s webpage. The reports are: Missouri Department of Corrections Reentry Funding Summary Report 2010-03 and Missouri Department of Corrections Community Reentry Funding Initiative 2010: Executive Summary 2011-11.

Figure 2:
Evaluation of Missouri’s Personal Responsibility Education Program

Team: Jake Cronin, Dr. Colleen Heflin, Elizabeth Pafford, and Laura Sloan

The Institute worked with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS) to evaluate the Personal Responsibility Education Program (PREP), part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010. Missouri’s PREP is part of a national initiative to reduce teenage pregnancy rates. The Institute is evaluating the extent to which implementation follows the prescribed curriculum (fidelity), the resources and ability each community has to address teen pregnancy, and the overarching effectiveness of the programs.

Funding was distributed to the highest need areas in Missouri, which ranged from inner city St. Louis and Kansas City to the rural communities of Southern Missouri. DHSS chose three evidence-based programs: Making Proud Choices (MPC), Becoming a Responsible Teen (BART), and the Teen Outreach Program (TOP). Two of these programs provide comprehensive sex education in a short time frame and the other follows an adult preparation curriculum that stresses community service. They are all, however, expected to achieve the outcomes of increasing knowledge about sexual health while decreasing teen birth rates and incidence of sexually transmitted infections and HIV-aids in the long-term.

Implementation began in Spring 2012, and there are currently 17 contractors providing approximately 30 classes throughout Missouri. The Institute conducted eight trainings in conjunction with DHSS and trained 70 contractors on the evaluation requirements of PREP.

Our experience indicates that implementing evidence-based teen pregnancy programs with high levels of fidelity in these extremely diverse communities is a challenge. The more rural communities are extremely sensitive to the comprehensive sex education approach these programs take, whereas the more urban communities have difficulty with student recruitment and parental consent to participate.

The Institute is currently collecting first-year data from the program facilitators and the program participants. We will analyze the data and produce a full report this fall. The report will show whether the programs are being implemented as designed and assess the benefits the participants receive from the programs. It will also use data collected from each sites’ partners and stakeholders to draw conclusions about the capacity of each community to address teen pregnancy.

Rape Prevention and Education (RPE) Program

Team: Jake Cronin, Harin Woo

The Institute served as the external evaluator for the Rape Prevention and Education (RPE) program, of the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services. RPE is a sexual violence program designed to prevent sexual violence before it happens, which is referred to as primary prevention. At the heart of primary prevention is changing the social norms that condone sexual violence. This requires a focus on the health and well-being of the community rather than on the individual. Historically, the focus has
been on providing services to victims. Such services are critically important, but they contribute little to prevention. The Institute evaluated the resources, structure, programs, organizational support, and overall ability of the 13 RPE-funded agencies in Missouri. Additionally, IPP surveyed 108 non-RPE funded agencies in Missouri to assess what they are doing to prevent sexual violence. Institute staff found that the 13 funded agencies are very supportive of the principles of primary prevention, but funding and staff present two major barriers to effective programming. To remedy this problem, funded agencies were advised to diversify their funding streams that are currently heavily dependent on government grants and contracts. A dependency on government grants and contracts presents a threat to the long-term sustainability of sexual violence primary prevention programs.

The survey respondents were asked how they would describe the prevention of sexual violence. The responses are presented in a “word cloud” to the left. The cloud allows us to visualize responses in the aggregate. The larger the word, the more frequently it was used by respondents. They understood the importance of a community role, as evidenced by the word cloud and they recognized the importance of attitudes and education to support attitude change.

21st Century Community Learning Center Grant

Team: Emily Johnson, Dr. Jill Nicholson-Crotty, and Sarah Parsons

The Institute of Public Policy is the external evaluator for Columbia’s Youth Community Coalition’s 21st Century Community Learning Center Grant that was awarded in August 2011. The grant is a multi-year project focusing on enhanced after-school programming for students in three established after-school programs in Columbia. The 21st Century grant provides additional resources and curriculum, teachers, tutors, counselors, and facilitators to the Boys and Girls Club, Fun City, and the Moving Ahead Program. These after-school programs will utilize the funding to improve the academic achievement of students in their programs.

The Institute will use data collected through an online database, parent and teacher surveys, and individual level data supplied by the Columbia Public School District to determine student improvements in:

- Academic performance;
- Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) test results;
- Reading and writing assessments;
- School attendance; and
- Discipline and misconduct reports.

The Institute will compare student achievement and behavior to previous years’ data and to a comparison group of students who did not receive enhanced after-school programming. The final results and reports for the first year of programming will be available in fall 2012.
Local leaders face more challenges today than they have in living memory. The Institute provided its annual local government leadership program in spring, 2012 to help those leaders develop and enhance the skills necessary for successful performance in today’s environment. The program helps participants identify their leadership skills, encourages peer learning, and presents new information about the evolution of modern organizations and the flexibility required to lead them. Presenters included Institute and School staff, Mark Levin, City Manager of the City of Maryland Heights; Mike Matthes, City Manager, Columbia; Ian Thomas, Executive Director, Pednet Coalition, Columbia; and Mike Pickerel, State Emergency Management Agency.

Columbia City Manager, Mike Matthes, addresses the 2012 Academy class.

2012 Academy for Leadership Development Class

Back row left to right: Dan Scherer, Ben Calia, Ryan Westcoat, Bart Wechsler, John Pautz, Andy Hixson, and David Valentine.
Middle row left to right: Joey Burnham, Shawna Funderburk, Melissa Burton, Wade Montgomery, Jason Eisenbeis.
Seated left to right: Teresa Williams, Aaron Kruse, Sally Faith, Dan Ross, Robert Jenne.
Early in 2012, Dr. David Valentine announced his retirement after ten years’ service to the Truman School providing exemplary leadership to the Institute of Public Policy. Among other things, he directed the Legislative Academy, supervised the applied research conducted by the Institute, provided training for non-profit organizations and government officials, and conducted applied research. He undertook contract work with several state agencies including the Secretary of State, the State Courts Administrator, and the Department of Public Safety. Dr. Valentine worked for almost 25 years in the Missouri Senate Division of Research, including 16 years as the Director. He also served on the Governor’s Commission on Management and Productivity, a mid 90s public-private initiative to improve operations and management practices in state government.

His experience and insights of the workings of government in Missouri will be greatly missed, although he will continue to work and provide counsel as a Senior Fellow from September 2012 onwards.
The Institute’s Policy Research Scholars make substantial contributions to the Institute through their academic and applied work. Academic publications are revised as briefs that are accessible to a general audience, distributed to policymakers, and posted on the Institute’s website. In addition, policy scholars serve a number of critical roles on Institute grants and contracts. The activities of the scholars enhance the quality of the Institute’s funded research and improve the quality of policy-related information for policymakers and the citizens of Missouri.

Colleen Heflin, Ph.D. Sociology, University of Michigan
Associate Professor

Dr. Heflin’s interests include social program participation, the well-being of veterans and disabled populations, the causes of consequences of food insufficiency and other forms of material hardship, the economic impact of poor health, and the impact of e-government on applicants for public services. She has written about several of these topics in recent articles.

Lael Keiser, Ph.D., Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Associate Professor

Dr. Keiser examines the implementation of public policies, specifically those involving social welfare and education. She is also interested in the relationship between public agencies and other political actors and institutions, again, those involving social welfare and education, as well as issues related to race and gender.

Melissa Maras, Ph.D., Miami University, Clinical Psychology
Assistant Professor

Dr. Maras is working with state leaders to assess and improve existing resources for school counselors to use when evaluating the services they provide to K-12 students. She is also working with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education on research designed to enhance the department’s goal of being among the top 10 states by 2020. In addition, Dr. Maras and her doctoral students worked with Kathy Thornburg, Missouri Associate Commissioner of Education, to improve the assessment of early childhood education.

Jill Nicholson-Crotty, Ph.D., Political Science, Texas A&M University
Associate Professor

Jill Nicholson-Crotty’s research focuses on the management of public and nonprofit organizations and the interaction of these sectors in the implementation of public policy. She has focused this research in the areas of education, health, and criminal justice policy. Her current projects investigate the strategic decision by nonprofit organizations to undertake political activities, such as legislative and administrative lobbying.
Judith Stallmann, Ph.D., Michigan State University  
Professor  
Dr. Stallmann’s research interests are in the area of state and local government finance. With colleagues in Wisconsin, she is examining the impact of state tax and expenditure limitations (such as the Hancock Amendment in Missouri) on state economic growth, state bond ratings, state use of debt, state infrastructure quality, and municipal bond ratings. She is also working on county budgets and the impacts of county population growth or decline on county budgets and tax bases.

Clark Peters, J.D., Ph.D., University of Chicago, Social Work  
Assistant Professor  
Dr. Peters has focused his most recent research work on exploring how disadvantaged youth engaged in a program designed to build their financial assets. In a June report to the Jim Casey Youth Opportunities Initiative, Dr. Peters and his co-author, Dr. Margaret Sherraden of UMSL, presented analyses of quantitative and qualitative data drawn from the experiences of 38 former foster youths in four sites across the country. In the upcoming months, Dr. Peters will be developing the findings into scholarly articles and conference presentations in an effort to inform policies regarding economically disadvantaged young people who are seeking to achieve financial independence.

Lilliard E. Richardson, Jr., Ph.D., University of Texas at Austin  
Professor  

Sean Nicholson-Crotty, Ph.D., Political Science, Texas A&M University  
Associate Professor  
Sean Nicholson-Crotty’s research interests include state and local politics and policy, federalism and intergovernmental relations, and criminal justice. His academic research focuses in two primary areas: the management and performance of public organizations, and the politics of federalism. His applied research is devoted almost exclusively to evaluating the performance of public programs. His primary areas of expertise include criminal justice, substance abuse, and education programming.
Other Public Services

The research, grants and contracts, and public service activities of the Institute are interrelated and mutually supportive. Grants and contracts can lead to other public service activities and public service activities increase visibility that can lead to grants and contracts. For example, the report on constitutional amendments and initiative petitions in 2010 led to work with a group seeking to modernize Missouri’s initiative petition process in 2011 and the term limits report in 2011 led to work in 2012 with a group seeking to adopt an enhanced 9-1-1 emergency system in Missouri.

Partners

- Nicolle Adair, Boys and Girls Club, Columbia, MO
- Vicki Bernard, Harris-Stowe State University, St. Louis, MO
- Christine Corcoran, Lutheran Family and Children’s Services
- Stacey Daniels-Young, Community-Backed Anti-Drug Tax (COMBAT), Jackson County, MO
- Steve Hollis, Columbia/Boone County Department of Health & Human Services, City of Columbia
- Julie Kempker, Assistant Division Director, Department of Corrections, Jefferson City, MO
- Susan Lutton, Mid-Missouri Legal Services, Columbia, MO
- Becky Markt, Columbia Housing Authority
- Joan Masters, Partners in Prevention
- Wendy Noren, Boone County Clerk
- Mike Pickerel, Missouri State Emergency Management Agency, Jefferson City, MO
- Andrew Pleasant, Canyon Ranch Institute, Tucson, AZ/Sullivan County Memorial Hospital, MO
- Beth Richards, University of Missouri, Missouri Arthritis and Osteoporosis Program (MAOP), Columbia, MO
- John Torbit, Preferred Family Healthcare, Kirksville
- Michael Trapp, Phoenix Programs, Columbia, MO
- Tuck Vandyne, DHSS (Rape Prevention and Education Program), Jefferson City, MO
- Patty Vantuinun, Department of Health and Senior Services (PREP), Jefferson City, MO
- LeighVoltmer, Heart of Missouri United Way, Columbia, MO
- Ryan Worley, Youth Community Coalition, Columbia, MO
Technical Publications


**Active**

Christian Arment, Principal Investigator, Missouri Arthritis & Osteoporosis Program (MAOP) – American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) - The Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services coordinates MAOP, which provides funding and support to the seven Regional Arthritis Centers (RAC) in Missouri. Each RAC offers a variety of different courses that provide individuals with the self-management skills and behaviors to deal with their chronic disease. The Institute coordinates the data collection process and analysis to ensure regional and state program goals are met. July 2010-July 2012. $9,500.

Emily Johnson, Principal Investigator, Jackson County Community-Backed Anti-Drug Tax (COMBAT) – Evaluation of COMBAT-funded agencies in Jackson County, MO. COMBAT agencies focus on substance abuse and violence prevention and treatment. Jackson County COMBAT funds 43 agencies non-profit agencies in the County through a dedicated sales tax, in an effort to prevent violence, and substance abuse. The Institute has been contracted to provide an evaluation of the funded agencies’ capacity to evaluate outcomes and measures of interest of the COMBAT initiative. March 19 2012-December 31, 2012. $15,723.

Emily Johnson, Principal Investigator, Missouri Department of Corrections Community Reentry Round Four – Missouri Department of Corrections 2011-2012 community reentry program. The Missouri Department of Corrections has funded 33 non-profit and governmental organizations to provide reentry services to offenders in an effort to reduce re-offense rates and the costs associated with repeat incarceration. The Institute provides technical assistance and management to the awardees and evaluates the process and impact of the overall initiative. August 1, 2011-December 31, 2012. $100,000.

Emily Johnson, Principal Investigator, Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education – Evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Center Grant. The Youth Community Coalition has been awarded a 21st Century Community Learning Center grant in an effort to enhance the afterschool programming at three programs in Columbia. The program focuses on student achievement and behavior, parent participation, and connections between the afterschool program and the school day teacher and curriculum. The Institute serves as the external evaluator on the project and provides evaluation and data analysis. September 1, 2011-August 31, 2012. $70,000.
Elizabeth Pafford, Principal Investigator, **Boone County/City of Columbia and Heart of Missouri United Way Issues Analysis** – The Heart of Missouri United Way, City of Columbia and Boone County contracted with the Institute to conduct a capacity evaluation of social services agencies funded in three categories: Mental Health, Economic Opportunity, and Independent Living. The evaluation is designed to provide a concise analysis of the agencies’ capacity to provide service in the community. The Institute’s evaluation will be used to inform the funding allocation process for the City and County. May –December, 2012. $33,463.

Elizabeth Pafford, Principal Investigator, **Phoenix Programs Enhanced Reentry Project** – The 3-year program evaluation focuses on assessing National Outcome Measures using data from client surveys at intake, 3 month post intake, discharge/6 month post intake and 12 month post intake. Clients are adults recently released from prison and receiving substance abuse treatment from the Enhanced Re-entry Project. December 1, 2010-September 30, 2013. $109,793.


Elizabeth Pafford, Principal Investigator, Preferred Family Health, **Portal II Program** – Provides process and outcomes evaluation tools and analysis for a technology-based substance abuse treatment program. The analysis will focus on comparing outcomes of the technology-based treatment and the traditional treatment program (the control group). October 2010-September 2013. $117,146.

Elizabeth Pafford, Principal Investigator, Youth Community Coalition, **Substance Abuse Prevention – Positive Action** – Evaluation of the program. October 1, 2011-September 30, 2012. $15,000.

Jake Cronin, Principal Investigator, **Canyon Ranch Institute Life Enhancement Program** project provides classes to improve health literacy, health-related behaviors, and physiological measurements of nutrition, physical fitness, and stress, and improve health literacy related to medical information. The Institute provides data entry, data management, and data analysis services to aid in the evaluation effort.

Jake Cronin, Principal Investigator, Evaluation of Organizational and Community Capacity for **Rape Prevention and Education** Funded Agencies and Stakeholders – Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS) – DHSS contracted with the Institute to evaluate the 13 Rape Prevention and Education (RPE) funded agencies. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the resources, structure, programs, organizational support, and overall capacity of the funded agencies delivering primary prevention of sexual violence programs. Additionally, DHSS and the Institute generated a list of 227 organizations in Missouri that are likely involved in sexual violence prevention work but did not receive RPE funding. The evaluation of the 13 funded agencies, as well as the non-funded agencies, provides a thorough assessment of the State of Missouri’s capacity to prevent sexual violence. October 1, 2011-January 31, 2012. $36,425.

Emily Johnson, Principal Investigator, **Missouri Department of Corrections Community Reentry Round Three** – Funding management and evaluation of the Missouri Department of Corrections 2010-2011 community reentry program. August 1, 2010-December 31, 2011. $100,000.

Elizabeth Pafford, Principal Investigator, **Children’s Mental Health Resource Assessment** – Lutheran Family and Children’s Services – A resource assessment of children’s mental health services in Boone County Missouri. March 2011-August 2011. $3,942.


Presentations


“In periods where there is no leadership, society stands still. Progress occurs when courageous, skillful leaders seize the opportunity to change things for the better.”