

**United Way of London and Middlesex**

**Outcome Evaluation Initiative**

**Final Report**

**Prepared by**

**Centre for Community Based Research**



CENTRE FOR  
COMMUNITY  
BASED RESEARCH

**April 2010**

## United Way of London and Middlesex Outcome Evaluation Initiative

### Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
The Outcome Evaluation Initiative .....	1
Strategies of the Outcome Evaluation Initiative .....	2
Strategies to Evaluate the Outcome Evaluation Initiative .....	3
Impact of the Outcome Evaluation Initiative.....	4
Participants .....	4
Successes of the Outcome Evaluation Initiative .....	4
Challenges Associated with the Outcome Evaluation Initiative .....	8
Final Thoughts.....	9
Appendix A: About Us .....	11
Appendix B: Community Reference Group.....	12
Appendix C: Workshop Topics .....	13

## **United Way of London and Middlesex Outcome Evaluation Initiative**

### **Introduction**

In 2007, United Way of London & Middlesex implemented a three year Outcome Evaluation Initiative. This initiative was designed to help organizations build their capacity for understanding and monitoring program results so that they may better answer the question, “What difference is our service making?” Building the capacity to undertake outcome measurement is consistent with United Way’s commitment to strengthening the sector through developing leaders and skills. As well, building agencies’ capacity for outcome evaluation is critical to United Way’s position as an organization focused on community impact.

To support the implementation of the Outcome Evaluation Initiative, United Way of London & Middlesex partnered with the Centre for Community Based Research (CCBR). CCBR is an independent, not-for-profit organization committed to social change and the development of communities through research and its application to important social issues (See Appendix A: About Us). As part of our process, CCBR works to incorporate evaluation into our projects with community partners. This report presents the key findings from CCBR’s evaluation of the OEI.

### **The Outcome Evaluation Initiative**

Led by the United Way of London & Middlesex, the OEI reflected a partnership between United Way, Ontario Trillium Foundation, City of London and London Community Foundation. Its purpose was to build the capacity of non-profit organizations to: i) better identify their programs’ outcomes; ii) effectively measure the impact of their programs on people and the community; and iii) effectively communicate the impact of their programs to funders and the community at large. Through this initiative, it was intended that participating agencies not only develop greater capacity for identifying and measuring and intended outcomes, but also the ability to strategically communicate and respond to their evaluation results.

It was also intended that the OEI help increase the capacity of the United Way itself to document its own outcomes and demonstrate the collective impact of investments on United Way funding priority areas. Information about outcomes and impact is a valuable resource for the United Way when speaking with donors. As well, the ability to demonstrate collective impact is an important part of accountability for United Way investments in the community. To follow through with the initiative, it was planned that in 2010 United Way would start incorporating outcome evaluation practice and findings as a significant criterion in its funding decisions.

Over the course of the three years, the OEI was guided by a number of community organizations that came together as the Community Reference Group (see Appendix B for members). The Community Reference Group (CRG) advised the United Way and CCBR on the development and implementation of the OEI.

### ***Strategies of the Outcome Evaluation Initiative***

The core of the OEI was comprised of a series of CCBR-led training and consultation sessions. CCBR designed these sessions by working closely with the United Way of London & Middlesex and with the Community Reference Group, with a particular focus on training curriculum and delivery for participating agencies. The strategies of the OEI included:

- **Community Launch Event** - A breakfast event was held in September 2007 to introduce the initiative to United Way agencies. The United Way, its partners in the OEI and CCBR outlined the initiative, its importance and objectives.
- **Funder Discussion** - CCBR facilitated a session for funders, which aimed to provide an overview of the OEI, with basic information about the outcomes measurement process and the content presented in the agency workshops.
- **Consultation with UW Allocations Volunteers** – CCBR facilitated a meeting with the U.W. Allocations Volunteer Committee to provide an overview of OEI and review core concepts related to outcome evaluation. The purpose of this consultation was to support allocations volunteers and help ensure that the review process would be aligned with the OEI.
- **Review of Annual Reports** – Midway in the OEI, funding applications from various programs funded by United Way of London & Middlesex were reviewed and summarized first by the United Way *Outcomes Task Group* then by CCBR. The intent of this review was to better understand the degree to which agencies were currently tracking their outcomes, what this tracking looked like, and in what ways they could improve. The results of this review were used to set priorities and directions for the *Outcomes Task Force*, and move forward with the objectives of the OEI. (For detailed discussion of this review, see *Review of Outcomes Information from Annual Funded Organizations Report*).
- **Agency Workshops** - CCBR conducted four series of workshops for agencies on outcome evaluation. Each series included three full-day workshops that covered the core concepts of program evaluation, including logic model development, indicators and measurement, as well as strategies for designing, implementing and using the results from evaluation (See Appendix C for topics covered by the workshops). The workshops

included opportunities for discussion, practical, hands-on exercises and resource materials. Workshop series were held in 2007, 2008 and 2009. Following the first series and based on feedback from participants as well as the results of the Review of Annual Reports and Community Reference Group discussion, workshops were reorganized into cluster sessions according to priority area. The idea was that participants with similar experiences would be grouped together to facilitate sharing and mutual learning.

- **Online Exercises** - To complement the workshops, online homework sessions for developing Logic Models were offered to help agencies build a model for their own program. Individual feedback was provided to each participant that completed the online Logic Model session.
- **Consultations with Agencies** - In addition to the agency workshops, CCBR held one-on-one consultations with agencies to provide them with more individualized support and direction for doing outcomes-based evaluation.

### ***Strategies to Evaluate the Outcome Evaluation Initiative***

The Outcome Evaluation Initiative included a number of strategies to evaluate the OEI itself. The purpose of this evaluation was to ensure that the delivery of the workshops and consultations was meeting the needs of the agencies and of the United Way. We also wished to look at the change in agencies' reported ability and practice for doing outcome measurement, and to gain a sense of the impact of the initiative. The strategies we used for this evaluation included:

- **Agency Survey** - Early in first year of the OEI, an online survey was developed for agencies to provide information about their experience measuring the outcomes of their services. The results of that survey were used to inform the design of training workshops. As well, the results acted as a baseline measure. In 2010, the survey was redistributed to agencies to assess what has changed in their evaluation practices.
- **Workshop Feedback** - Agencies participating in the workshop series were asked to complete evaluation forms at each workshop. These evaluation forms monitored learning and satisfaction with each workshop, as well as the series as a whole.
- **Community Reference Group and OEI Partner Interviews** - In early 2010, interviews were conducted with the members of the CRG and with the funders that partnered with UW for the OEI. The purpose of these interviews was to gain insight into CRG and funder perspectives on the successes and challenges of the OEI as well as on sustainability of the initiative.

## **Impact of the Outcome Evaluation Initiative**

This section of the report summarizes our findings from the evaluation of the OEI, with particular attention to the results of the agency survey and the CRG and funder interviews. Following a brief description of the number of participants, we discuss the successes and challenges related to the OEI.

### ***Participants***

Workshops: In total, there were 138 individuals to participate in the OEI workshops, as follows:

- In 2007, 48 participants representing 27 agencies attended the series
- In 2008, 64 participants representing 39 agencies across two series (Spring session and Fall session)
- In 2009, 26 participants, representing 18 agencies attended the series

From these participants, approximately 80% across each workshop series returned their feedback form.

Agency Survey: In 2007, 33 individuals from 32 agencies completed the baseline survey. In 2010, 26 individuals from 22 agencies completed the follow-up survey.

Interviews: There were ten interviews conducted: eight with members of the CRG and two with funders who partnered with the United Way on the OEI.

### ***Successes of the Outcome Evaluation Initiative***

Results of our evaluation suggest that there were gains at the agency level as well as for the non-profit sector within the region.

#### **For Agencies**

Results from the workshop feedback, interviews and the agency survey suggest staff from agencies that participated in the OEI developed their awareness of outcome evaluation, with many shifting their attention towards identifying and measuring meaningful outcomes for their programs. Workshops and consultations were seen to support staff learning and skill development. This training was believed to help participants become more thoughtful about the longer-term impact and effects of their programs. As well, the training was thought to bring greater clarity not only around to what to measure, but also how to use the information better.

Feedback from each of the workshops series supports these perceptions. Overall, the majority (80% or more) rated the workshops highly and reported that they felt better prepared to measure their program outcomes as a result of what they had learned. They found the content both relevant and useful in their planning for doing program evaluation. Additionally, the facilitator of the workshops was very highly regarded by participants and seen to be both knowledgeable and supportive. Some of the feedback included:

*“Worthwhile!! What I have learned is great and I think it provides a tool to share information about our programs and clearly state the impact for community.”* (2007 participant)

*“Thorough, valuable, good instruction, good examples, great how to create a logic model, how to plan, measure, and do outcome evaluation.”* (2008 participant)

The facilitator was *“very engaging”*, *“very knowledgeable and helpful- open to questions”* (2009 participants)

The topics identified as most useful included logic models, evaluation questions and indicators. Topics on which participants reported needing more training included tool development and analysis.

Members of the CRG who were interviewed also believed that the OEI supported the development of agencies’ ability to follow a common process for identifying and measuring their outcomes, develop tools and to demonstrate that they are making a difference. Interviewees had participated in the training and reported that they had begun implementing new strategies for identifying and measuring their outcomes. Some of their comments included:

*“The value of the training - people are initiating more logic models and measurements. They have a better understanding and it has got organizations thinking about outcomes and evaluations.”*

*“The agencies are now identifying measurable and significant outcomes. There is a better understanding of how to clarify and develop these outcomes, in terms of what should you be measuring, and what is impactful.”*

For each workshop, however, there were also those (around 20%) who reported still struggling with how to apply the concepts to their situations and contexts. Recognizing this challenge, those who participated in the CRG interviews emphasized that one of the most valuable aspects of the OEI for agencies was the individual consultations. The workshops were seen to provide the background training for the consultations to then concretely support agency staff in doing

outcome evaluation at their program. Consultations were identified as particularly helpful in building organizational capacity for program evaluation and taking outcome measurement “to the next level”.

According to the agency survey, there was an increase from baseline to follow-up in the proportion of agencies to have identified outcome objectives (+13%) and indicators (+16%), and to have developed an outcome evaluation plan (+25%; see Table 1). As well, there was an increase in the proportion of agencies to have reported completing evaluation reports (+9%). While there was no increase in the proportion that reported they had collected and analyzed outcome data, there was a greater number reporting to be in progress on these activities.

At follow-up, a greater proportion of agencies reporting both using their evaluation findings as well as communicating their findings. The majority reported using evaluations findings to improve services (84%) and in reports to funders (88%). Evaluation findings were most often communicated to staff (80%), and then to Boards and the community (72%, respectively).

**Table 1: Reported Evaluation Activities at Baseline and Follow-up**

<b>Evaluation Activity</b>	<b>Baseline (n=30)</b>	<b>Follow-up (n=26)</b>
Articulated program goals	87%	88%
Identified outcome objectives	83%	96%
Identified outcome indicators	80%	96%
Developed outcome evaluation plan	67%	92%
Developed methods to collect outcome information	80%	92%
Collected outcome data	76% (6% in progress)	76% (24% in progress)
Analyzed outcome data	67% (9% in progress)	60% (32% in progress)
Completed evaluation reports	63%	72%

**Table 2: Reported Use and Communication of Evaluation Findings at Baseline and Follow-up**

Use of Evaluation Findings	Baseline (n=30)	Follow-up (n=26)
Used outcome findings to improve services	69%	84%
Have used outcome findings in reports to funders	79%	88%
<b>Communication of Evaluation Findings</b>		
To staff	73%	80%
To Board	61%	72%
To community	62%	72%

**For the Non-Profit Sector within the Region**

Community reference group members and funders who participated in the interviews were asked whether they perceived any changes to the non-profit sector within the region that could be related to the OEI. Overall, they shared the sense that there is now greater clarity and consistency around outcome measurement and evaluation, believing that more agencies are now discussing and attending to evaluation as an integrated part of their organizational processes. Outcome evaluation has, at least, become a conversation within the region. The OEI was further seen to have brought agencies together around a common purpose and process. As well, there was the belief that a greater number of agencies than previously now recognize and have committed to evaluation as an important part of accountability and program improvement.

Some of their comments included:

*“One success was to have all agencies involved focus on one process for measurement and evaluation. Agencies can be all over the place using different methods. ... It’s important for UW to understand what organizations are doing and having a process is a good thing.”*

*“It has really raised the importance of conducting evaluation. The reality is that evaluation is needed and there has been a deeper commitment to conducting evaluation*

*by the community. United Way is now being very specific on what they can ask us for evaluation. Now we can respond to that. That's really important."*

There was some disparity amongst CRG members that were interviewed. There were a few who did not see that the OEI had an impact on the non-profit community within the region. They recognized benefits to individual agencies but had *"no real sense"* of whether there has been any impact on the sector as a whole. In contrast, both funders interviewed reported that they had seen a general impact. One explained there was a shift towards a common understanding and set of expectations; the other explained there was now a greater understanding of the value of outcome evaluation. They said:

*"We have seen, I think a more standardized and common understanding of the concepts and the expectations we have as funders."*

*"With all of the agencies that are non-profit, there has been a positive impact. People understand the value of it."*

### ***Challenges Associated with the Outcome Evaluation Initiative***

There was agreement between each of our data sources on the shift in focus and attention towards identifying and measuring meaningful outcomes. In tandem, however, a number of challenges for agencies were seen to accompany this shift. Interviewees emphasized that *"evaluation is a journey"*, *"difficult to do well"* and *"not [always] a fun topic"*. Challenges identified through the workshop feedback, interviews and the agency survey were primarily focused on the expectation for and practicalities of doing evaluation within non-profit agencies. These challenges included:

- **Demand on already strained resources:** The demands associated with doing evaluation well, including the necessary commitment and inter-relatedness of time, staff and funding, were still seen as barriers by some agencies. There was the concern that investing these limited resources in evaluation would diminish the delivery of front-line services.

*"I think the biggest concern is juggling the resources required to undertake the evaluation, reporting and repeating on a regular basis. There is huge need for frontline staffing and some of this resource comes from them. It is hard to successfully integrate and continue working with it over a long period of time."* (follow-up survey)

*"Proper outcome evaluation takes a solid knowledge base and time. We are not funded for this activity, only to produce the outcome and continue to build, change and increase outcomes."* (follow-up survey)

- **Staff capacity for doing evaluation:** A few interviewees explained that given the regularity of hiring new staff without the level of education or the background and training in evaluation made it difficult to keep good evaluation work a consistent part of their practice. Staff turnover and the hiring of new staff made it challenging to develop continuity in knowledge, skills and the process of doing evaluation.
- **Developing appropriate questions and measures:** Following from staff capacity for doing evaluation, some agencies (20% of follow-up participants) expressed uncertainty about their ability to identify the “right” questions or develop the “right” tools.

*“When you do evaluation work, it’s huge....developing tools (the feedback tools for example), the details of developing the tools, that’s the limitation. ... Organizations don’t have training or knowledge to develop specific tools. ... Developing the specific tools is a barrier for people to move forward.” (interview)*

*“How do we know we are measuring the right things?” (follow-up survey)*

Other challenges identified by the Community Reference Group related to the implementation of the OEI over the three years. Overall, interview participants believed it was a valuable initiative, meeting their expectations for its success. However, comments regarding its implementation included the concern that there were periods of inactivity and times when the initiative seemed to lapse. As well, it was suggested that there could have been greater use of the CRG as partners throughout the different aspects of the initiative.

## Final Thoughts

Results from the evaluation of the OEI suggest that it accomplished a shift in focus and attention to outcome evaluation within the non-profit sector in the region. Agency staff that participated in the training valued the workshops and consultations and many reported an increase in confidence for doing outcome evaluation. Their learning appeared to translate into action as by follow-up, a greater number of agencies reported engaging in activities related to outcome evaluation. While the understanding of and commitment to outcome evaluation was seen to increase, there were persistent challenges for some agencies. These agencies strongly emphasized the need for ongoing support in order to do good outcome evaluation.

As well, sustainability of the OEI was very much on the minds of the CRG and funders. They saw the gains made by the initiative and were concerned that without continued work to maintain buy-in and practice, then these gains would be lost. As one funder expressed, *“the ball is now*

*in our court to continue*” with the initiative and support for agencies. A CRG member emphasized:

*“Who are the champions? What now? I think it was excellent to educate people, and to bring everyone on the same page. But the question is how do we keep them there?”*

To help address challenges and to further the regular practice of outcome evaluation, it was suggested that ongoing training for staff and individual consultations for agencies are needed. It was further suggested that one way to accomplish ongoing support was through peer-networks for evaluation, where agencies could learn from each other’s experiences and skills. It was believed important for agencies that are struggling to see agencies similar to themselves doing evaluation well. Additionally, one interviewee strongly recommended showcasing agencies and outcomes to the wider community. Another provided this final thought:

*“I hope it’s not a process that ends. If it is shelved by the United Way, then it will be shelved by everyone else. It has to be in the forefront and integrated to continue to make a difference”*

## Appendix A: About Us

### The Centre for Community Based Research

The Centre for Community Based Research is an independent, non-profit organization with over 25 years experience in participatory program evaluation and community-based research. Located in downtown Kitchener, Ontario, our projects are local, provincial, national and international in scope. In all Centre work, we use a participatory, action-oriented approach which is well suited to enable groups to develop relevant and innovative solutions to address important social issues and meet individual and community needs. Today CCBR employs 25 research staff and manages approximately 35 applied research and evaluation projects at any given time.

#### Our Mission

Our Centre is committed to social change and the development of communities and human services that are responsive and supportive, especially to people with limited access to power and opportunity. Demonstrating leadership through research, education and community involvement, our Centre stimulates the creation of awareness, policies and practices that advance equitable participation and integration of all members of our community.

#### Distinctive Features

Our organization is **Independent**. It is an incorporated non-profit organization guided by a volunteer board of directors, and is not permanently affiliated with any funder or institution.

Our approach is **Collaborative**. We collaborate with academics, service organizations and government to support innovations in human service policy and practice. We see research as an opportunity to give voice to less powerful stakeholders and as a means to foster social cohesion. Stakeholders set the agenda for each research project, and our approach emphasizes ongoing feedback in all directions throughout the process.

Our organization is **Responsive**. We design multi-phase research projects so that our methodologies can be adapted to changing situations. We apply lessons across different projects and communities, and disseminate findings through our newsletters, workshops, and web pages.

Our organization is **Experienced**. It was founded 27 years ago, and has an established reputation for managing projects successfully. Our team includes experienced researchers, facilitators and academic instructors, and we have produced a body of published scholarly and popular writings.

Our team is **Multidisciplinary**. It includes members with graduate degrees in social work, community psychology, developmental and social psychology, women's issues, sociology, and planning. Our team has content expertise in diverse issues including, immigration and cultural diversity, settlement and integration, social housing, family support, community mental health, disability issues, community safety and violence prevention, poverty and international development.

**For more information about CCBR, visit our web site at: [www.communitybasedresearch.ca](http://www.communitybasedresearch.ca).**

## **Appendix B: Community Reference Group**

Special thanks to the participating members who represented a diverse group of service providers in the community:

Barb Schust-Lawrence, Glen Cairn Community Resource Centre

Tracy Fawdry, Learning Disabilities Association

Michelle Hurtubise, London InterCommunity Health Centre

Bill Diver, London & District Distress Centre

Bonnie Williams, Daya Counselling Centre (formerly London Interfaith)

Laurel Hevenor-Vallance, Meals on Wheels London

Michelle Baldwin, Pillar Voluntary Sector Network

Steve Cordes, Youth Opportunities Unlimited

As partners and funders in the initiative, the following representatives also thanked for their participation:

Janice Walter, City of London

Catherine Joyes, London Community Foundation

Yacouba Traore, Ontario Trillium Foundation

## **Appendix C: Workshop Topics**

### **Session #1 – Core Concepts and Building the Foundations**

1. Building blocks of program evaluation
2. Our approach to outcome measurement
  - *\*Eight Steps Handout*
3. Step 1: Stakeholder involvement
  - *Stakeholder Involvement Role-playing Exercise and Handout*
4. Step 2: Program logic models
  - *Logic Model Placemat and Link to Online Exercise*
5. Identifying activities, outputs, indicators, outcomes for own programs
6. Step 3: Evaluation purpose\*
7. Step 4: Evaluation questions\*
8. Step 5: Developing measurement plans\*
9. Step 6: Analysis plans\*
10. Step 7: Communicating results\*
11. Step 8: Acting on results\*

*Homework: Program Logic Models Online Exercise*

### **Session #2 – Developing/Refining Evaluation Framework and Measurement Tools**

1. Program logic models
  - *Online exercise, give everybody a copy of what they did online with some feedback on it.*
  - *Logic model placement exercise with post it notes, improving upon online results*
2. Creating a useful evaluation framework
3. Framework for outcome measurement
4. Identifying evaluation questions
  - *Trying out some different measurement tools (empathy exercise)*
5. Measurement tools
6. Indicators
  - *Indicator Handout*
  - *Indicator Exercise*
7. Research design

*Homework: Indicators Online Exercise*

### **Session #3 – analyzing data and fostering change**

1. Developing an evaluation workplan
2. Popular data collection methods
3. Tools and methods design

## Appendix D: Workshop Participants

### 2009 Workshop Participants

	Alana Budden
Big Brothers Big Sisters	Cathy Urquhart
Big Brothers Big Sisters	Kellie Knights
Boys & Girls Club of London	Christopher Hood
Boys & Girls Club of London	Lisa Evans
CAS – Student MSW – Kings College	Amy Robinson
Childreach	Nici Cole
Children's Aid Society of London	Diana Budden
East London Community Centre	Tammy Ball
Employment Sector Council	Carol Stewart
Employment Sector Council	Tais Lintz
Fanshawe Pioneer Village	Sheila Johnson
Glen Cairn Community Resource Centre	Charis Parker
Hospice of London	Jayne Graham
Hospice of London	Rhonda Gilby
Information London / thehealthline	Lisa Misurak
John Howard Society	Tim Dickert
London Block Parent Program	Gail McMahan
London Occupational Safety & Health (LOSH)	Jenn Ouimette
LOSH	Jann Ouimette
LUSO Community Services	Carrie Welsh
LUSO Community Services	Tracy Tolton
United Way	Catherine Joyes
United Way	Jason Hastings
United Way	Nathalie Noël
United Way	Yumna Al-Adeimi

### 2008 Workshop Participants

Across Languages	Dianne Ducharme
Big Brothers of London	Glen Mitchell
Boys' & Girls' Club	Candice Harris
Boys' & Girls' Club	Mirella Bryant
Canadian Association of Family Enterprise, Southwestern Ontario Chapter	Daina Grigenas
Canadian Hearing Society	Marilyn Reid
Canadian Mental Health	Trix Van Egmond
Changing Ways	Trevor Hinds
Childreach	Kim Bewsky
Community Living London	Laurie Baker
Crouch Neighborhood Resource Centre	Seanda Wilkins
Crouch Neighbourhood Res. Centre	Tamelynda Lux

East London Community Centre	Jacque Carr
East London Community Centre	Joe Swan
Epilepsy Support Centre	Grace Stafford
Epilepsy Support Centre	Ken Yinger
Epilepsy Support Centre	Mary Secco
Glen Cairn Resource Centre	Christine Li
Glen Cairn Resource Centre	Krisa Sisco
Glen Cairn Resource Centre	Lizbeth Hernandez
Glen Cairn Resource Centre	Noelle Fletcher
Goodwill Industries	Robert Collins
Investing in Children	Greg Picken
John Howard Society	Charlene Foster
John Howard Society	Chris Morris
John Howard Society	Kathleen Lowe
John Howard Society	Louise Pitre
John Howard Society	Taghrid Hussain
Learning Disabilities Assoc.	Stacey Cassell
Learning Disabilities Assoc.	Tracy Fawdry
London & District Distress Centre	Bill
London Coffee House	Carol Brown
London Coffee House	Marnie Thompson
London Distress Centre	Michelle Franklin
London InterCommunity Health Centre	Anthoula Doumhou
London InterCommunity Health Centre	Vindu Balani
London Unemployment Help Centre	Lucille Brennan
London Unemployment Help Centre	Luis Pugliese
London Unemployment Help Centre	Nancy McQuillan
LOSH	Karen Laverty
LUSO	Adriana Pena
LUSO	Chad O'Halloran
LUSO Community Services	Leroy Hibbert
LUSO Community Services	Meredith Fraser
Meals on Wheels	Debbie Meagher
Neighbourhood Watch	Donna Szpakowski
Neighbourhood Watch	Nadine Harrison
Ontario March of Dimes	Judy Webb
Pillar Nonprofit Network	Michelle Baldwin
Scouts Canada	John Galloway
Scouts Canada	Sarah Ransome
Sexual Assault Centre of London	Marg Glendon
South London Neighbourhood Res. Centre	Allison Martin
South London Neighbourhood Res. Centre	Natalie Coles
Stevenson Children's Camp	Sue Beckett

The Canadian Medical Hall of Fame	Heather Sercombe
Volunteer Coordinator, SLNRC	Chris Hepburn
WIL Employment Connections	Elisabete Rodrigues
YES Leadership Project, SLNRC	Alyson Gover
YMCA Community School Program Director	Rebecca Webster
Youth Opportunities Unlimited	Kelly DiMuzio
Youth Opportunities Unlimited	Wraychel Horne
Youth Opportunities Unlimited	Anna Hendrikx
Youth Opportunities Unlimited	Jackie Deleeww
Youth Opportunities Unlimited	Kim Bewsky
Youth Opportunities Unlimited	Kim Resendes
Youth Opportunities Unlimited	Trevor Johnson

### 2007 Workshop Participants

Boys & Girls Club	Julio Cristales
Boys & Girls Club	Kathy Kosatschenko
CAS - MAPP	Lynda Murray-Crozier
Childreach	Anne McKay
Childreach	Huda Hussein
Children's Aid Society	Carrie Smith
City of London	Janice Walter
CMHA	Marnie Wedlake
CMHA	Michele VanBeers
CNIB	Shaunna Magee
CNIB	Sherry Malcho
Community Mental Health-/MSL	Christine Griffith
Community Mental Health-/MSL	Selvin Mejia
Crouch Neighbourhood Res. Ctre	Mary Starnaman
Glen Cairn Community Resource Centre	Barb Schust-Lawrence
Glen Cairn Community Resource Centre	Pam Beckles
John Howard Society	Lori Cunningham
Leads Employment Services	Janet Neeb
Leads Employment Services	Janette Butler
London Children's Museum	Tammy Adkin
London Comm. Resource Centre	Linda Davies
London Comm. Resource Centre	Mary Yanful
London Interfaith Counselling Centre	Bonnie Williams
London Mental Health Crisis Svc.	Dawn White
London Mental Health Crisis Svc.	Mike Petrenko
LUSO Community Services	Anita Anoya
LUSO Community Services	Jennifer Smith
MAPP – Spanish	Martha Salguero
Meals on Wheels	Laurel Hevenor-Vallance
Nokee Kwe	Darlene Bellerose

Nokee Kwe	Dianne Oliphant
Nokee Kwe	Laura Ladouceur
Northwest London Resource Centre	Candas Whitlock
Pillar Nonprofit Network	Nana Yanful
Rotholme Women's and Family Shelter	Leaurie Noordermeer
SARI	Kirste Trenc
SARI Therapeutic Riding	Scott Andrew
South London Neighbourhood Resource Centre	Cathy DeVries
South London Neighbourhood Resource Centre	Michelle Barkley
South London Neighbourhood Resource Centre	Mohamed Al-Adeimi
South London Neighbourhood Resource Centre	Nancy Needham
The Salvation Army Centre of Hope	Nancy Powers
The Salvation Army Ctre. of Hope	Debra Johnston
United Way	Kelly McManus
United Way	Stewart Leatherdale
Women's Rural Resource Centre	Brenda Sousa
Women's Rural Resource Centre	Kathryn Eggert
WOTCH	Elsa Lammers
WOTCH Community Mental Health Services	Chris Babcock