
**Evaluating the Effectiveness of Lead Hazard
Control Grantee/Sub-grantee Outreach
Activities**

Final Report

March 31, 2004

Submitted to:
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 Seventh St. SW
Washington, DC 20410

Submitted by:
ICF Consulting
9300 Lee Hwy
Fairfax, VA 22031
(703) 934-3000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Section I: Introduction	1
Section II: Grantees, Sub-Grantees, and Their Outreach Methods	4
Section III: Analysis of Outreach Methods Used & Key Findings	12
Section IV: Outreach - Practical Lessons and Best Practices for Grantees and Sub-Grantees	28
Section V: Conclusions & Recommendations	36

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Summary of Evaluation Approach

Appendix B: Consolidated Data Sheet by Type of Outreach Activity

Appendix C: Individual Grantee Data Sheets

Executive Summary

HUD's Lead Hazard Control (LHC) grantees conduct outreach activities as a means to generate program enrollment, increase awareness among the public about the dangers of lead hazards, and educate families and property owners about ways that they can reduce the risk of exposure to lead hazards. With a focus on primary prevention, grantees conduct outreach to correct lead hazards and educate people to take lead safety measures before lead poisoning occurs.

This evaluation was conducted by ICF Consulting and the National Center for Healthy Housing (the Project Team). For the evaluation, the Project Team conducted telephone interviews with nine current LHC grantees that were identified as successful in their outreach activities. The team also interviewed seven CBOs that serve as sub-grantees to the interviewed grantees.

The goals of this evaluation are to assess the impact and effectiveness of the outreach activities used by the selected grantees and sub-grantees, determine the replicability of successful outreach methods, identify best practices among the outreach methods used by grantees and sub-grantees, and to report other findings that impact on how grantees and sub-grantees conduct outreach.

Grantees and Sub-Grantees Interviewed

- Alameda County, CA
- Charlotte, NC
 - a. Belmont CDC
- Kansas City, MO
 - b. Healthy Homes Network
- Lowell, MA
 - c. Greater Lawrence Community Action Council
 - d. Merrimack Valley Housing Partnership
- Madison County, IL
- Mahoning County, OH
- Phoenix, AZ
 - e. Issac Preschool Family Literacy Program
- St. Paul/Ramsey County, MN
 - f. Sustainable Resources Center
- State of Rhode Island
 - g. Childhood Lead Action Coalition

Types of Outreach Activities

Grantees and sub-grantees conduct outreach using a range of methods to achieve specific outreach goals. These activities have different functions within the outreach plan and need to be considered within the context of the role they play. To assist in the analysis, the outreach activities are grouped into five categories:

- **Community Outreach.** These activities include conducting outreach through small group meetings, community events or fairs, door-to-door canvassing, and obtaining referrals from existing programs. These activities are the most common methods that grantees and sub-grantees use to obtain program applications and can also offer an excellent opportunity to improve awareness.
- **Earned Media.** Earned media includes public service announcements as well as media stories either on television, on the radio, or in print. Media activities are strongest in raising public awareness and promoting name recognition for the grant program.
- **Advertising.** Advertising includes paid advertisements on billboards, buses or other locations as well as point of purchase advertising through store displays, for example. Advertising aids in improving public awareness.

- **Collateral Materials and Campaign Props.** These materials include brochures and printed materials, visual presentations, giveaways, mascots, and cleaning kits. These materials and props can support both enrollment and general education efforts.
- **Infrastructure/Support.** Key infrastructure for outreach includes a telephone hotline and a web site. They provide the necessary infrastructure to support both enrollment and general education efforts.

Summary of Key Findings

Based on the evaluation results, six common findings about outreach activities that were consistent across the grantees in the study were:

- Participation in community events and presentations at small group meetings are the two most common methods that grantees and sub-grantees effectively used to generate program applications (i.e., enrollment), and increase the target population's knowledge about lead safety.
- Media activities, such as radio and television public service announcements and cable access television programs, and advertising to the general public generally are not effective in generating program enrollment. However, they can be effective in increasing a program's recognition and credibility and good at improving general awareness about lead, which has an indirect impact on enrollment.
- Grantees and sub-grantees that are not well known and respected in the community, or who have staff that interact with the public that do not reflect the linguistic and ethnic characteristics of the target community, struggle to implement successful outreach activities.
- Successful grantees establish good communication and coordination practices with their sub-grantees. This communication begins during the planning phases as grantees utilize CBOs to provide the important in-sights and research about the target community.
- Sub-grantees that do not view lead safety as directly relevant to their core mission are less successful in conducting outreach activities. These sub-grantees are more likely to give the lead outreach activities a lower priority and they often do not invest the time needed to develop strong outreach activities. Strong sub-grantees are known in the community, capable of performing their required duties, and view lead safety as a critical component to fulfilling its mission of improving the lives of its target community.
- To be successful with its outreach activities, sub-grantees need their grantees to implement effective programs and to maintain good communication. Through outreach activities sub-grantees refer potential applicants for lead hazard reduction work to the grantee. If the sub-grantee cannot clearly and accurately describe the grantee's program due to unclear or changing program procedures, the sub-grantee becomes less effective in its outreach. Furthermore, if the applicant has a poor experience working with the grantee to have the lead hazard reduction work completed, it reflects poorly on the sub-grantee.

Lessons for Grantees and Sub-Grantees

The findings from the grantee and sub-grantee interviews offer several implications for how grantees and sub-grantees plan and implement their outreach activities or strategy to be most effective. Many of the implications are most relevant for potential grantees and sub-grantees to address during the planning stages of a program, while others are directly applicable to existing grantees and sub-grantees.

Future grantees and sub-grantees

- Grantees that clearly define their target area and have developed an in-depth understanding of this community have greater success in achieving their outreach objectives.
- Grantees and sub-grantees should develop outreach plans specifically tailored to hard-to-reach target populations.
- To better understand the effectiveness of outreach strategies, grantees and sub-grantees should set specific goals for their outreach strategies with measurable objectives.
- Grantees and sub-grantees should schedule periodic reviews of their outreach approaches.
- Grantees should consider assigning a staff person with responsibility for serving as an outreach coordinator.
- Grantees and sub-grantees should start with a set of “core” outreach activities that provide a sound basis for early success and momentum, and then move onto more challenging activities as their program grows.

Current Grantees and Sub-Grantees

- Grantees and sub-grantees will need to allocate some staff time and budget resources to develop program-specific written materials and have materials translated. But to the extent that grantee/sub-grantees can use existing quality materials (from HUD, EPA, State agencies, and other grantees), they can conserve staff time and other resources for performing outreach.
- As face-to-face interaction is seen as the most effective approach to recruitment, the skill and commitment of the staff that interact with potential participants is a critical factor for success. Programs should ensure that staff are well trained, motivated, committed to the program, and reflect the characteristics of the community.
- Grantees and sub-grantees should carefully evaluate any investment of significant outreach funds or staff time on media activities, especially in an effort to generate program applications.
- It will take new grantees and sub-grantees time to craft and implement a successful outreach approach.

Recommendations

The Project Team offers the following recommendations to HUD based upon the experience of the grantees and sub-grantees examined for this study, and the project objectives.

1. Develop and distribute guidance and informational resources about effective outreach strategies and methods to prospective applicants and new grantees. This guidance and any resources could be made available with the NOFA when it is published annually; provided as part of any training, workshops, or satellite broadcasts to assist applicants in responding to the NOFA; and presented in a written program guide for new grantees.
2. Collect hard copy and electronic versions of outreach materials from successful grantees.
3. Make sample outreach materials and commonly-used outreach documents available to applicants or grantees. Consider establishing a forum similar to the Healthy Homes Electronic Exchange and developing a Starter Outreach Kit.
4. Ask grantees to develop brief, written outreach strategies to be attached to their work plan.
5. Convene an advisory group of successful grantees, CBOs and sub-grantees.
6. Identify practical ways that grantees/sub-grantees can track the impact of different types of outreach activities and share these methods with grantees.
7. Develop guidelines and resources for HUD GTRs to assist them in tracking and supporting outreach activities.

Section I: Introduction

HUD's Lead Hazard Control (LHC) grantees conduct outreach activities as a means to generate program enrollment, increase awareness among the public about the dangers of lead hazards, and educate families and property owners about ways that they can reduce the risk of exposure to lead hazards. With a focus on primary prevention, grantees conduct outreach to correct lead hazards and educate people to take lead safety measures before lead poisoning occurs.

Grantees either conduct outreach using their own staff, or by enlisting sub-grantees and partners to conduct specific types of outreach activities. Sub-grantees can be community-based organizations (CBOs), local universities or hospitals, consultants, or other types of organizations.

Given the important role that outreach plays in grantee performance (e.g., program enrollment, awareness and public education), HUD's Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control (OHHLHC) seeks to better understand the outreach activities that have been used successfully by grantees and sub-grantees, and specifically sub-grantees that are CBOs. OHHLHC is also interested in learning about "best practices" used by successful grantees and their sub-grantees that can be shared with other grantees.

This evaluation was conducted by ICF Consulting and the National Center for Healthy Housing (the Project Team). For the evaluation, the Project Team conducted telephone interviews with nine current LHC grantees that were identified as successful in their outreach activities. The team also interviewed seven CBOs that serve as sub-grantees to the interviewed grantees.

The goals of this evaluation are to assess the impact and effectiveness of the outreach activities used by the selected grantees and sub-grantees, determine the replicability of successful outreach methods, identify best practices among the outreach methods used by grantees and sub-grantees, and to report other findings that impact on how grantees and sub-grantees conduct outreach. To achieve these goals, the Project Team developed the following key evaluation questions guide its analysis and the findings:

1. What lessons can be conveyed to OHHLHC grantees, particularly new grantees?
2. What are the populations and information needs that successful grantees and sub-grantees have targeted?
3. What outreach methods/materials have worked most effectively for these grantees and sub-grantees in addressing common information needs in communities?
4. What factors are important to the success of these methods and materials?
5. What methods were less effective based on grantees' and sub-grantees' experience and why?

6. What materials have grantees and sub-grantees developed that could be readily used or adapted by other grantees and sub-grantees?
7. What other lessons or findings can be drawn from the experience of these grantees and sub-grantees?

Based on the evaluation results, six common findings about outreach activities that were consistent across the grantees in the study were:

- Participation in community events and presentations at small group meetings are the two most common methods that grantees and sub-grantees effectively used to generate program applications (i.e., enrollment), and increase the target population's knowledge about lead safety.
- Media activities, such as radio and television public service announcements and cable access television programs, and advertising to the general public generally are not effective in generating program enrollment. However, they can be effective in increasing a program's recognition and credibility and good at improving general awareness about lead, which has an indirect impact on enrollment.
- Grantees and sub-grantees that are not well known and respected in the community, or who have staff that interact with the public that do not reflect the linguistic and ethnic characteristics of the target community, struggle to implement successful outreach activities.
- Successful grantees establish good communication and coordination practices with its sub-grantees. This communication begins during the planning phases as grantees utilize CBOs to provide the necessary insight and research on the target community.
- Sub-grantees that do not view lead safety and reducing childhood lead poisoning as part of their core mission are less successful in conducting outreach activities. These sub-grantees are likely to give the lead outreach activities a lower priority and they often may not invest the time needed to develop strong outreach activities. Strong sub-grantees are known in the community, capable of performing their required duties, and view lead safety as a critical component to fulfilling its mission of improving the lives of its target community.
- Sub-grantees need a strong grantee to be successful with its outreach activities. Through outreach activities sub-grantees refer potential applicants for lead hazard reduction work to the grantee. If the sub-grantee cannot clearly articulate the grantee's program, or if the applicant has a poor experience working with the grantee to have the lead hazard reduction work completed, it will reflect poorly on the sub-grantee and make its outreach activities more difficult to complete successfully.

These broad findings, as well as more targeted findings presented later in the report, offer important lessons and implications for existing grantees, new grantees, potential grantees, and HUD regarding the effectiveness and replicability of outreach activities. Sections III and IV of this report present the findings from the evaluation and also include practical lessons, best practices for grantees and sub-grantees and their

outreach activities. The report also includes recommendations for HUD related to facilitating the sharing of information among grantees, monitoring outreach activities, and supporting grantees successful outreach activities.

Although the evaluation focused on grantees and sub-grantees that are generally successful with their outreach activities, the interviews also revealed several barriers that the grantees and sub-grantees had to overcome in order to be successful. The evaluation results also show that while there are many similarities among the interviewed grantees and sub-grantees, there are also substantial differences in the approach that each grantee and sub-grantee uses to meet its outreach goals. Grantees and sub-grantees were not successful solely because of the outreach activities they chose to implement, but rather because they are also well managed organizations with dedicated staff and partners that work hard to become a part of their target communities.

The remainder of the evaluation is organized as follows:

- Section II: Grantees, Sub-grantees, and Their Outreach Methods
- Section III: Analysis of Outreach Methods Used & Key Findings
- Section IV: Outreach - Practical Lessons and Best Practices for Grantees and Sub-Grantees
- Section V: Conclusions and Recommendations
- Appendix A: Summary of Approach¹
- Appendix B: Consolidated Data Sheet by Type of Outreach Activity
- Appendix C: Individual Grantee Data Sheets

¹ HUD: This summary of approach is based on the Evaluation Design submitted earlier, with minor modifications to account for how the team carried out the methodology.

Section II: Grantees, Sub-Grantees, and Their Outreach Methods

A. Grantees and Sub-grantees Examined in This Evaluation

To select grantees with a diverse range of characteristics and experiences, the Project Team worked with HUD to identify grantees that HUD GTRs identified as successful with outreach activities. Reviewing the grantees against the selection criteria established in the Evaluation Design², the team then narrowed the list down to 15 grantees.

To further narrow the pool, the Project Team reviewed available work plans and quarterly reports to complete a matrix of data. Using this data the team selected four cities, four counties, and one state organization to be interviewed.

Following HUD approval of the nine grantees, individual HUD GTRs notified grantees that they had been selected for the evaluation and requested their participation. At this point, the Project Team arranged telephone interviews with the nine grantees. While scheduling an interview time, grantees were also asked to identify successful sub-grantees. Due to time constraints, none of the grantees included sub-grantees in the telephone interviews. Grantees did provide information about sub-grantee activities and accomplishments based on their knowledge of the sub-grantees' performance.

To obtain direct input from sub-grantees in order to meet the objectives of the evaluation, the Project Team asked grantees to identify their strongest CBOs that contribute to the success of their outreach activities and requested permission to contact the sub-grantee directly. Two grantees responded that they did not rely on CBOs to conduct outreach, or the CBOs were so new to the program and it would not be useful to contact them for this evaluation. However, the remaining grantees provided the team with the name of their one or two most successful and supportive CBOs.

Below is a list of grantees and sub-grantees interviewed for the evaluation and a brief description of each grantees program and the outreach activities the grantee or sub-grantee conducts.

- Alameda County, CA
- Charlotte, NC
 - a. Belmont CDC
- Kansas City, MO
 - b. Healthy Homes Network
- Lowell, MA
 - c. Greater Lawrence Community Action Council
 - d. Merrimack Valley Housing Partnership
- Madison County, IL

² The Evaluation Design was submitted to HUD by ICF in December 2003.

- Mahoning County, OH
- Phoenix, AZ
 - e. Issac Preschool Family Literacy Program
- St. Paul/Ramsey County, MN
 - f. Sustainable Resources Center
- State of Rhode Island
 - g. Childhood Lead Action Coalition

Following is a summary of each grantee's program objectives and an overview of the role outreach plays in its program. A summary of the sub-grantees interviewed for the evaluation is highlighted next to its grantee.

Alameda County, CA

Program Objectives

The Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (ACLPPP) works with housing authorities, housing rehabilitation programs, and property owners to increase their capacity to remediate lead hazards in low-income rental housing. The program also works with tenant assistance agencies to increase renters' knowledge of lead-based paint hazards. The organization targets high-risk neighborhoods, which are identified based on data from the Census, case studies, Section 8, Medicare, and data on young children. The program's goals under its current grant include:

- Completing lead hazard control in 144 housing units;
- Educating 4200 low-income tenants to recognize potential;
- Using two community-based tenant organizations to conduct workshops for over 600 tenants;
- Increasing the lead awareness of 1000 Section 8 property owners; and
- Training 296 contractors, owners, and workers in lead-safe work practices.

The Role of Outreach

ACLPPP conducts outreach activities with public and private organizations that share its mission. Partners that are housing authorities specialize primarily in recruitment activities, while other organizations' activities are for general education and outreach. Materials for outreach activities have included power point presentations to community groups, brochures, and ads in newspapers and magazines. The program also staffs a telephone information line and holds conferences for property owners. Alameda County indicated that it does not have a strong CBO sub-grantee that would be appropriate for the evaluation.

Charlotte, NC

Program Objectives

The City of Charlotte's Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control program has several components to help it achieve its lead safe housing goals. The program targets the predominantly African-American and Hispanic populations in three Enterprise Communities that have the most critical needs factors, such as most dilapidated housing, lowest incomes, and highest percentage of elevated blood lead level (EBL) children. The overall goals of the program are to perform lead hazard control and reduction activities in 312 housing units and provide outreach and education to the community by:

- Performing lead hazard reduction and control work;
- Providing community education, awareness, training, and employment opportunities;
- Maintaining a Lead Safe Charlotte hotline; and
- Screening children under the age of six for elevated blood levels.

Belmont Community Development Corporation

The Belmont Community Development Corporation (CDC) is a sub-grantee to the Charlotte, NC lead program and has been since July 2003. Belmont's major activity is to go door-to-door to provide every household in the target community with a packet of information about lead hazards and information about Charlotte's lead program. Belmont also has two tabletop lead "information centers" that are on display at its offices and a community center. These activities are designed both to provide general information and to increase enrollment in the Charlotte lead program.

Over the long-term, the program would like to incorporate lead-based paint protections into the city's housing code enforcement program and form a task force that would partner with public and private organizations to secure future funding.

The Role of Outreach

Outreach activities in Charlotte serve to both recruit program participants from the target areas and provide information to residents of the City and Mecklenburg County. The program uses community events in target areas to conduct blood lead screening for children and distribute information. The program also distributes cleanup kits that have been donated by Lowe's home improvement stores. The organization also has formed a partnership with the Carolina Panthers football team, which provides free public service announcements at games.

Kansas City, MO

Program Objectives

The Kansas City Round 10 Lead Hazard Control Project conducts a variety of activities to increase the city's inventory of lead-safe units, provide economic opportunities, and help stabilize the community's inner urban area by improving the quality of the housing stock. Currently the program targets the population in nine zip codes. Their target areas were selected because an analysis of public health and housing data showed that they had high percentages of lead-poisoned children, housing stock built before 1978, and low income families. With the most recent HUD grant, the program intends to work with at least six partners to perform lead hazard control in 57 owner-occupied units, 105 rental units, and eight foster care homes, and to increase awareness in the community through education, the distribution of clean-up kits, and maintenance of a telephone hotline.

Healthy Homes Network

The Healthy Homes Network is a sub-grantee to the Kansas City, MO lead program. The Healthy Homes Network is engaged in many lead- and healthy homes-related activities, but their activities for the Kansas City lead program consist of attending community meetings, events, and fairs to educate the public on the problems associated with lead. Although Healthy Homes Network employees do refer people to the Kansas City lead program if directly requested, their role on this grant contract is largely an educational one.

The Role of Outreach

The key outreach activities have been presentations to community organizations and attendance at community events. The program does not take a one-size fits all approach to presenting and instead tailors presentations to the needs of the population and participates in many big name community events, rather than trying to stage its own.

Lowell, MA

Program Objectives

The Lowell Lead Hazard Control program provides grants and loans for lead abatement, offers training courses, and participates in health fairs and other community events as part of the city's commitment to finding solutions to lead paint problems. The program targets the residents of one of the poorest and most densely populated areas of the city called the Acre Urban Renewal and Enterprise Community. More than 44 percent of housing in this area was constructed before 1940 and 41 percent of the units are in need of major maintenance. The

Merrimack Housing Valley Partnership

The Merrimack Housing Valley Partnership (MVHP) is a sub-grantee to the Lowell, MA lead program that has a three-year contract with the Lowell program, but has had an established relationship with the city for the past 5-7 years. Merrimack's major activity is homebuyer education seminars. The seminars are open to everyone, but as many as 90 percent of the participants are low- to moderate-income individuals. MVHP educates its participants on all aspects of lead issues and refers residents to the Lowell lead program if they have any lead concerns with their home. The purpose of incorporating lead education into the homebuyer sessions is both educational and supports enrollment in the City's Lead Program.

area's population is 41 percent Cambodian, Vietnamese, or Laotian and 20-25 percent Hispanic. The goal of the program under its 1999 Lead Hazard Control grant is to conduct lead hazard control activities in 170 units and to provide education, outreach, and training to residents throughout the city, but focusing on the target areas.

The Role of Outreach

The program relies heavily on sub-grantee partners to educate community members by conducting outreach activities such as workshops in the target area and training sessions for low-income men and women. The program chooses partners based on the niche they fill. The mainstays of the program's outreach efforts are participating in annual community events such as the Halloween Monster Bash and the Southeast Asian Waterfront Festival and having signature giveaways at these events, which are a signature t-shirt and a plastic frog.

The Greater Lawrence Community Action Council

The Greater Lawrence Community Action Council (GLCAC) is a sub-grantee to the Lowell, MA grant program and has been involved in lead activities since 1975. The GLCAC's activities include conducting housing inspections, one-on-one visits by community health workers to families of children with high blood lead levels, an on-site clinic that provides lead screenings, and coordination with the County's programs. GLCAC also performs outreach by distributing materials at day care centers, stores, and other locations, works with the media to air PSAs and publish articles in community newspapers, and participates in community fairs.

Madison County, IL

Program Objectives

The Madison County Lead Safe Madison program leverages existing partnerships to conduct lead remediation and increase awareness of lead hazards through giving presentations, testing children's blood lead levels, distributing materials, and involving the local media. The program targets low-income families with children under six and households with children with elevated blood levels in 11 areas, selected based on historical data. Under its current grant, the goal of the program is to conduct lead hazard control activities in 180 units and increase public awareness about unsafe lead practices in the community.

The Role of Outreach

The program performs outreach activities to both enroll units and provide general education. For enrolling units, direct word-of-mouth continues to have the most success. The program maintains a list of potential clients that call to have their homes tested for lead. The majority of callers are referred by someone they know that is having or has had lead hazard control work done on their home. In addition, Lead Safe Madison has used newspaper, television, and radio news stories to promote the program. To engage and educate children, staff members perform skits and distribute goody-bags with pencils, coloring books, magnets, and brochures at county schools.

Mahoning County, OH

Program Objective

The Mahoning County Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control Program (MCLBPHCP) works with 70 partners to remediate lead-based paint hazards and integrate lead hazard control activities into other housing, health, and environmental programs. MCLBPHCP used data from the Census and CDC to target areas with low-income residents, lead-poisoned children, and older housing stock. The goal of the program under its current grant is to provide lead hazard control services to at least 281 housing units and continue working to make lead a recognized health issue within the community.

The Role of Outreach

Outreach is an integral part of helping MCLBPHCP reach its goal by serving to recruit program participants and provide general education to the community. During National Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Week, the program sponsors paper placemats in popular fast food restaurants with information about lead safety. In addition, the program has done presentations at all 13 Youngstown schools. To better connect with the Spanish-speaking population, the program works closely with the Organizacion Civica y Cultural Hispana Americana (OCCHA), which provides both oral and written translation services.

Phoenix, AZ

Program Objectives

The Phoenix Lead Hazard Control Program, under the Neighborhood Services Department, controls lead hazards in privately-owned homes, conducts community education and economic opportunity activities, and builds the capacity for lead safe housing. The target population is an Enterprise Community, which has a large population of Hispanic residents, the highest percentage of low-income residents, and the oldest housing stock in the city. The two major goals of the program are to provide direct lead hazard control and related primary and secondary lead poisoning prevention services to families of high-risk children and to build infrastructure within the city and among other community stakeholders to allow for maximum long-term capacity. The program is using its current grant to remediate hazards in 133 housing units.

Isaac Preschool Family Literacy Program

The Isaac Preschool Family Literacy program is partnering with the Phoenix, AZ lead program both in educating parents on lead issues and in enrolling families in the Phoenix lead program. The Family Literacy Program is a program designed to help engage the parents of preschool-aged children in their communities, either through language classes, continuing education, or parenting classes. Once or twice a year, the Phoenix Lead program visits the parents of the Family Literacy Program and presents on lead in both Spanish and English. The lead program records the names and addresses of parents in their target area and follows up with those parents later. Therefore, the partnership is designed for both education and enrollment.

The Role of Outreach

Having several years of experience with a lead hazard control grant, the program uses established methods to reach out to communities and reduce lead-based paint hazards. Outreach is a systematic part of the Lead Hazard Control Program. The

program developed a Lead bingo game with an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) grant that is played at many community workshops and presentations. Staff members have found door-to-door outreach to be the best way to enroll units. For hard-to-reach populations, the organization translated some materials into Spanish. However, it tries not to rely extensively on written materials because many members of the highest risk population have low literacy levels. Phoenix does not have formal sub-grant agreements with any CBOs, but does have active partnerships with several CBOs.

St. Paul/Ramsey County, MN

Program Objective

The St. Paul – Ramsey County Health Department conducts lead remediation activities, contractor capacity building, health fairs, and training of senior nursing students to improve the area's housing stock and increase awareness of lead hazards. The program targets Census tracts containing the highest numbers of children with elevated blood levels and high concentrations of lead in the soil. The goal of the program is to reduce the prevalence of lead and the risks associated with it in the target areas. With its year 2000 Lead Hazard Control grant, the program has completed and cleared more than 450 units.

Sustainable Resources Center

The Sustainable Resources Center has been involved with a number of lead programs over the years, including the St.Paul/Ramsey lead grantee. The Sustainable Resources Center is involved in both clinical and general education and outreach activities that include visiting health centers and physicians' offices; hosting and attending community events/fairs; attending small group meetings; conducting door-to-door outreach; using the media; and developing some brochures and flyers in-house. Although much of the program is education-oriented, they do also refer people to lead programs like the St.Paul/Ramsey County and Hennepin County lead programs.

The Role of Outreach

Outreach activities are used to recruit both families and housing units into the remediation program. These activities also intend to educate families in target areas about actions that they can take on their own to protect themselves. Many of the outreach activities also have focused on building the capacity of contractors in the area. The program offers a lead safe work practices course four times a year, which has resulted in approximately 100 workers and supervisors being trained each year. The program also uses outreach activities to encourage contractors to use lead safe work practices in jobs where lead requirements do not apply. The program works closely with housing inspectors, rehabilitation advisors, and community development groups in targets areas to let contractors know about HUD regulations. Finally, the program reaches out to residents in target areas by attending health fairs and conducting door-to-door outreach to provide information one-on-one.

State of Rhode Island

Program Objectives

The State of Rhode Island's Lead Hazard Control Program participates in health fairs, back-to-school events, one-on-one trainings, and neighborhood parties to increase awareness about lead hazards and recruit units into the lead hazard remediation program. The organization also has printed educational materials on milk cartons and distributed information at hardware/home improvement stores.

These efforts target neighborhoods in three cities: Center Falls, Woonsocket, and Providence. Program staff selected these cities because the percentages of children with elevated blood levels are 20.5, 16, and 19.3 percent, respectively. Also, a high percentage of the housing stock in these

areas was built before 1950 and the cities have not spent funds on improvements. Under its current grant, the program's goal is to conduct lead hazard control activities in at least 338 units.

Childhood Lead Action Coalition

The Childhood Lead Action Coalition is a sub-grantee to the State of Rhode Island, and also to several other HUD grantees in Rhode Island. The Coalition performs a wide range of outreach activities, including presentations to small groups, door-to-door outreach, attending community fairs, and getting information out to the public through the media. While their activities have a strong education component, the activities are designed to increase enrollment in lead reduction programs. Their activities have systematically targeted day care centers, immigrant populations and young mothers.

The Role of Outreach

Outreach activities are used to recruit program participants and provide information to the target populations. The program has three cornerstone activities that have been particularly successful: participation in a back-to-school night where families pick up free school supplies, home parties, similar to "Tupperware parties," which are hosted at a resident's home, and a large health fair during Lead Awareness Month in May, which last year attracted 500-700 people.

Section III: Analysis of Outreach Methods Used & Key Findings

A. Outreach Methods

Grantees and sub-grantees conduct outreach using a wide variety of activities and methods. These activities have different functions within the outreach plan and need to be considered within the context of the role they play. To assist in the analysis, the outreach activities are grouped into five categories:

- **Community Outreach.** These activities involve face-to-face interaction with potential participants and members of the public. These activities are the most common methods that grantees and sub-grantees use to obtain program applications. These activities can also offer an excellent opportunity to improve awareness.
- **Earned Media.** These activities involve stories or information relayed through the media to improve public awareness that are “free”. It is “earned” because although there may be no financial cost, the grantee or sub-grantee often spends staff resources educating and negotiating with the media to relay the program’s message about lead. Media activities are strongest in raising public awareness and promoting name recognition for the grant program.
- **Advertising.** Similar to media activities, except that there is a financial cost to running an advertisement, and it provides information to the general public through both media and non-media sources. Advertising aids in improving public awareness.
- **Collateral Materials and Campaign Props.** These materials and props are often used as supporting materials to enhance the quality of the primary outreach activity or to provide additional information to the recipient. These materials and props can support both enrollment and general education efforts.
- **Infrastructure/Support.** These activities are essential to a successful program, but are usually not outreach activities by themselves. They provide the necessary infrastructure to support both enrollment and general education efforts.

Table 1 summarizes the types of outreach methods, by category, that grantees and sub-grantees report using.

Table 1: Types of Outreach Methods

Method	Description	Example
Community Outreach		
Small Group Meetings	Face-to-face presentations to groups of community members, often at meetings, training sessions, education classes, or other gatherings of small groups of people. Often an opportunity for a 15 to 45 minute presentation on lead issues and program information. Can be an opportunity to identify potential program enrollees, or to enlist professionals who could refer families to a grantee's lead program.	The Childhood Lead Action Coalition in Rhode Island gives presentations to many groups, such as to health providers, parent associations, Head Start programs and others. They also give presentations during Baptism classes at several local Catholic churches. As part of the Churches required class, the program gives a brief presentation about lead hazards. The Coalition reports that it has been successful in helping them reach the Latino community and their target population of young mothers.
Community Events/Fairs	Face-to-face interaction with community members at a public event, such as a health or community fair. Usually brief interactions to provide program information to interested parties. A practical way to quickly and efficiently make initial contact with many people in a specific community.	The Lowell, MA grantee, working with several sub-grantees, actively engages community members during events such as the Southeast Asian Water Festival and the Monster Bash, a Halloween-related event for children and families.
Door-to-door canvassing	Face-to-face interaction with a resident in their home, either through an unsolicited knocking or as follow-up to an earlier event. Provides a way to reach members of a community that are not easily reached through community events and services.	Mahoning County, Ohio is working with a faith-based organization, the United Methodist Community Center (UMCC) to conduct door-to-door outreach to 600 homes to educate families with young children whose blood lead levels are just below the threshold where the county health department will get involved. For \$33 per visit, UMCC staff will teach people how to clean for lead, maintain a healthy diet, and talk about lead poisoning.
Referrals from existing programs	Usually a face-to-face interaction that provides program information or education materials as part of a meeting about a different, yet related, program or topic. Makes use of existing community networks and infrastructure.	The Greater Lawrence Community Action Council, Inc (GLCAC) is a private non-profit agency designated at the official federal and state anti-poverty agency for the Greater Lawrence area. GLCAC refers families of lead poisoned children to the Lowell, MA grant program and provides educational information to these families.

Earned Media		
Public Service Announcements (Radio, print, and TV)	Typically :30 or :60 second messages on radio, television or in print. They usually provide a "call to action" (e.g. have your child screened) and a telephone number or web site for more information. Media outlets will air PSAs free of charge, at times of their choosing.	Phoenix, AZ utilizes Spanish radio to get out its message. They report that it has given the program increased recognition but has not directly resulted in program applications.
Media stories, cable access TV	These involve a variety of ways to get information out to the public through available media outlets that provide more information than a PSA. These include articles in a newspaper or newsletter, airing of programs on cable access television, or television news stories.	The Madison County, IL grantee works closely with local newspaper, radio, and television stations to develop and air stories about lead hazards and the program. These efforts have given the program increased recognition and contribute to the program's strong enrollment.
Advertising		
Paid media, ads on billboards, buses, etc	Similar to PSAs, advertisements provide brief messages about an issue through paid media or space on public buses (transit advertisements) or billboard or other venues	The Kansas City, MO grantee paid for advertising in movie theatres, as part of a slide show prior to the movie. It was pleased with the responses they received as a result of this advertising but determined the cost was too high to continue.
Store displays (Point-of Purchase advertising)	Information on the lead program and lead hazards provided in commercial stores, often through the display of posters and printed materials available for interested customers to take.	The Childhood Lead Action Coalition, a sub-grantee to the State of Rhode Island, distributes literature and program information at local hardware and home improvement stores through store displays. The displays have received positive media coverage.
Collateral Materials and Campaign Props		
Brochures/ printed materials	Printed materials that provide program information or information related to lead hazards and safety. These come in a variety of formats including brochures, flyers, fact sheets, booklets, posters, etc.	The St. Paul/Ramsey County, MN grantee relies heavily on existing materials, including those developed by the State, but they have also developed a variety of their own fact sheets and materials. They frequently customize materials based on the demographics of the target population and other specific information needs.

Visual presentation	A PowerPoint or other visual presentation that is used most often during presentations to small groups. Many grantees and sub-grantees have a standard presentation that can be easily tailored to meet the needs of the group to which they are presenting.	The Alameda County, CA grantee has developed a PowerPoint presentation that they are able to easily customize. This allows them to have an effective presentation to give to a variety of small groups, which focuses on the messages or information most relevant to the audience at a particular meeting.
Giveaways	Small toys, supplies or other materials that are often directed at children or parents of children to reinforce messages about lead safety and to provide program contact information. Common giveaways include school supplies, home safety supplies, small toys, growth charts, magnets, t-shirts, and other similar products.	The Lowell grantee distributes a plastic toy frog at its community events, which has become a recognized symbol of the program. They also distribute t-shirts, coloring books, and other items for children.
Mascot	Usually a costume or outfit worn at community or school events designed to attract children to a booth or to provide brief messages on lead safety.	The Healthy Homes Network, a sub-grantee to the City of Kansas City, MO utilizes "Leady the Leadasaur," a full size dinosaur mascot at its community events to attract children to their booth.
Cleaning kits	Cleaning materials usually provided to adults at small group meetings, or other targeted events. Also a type of giveaway, but targeted to adults and providing them cleaning supplies to implement lessons learned during an education event.	The Healthy Homes Network in Kansas City distributes cleaning buckets that include a mop, paper towels, gloves, detergent, spray bottle, a paint scraper, and instructions to parents at small group meetings. They pay a cost of \$11 per bucket, which is much lower than the retail cost.
Infrastructure/Support		
Hotline	A telephone number that the public can call to find out more information about the lead program or lead hazards. Frequently listed on printed materials, in PSAs, or in advertising.	The Charlotte, NC grantee has a telephone hotline to respond to program inquires. The hotline is staffed by administrative and program staff.
Web site	A web site at which the public can find out more information about the lead program or lead hazards. Frequently listed on printed materials, in PSAs, or on advertising.	The Alameda County grantee quickly established a website for its program, which has received over 14,000 hits.

B. Analysis of Interview Results, Program Data, and Outreach Materials

Outreach activities play a critical role in the programs of most lead hazard control grantees. The methods used are not technically complex and do not necessarily require special training. However, some LHC grantees have reported challenges in implementing their programs that suggest their outreach activities may not be having the expected impact.

Based on a systematically examining the experience of a sample of successful grantees and sub-grantees, the Project Team identified specific aspects of how these organizations planned, implemented, and tracked their outreach efforts, which contributed to their success. The results from the experience of these grantees provides valuable information for organizations applying for grants, as well as existing grantees, that can help them take steps to get the most out of their outreach efforts.

Using the methodology described in Appendix A, the Project Team examined each of the outreach methods discussed above based on the experience of the grantees and sub-grantees selected for this study. The outreach were examined using the following four performance measures:

- The level of impact the activity has in obtaining enrollment applications and in educating the intended audience.
- The level of resources needed to implement the activity.
- How common the activity is among the interviewed grantees.
- How easy it is to replicate the activity in another community.

The Project Team recorded the outreach activities conducted by each grantee and recorded its findings under each performance measure. It should be noted that the team incorporated the activities reported by sub-grantees into the grantee's activities as grantees often have multiple sub-grantees carrying out an activity. The data sheets for each grantee's outreach activities are presented in Appendix C.

In order to analyze the findings for each activity across all grantees, the team consolidated the data into one spreadsheet, organized by activity. This consolidated sheet, presented in Appendix B, allowed the team to compare results across grantees.

Based on this analysis, the team developed an overall rating for each performance measure for an activity. Based on the grantee/sub-grantee's reported experience, the team also describes the use of each activity where it is most effective. This analysis is presented in Table 2 below. The definitions of key terms and criteria are presented in a key at the end of the table. For more information on the methodology used in this analysis, see Appendix A.

Table 2: Summary of Outreach Activities

Outreach Activity	Level of Impact	Level of Resources	Commonality	Replicability	Key Uses and Comments
Community Outreach					
Small group meetings	Enrollment: High Education: High	<i>Staffing:</i> Length of event plus 2-4 hours (1 staff person) <i>Skill-level:</i> Professional <i>Cost:</i> \$0 (does not include cost of materials distributed at event)	High	High	Effective for both enrollment and general awareness.
Community Events/Fairs	Enrollment: High Education: Moderate	<i>Staffing:</i> Length of event plus 2 hours (1-4 staff people) <i>Skill-level:</i> Professional <i>Cost:</i> \$0 (some grantees will pay up to \$3,000 to co-sponsor events which provides increased visibility.)	High	High	Effective for both enrollment and general awareness.
Door-to-door canvassing	Enrollment: Moderate Education: Moderate	<i>Staffing:</i> Varies (either set amount of time, or # of doors) <i>Skill-level:</i> Professional or semi-skilled <i>Cost:</i> \$0 for materials (up to \$30-\$40/house for sub-grantees)	High	Moderate	Effective for both enrollment and general awareness. Success requires strong relationship with community.
Referrals from existing programs	Enrollment: High Education: Moderate	<i>Staffing:</i> Time to coordinate with other programs <i>Skill-level:</i> Professional <i>Cost:</i> \$0 (does not include cost of materials)	Low	Moderate	Effective for enrollment. Success requires good coordination with partner agencies.
Earned Media					
Public Service Announcements (Radio, print and TV)	Enrollment: Low Education: Moderate	<i>Staffing:</i> Varies (4-10 hours estimated) <i>Skill-level:</i> Professional with specialized skills needed <i>Cost:</i> Varies – mostly produced with in-kind donations, free to \$4,000 for air time	High	Moderate	Effective for general awareness.

Outreach Activity	Level of Impact	Level of Resources	Commonality	Replicability	Key Uses and Comments
Media stories, cable access TV	Enrollment: Low Education: Moderate	<i>Staffing:</i> Varies – generally minimal staff time required <i>Skill-level:</i> Professional <i>Cost:</i> Varies – mostly produced with in-kind donations	High	Moderate	Effective for general awareness.
Advertising					
Paid media, ads on billboards, buses, etc	Enrollment: Low Education: Moderate	<i>Staffing:</i> Varies – generally minimal staff time required <i>Skill-level:</i> Professional with specialized skills needed <i>Cost:</i> Varies – mostly produced with in-kind donations	Moderate	Moderate	Effective for general awareness.
Store displays (Point-of-Purchase advertising)	<i>Enrollment:</i> Insufficient data <i>Education:</i> Insufficient data	<i>Staffing:</i> Minimal <i>Skill-level:</i> Professional, semi-professional <i>Cost:</i> Cost of materials	Low	Moderate	Effective as a secondary or support activity for general awareness.
Collateral Materials and Props					
Brochures/ printed materials	Enrollment: Moderate Education: Moderate	<i>Staffing:</i> Varies (6-12 hours estimated average) <i>Skill-level:</i> Professional (specialized graphic design or translation skills may be needed) <i>Cost:</i> Up to \$600 or more for graphics plus printing costs	High	Moderate	Effective primarily as a support activity for both enrollment and general awareness. Critical product for program success.
Visual presentation	Enrollment: Moderate Education: Moderate	<i>Staffing:</i> Varies (may require up to 1-2 hours customizing prior to each presentation) <i>Skill-level:</i> Professional <i>Cost:</i> \$0	High	High	Effective as a secondary or support activity. Used during small group meetings.
Giveaways	Enrollment: Moderate Education: Low	<i>Staffing:</i> Minimal time <i>Skill-level:</i> Professional <i>Cost:</i> Varies – low cost per item, often high number of items	High	High	Effective as a secondary or support activity. Used mostly during community fairs and small group meetings.

Outreach Activity	Level of Impact	Level of Resources	Commonality	Replicability	Key Uses and Comments
Mascot	Enrollment: Low Education: Moderate	<i>Staffing:</i> Staff time during event <i>Skill-level:</i> Semi-skilled <i>Cost:</i> Cost of costume (initial cost unknown)	Low	Moderate	Effective as a secondary or support activity. Used mostly during community fairs.
Cleaning kits	Enrollment: Low Education: Moderate	<i>Staffing:</i> Minimal time <i>Skill-level:</i> Professional <i>Cost:</i> Cost of supplies (often receive in-kind or reduced prices)	Moderate	High	Effective as a secondary or support activity.
Infrastructure/Support					
Hotline	Enrollment: Moderate Education: Low	<i>Staffing:</i> Built into admin staff time <i>Skill-level:</i> Semi-professional <i>Cost:</i> \$0 (possible cost of "800" number)	Moderate	High	Effective as a secondary or support activity. Critical element of program infrastructure.
Website	Enrollment: Low Education: Moderate	<i>Staffing:</i> Varies – incorporated into Dept web site, or managed by sub-grantee <i>Skill-level:</i> Professional, specialized skills may be needed <i>Cost:</i> \$0 (unless outside experts needed)	Moderate	High	Effective only as a secondary or support activity. Critical element of program infrastructure.

Note: Activities that are underlined are designated as critical to implementing an outreach strategy.

Key	
Criteria	Definition
Level of Impact	Activity rated for its impact on obtaining enrollment applications and increasing general awareness.
High	<i>Enrollment:</i> Activity is effective in generating program applications. <i>Education:</i> Activity is effective in educating its intended audience.
Moderate	<i>Enrollment:</i> Activity is moderately successful in generating program applications. <i>Education:</i> Activity is moderately effective in educating its intended audience.
Low	<i>Enrollment:</i> Activity is not successful in generating program applications. <i>Education:</i> Activity is not successful in educating its intended audience.
Level of Resources	Grantee reported estimates of resources needed to complete activity. Three types of resources reported.
Staffing levels	Average staff hours needed to perform activity.
Expertise/skill level	Skill level needed to perform activity, Specialized, professional, or semi-skilled.
Materials/services cost	Other direct costs needed to produce or perform activity.
Commonality	Rating of how many grantees report using an activity, out of nine grantees.
High	Five or more grantees report using an activity.
Moderate	Three to four grantees report using an activity.
Low	One to two grantees report using an activity.
Replicability	Rating of ability of a different grantee to adopt and implement the activity.
High	Activity could be readily transferred to other grantees with minimal modifications.
Moderate	Activity could be used by other grantees with moderate customization or adaptation.
Low	Activity is difficult or time-consuming to adapt by other grantees.
Comments	Recommendation for how an activity can be used as part of an outreach plan. Additional context is provided as appropriate.
Effective for enrollment	Activity can be effective in generating program applications. Increased awareness is a secondary benefit.
Effective for general awareness	Activity can be effective in increasing general awareness about the program and lead hazards. Generating program applications is unlikely or is a secondary benefit.
Effective for both enrollment and general awareness	Activity can be effective to both generate program applications and to increase awareness. Activity can be structured to give primary importance to one benefit over the other.
Effective only as a secondary or support activity	Activity can play an important supporting role for either generating applications or increasing awareness, but will not do so on its own.

C. Key Findings

Based on the analysis presented above, and by identifying common observations or impacts discussed by grantees/sub-grantees during the interviews, the Project Team identified a set of findings for each of the four key goals for the report:

- Assessing the “effectiveness” of outreach activities;
- Determining the “replicability” of activities;
- Identifying best practices; and
- Reporting other findings that impact on how grantees and sub-grantees conduct outreach.

The key evaluation questions that the Project Team established for the evaluation are organized under these goals. These findings represent common experiences or messages conveyed by grantees and sub-grantees that may have particular interest to HUD and benefit to current and future grantees/sub-grantees. The objectives and key evaluation questions are:

General

1. What are the populations and information needs that successful grantees and sub-grantees have targeted?

Effectiveness of Outreach Activities

2. What outreach methods/materials worked most effectively for these grantees and sub-grantees in addressing common information needs in communities?
3. What factors are important to the success of these methods and materials?
4. What methods were less effective based on grantees’ and sub-grantees’ experience and why?

Replicability of Outreach Activities

5. What materials have grantees and sub-grantees developed that could be readily used or adapted by other grantees and sub-grantees?

Best Practices

Lessons and best practices can be conveyed to other grantees? (See Section IV.)

Other Lessons

6. What other lessons can be drawn from the experience of these grantees/sub-grantees?

General

1) What are the populations and information needs that successful grantees have targeted?

- Most grantees target two to four clearly defined communities or specific areas of communities for program enrollment. Most sub-grantees support a grantee's effort to reach a particular component of the designated target population, although some sub-grantees will focus outreach efforts across the grantee's entire target population. Grantees rely primarily on census data, location of children with elevated blood lead levels, and age of housing as critical criteria for determining the target areas. Grantees and sub-grantees generally focus on increasing awareness of lead hazards among the general population, but with an emphasis on raising awareness in the target areas. Grantees and sub-grantees work to understand and know the institutions, characteristics, and community infrastructures that exist when planning their outreach strategies to take advantage of existing resources in the target areas.
- Grantees and sub-grantees target a range of specific populations based on the goals of the program, the characteristics of the target communities, and their outreach activities. In general, grantees and sub-grantees target families with young children, property owners, or both. Many grantees and sub-grantees identify more specific sub-populations that they seek to reach, such as Section 8 property owners, renters in single and multi-family properties, recent immigrants, young mothers, etc.
- Many grantees and sub-grantees recognize that they have challenges reaching some hard to reach populations, generally ethnic minorities. Most grantees have outreach materials translated into Spanish and other relevant languages, ensure that they have bi-lingual or multi-lingual staff or sub-grantees who can communicate with non-English speaking populations, and use sub-grantees and partners who reflect and know the hard to reach community. Grantees report that partnering with the right sub-grantee that is known and respected in an ethnic community is critical to reaching that population. For several grantees, the challenge is to improve their ability to reach a "growing" ethnic population that previously did not have a substantial presence in the target area.

Effectiveness of Outreach Activities

2) What outreach methods/materials have worked most effectively for these grantees and sub-grantees in addressing common information needs in communities?

- Grantees and sub-grantees use multiple outreach activities to achieve their outreach goals. These often include community events, presentations to small group meetings, working with existing housing or social services programs, and media. Some activities, such as PSAs or billboard ads may be difficult to track for results or may not lead directly to applications, but it often takes people hearing messages multiple times from multiple sources before they take action.
- Grantees and sub-grantees report that face-to-face outreach is the most effective approach in obtaining program applications. Presentations at small meetings (PTA, churches, local clubs, associations, tenant and owner groups, etc.) are a primary way that several grantees obtain many of their applications. Community fairs are also seen as an effective way to provide education and to solicit applications and participation in the program. To make community events more successful grantees provide small giveaways (toys, t-shirts, wall chart, school supplies, etc.), have a mascot that can attract kids, or pay a sponsorship fee to the event for prime booth location and advertising space in festival materials.
- Successful grantees and sub-grantees take advantage of existing programs and activities. The approach requires fewer staff resources and results in larger audiences. For example, organizing a ‘lead fair’ or program specific activity is time-consuming and may not draw the number of people expected. Grantees and sub-grantees find that attending existing fairs and meetings to reach their target audience is more effective than organizing events on their own.

A Variety of Methods To Get the Point Across

The Madison County Lead Hazard Control Program used both the media and presentations to generate awareness and enroll units. The program purchased a traveling display unit with a grant from a local utility company. Presentations at health fairs included a skit starring the “health police.” At these presentations, the program distributed goody-bags with brochures, pencils, magnets, rulers, coloring books, crayons, and marker boards. The media also played an important role in Madison County’s outreach efforts. The program has used television, print, and radio public service announcements and prompted news organizations to write articles about the program. Through these multiple strategies, the program has saturated its community with information, which has resulted in successful program enrollment and increased awareness.

- Door-to-door recruitment was utilized by almost all grantees, either by grantee staff or through sub-grantees. Many grantees and sub-grantees had success with this technique, but others did not. The key factors for success for this type of activity are as follows: 1) the staff doing the outreach should reflect the make-up of the community; 2) the staff should be well-trained and knowledgeable about the program; 3) door-to-door is most effective when conducted with another event known in the community (follow-up to a community fair, neighbor is having lead work done, PTA or day-care connection, etc.). Some grantees and sub-grantees stated that door-to-door activities were not successful in some immigrant communities who were nervous about government-associated programs.

Conducting Outreach One House At A Time

While most of the grantees interviewed had some type of outreach activity that involved going door-to-door, they had mixed views on its effectiveness. Success appears to be related to the community's familiarity with the program and its trust in the local government.

Kansas City, MO tried to start a program that trained "health ambassadors" to go around the neighborhoods to provide information about lead hazards and the program. However, this program was dropped after it failed to generate program applications. Kansas City still does some door-to-door outreach, but in a more targeted fashion.

Phoenix, AZ relies on door-to-door outreach as the best way to enroll units. All staff members participate in door-to-door recruitment in target areas. The program staff credit the city's good relationship with residents as one of the reasons the program has positive results.

- Grantees and sub-grantees reported mixed success in reaching owners and managers of multifamily properties through small group meetings. Some grantees and sub-grantees reported that through frequent contact with property owner associations at meetings, the program was able to enroll property owners. The staff was able to improve the perception of the program by explaining the program and answering questions. Other grantees and sub-grantees reported that they were more effective recruiting property owners in a one-on-one situation and found that it was more difficult to generate interest in the program in a small group setting with owners.

3) What factors are important to the success of these methods and materials?

- Grantees and sub-grantees emphasize that it is critical to have staff members and sub-grantees that interact with community members who "look like and understand the community." They stated that cultural and linguistic diversity is essential to gaining trust in a community. People who conduct outreach and interact with the community also need to be credible and knowledgeable to earn people's trust. Finally, for new grantees and sub-grantees, gaining trust is often a result of spending time in the community and delivering on promises.
- Sub-grantees report that their success in conducting outreach and education activities is closely tied to the quality of the grantee. Sub-grantees need a strong grantee to be successful with its outreach activities. Through outreach activities sub-grantees refer potential applicants for lead hazard reduction work to the grantee. If the sub-grantee cannot clearly articulate the grantee's program, or if

the applicant has a poor experience working with the grantee to have the lead hazard reduction work completed, it will reflect poorly on the sub-grantee and make its outreach activities more difficult to complete successfully.

- Most grantees report that the success of their outreach activities is dependent on strong sub-grantees that are known in the community, capable of performing their required duties, and committed to lead safety. Grantees report that sub-grantees that do not view lead safety as part of their core mission are less successful. These sub-grantees are more likely to give the lead outreach activities a lower priority and they often do not invest the time needed to develop strong outreach activities. Grantees state that close oversight of sub-grantees is needed, especially during start-up phases. If a sub-grantee is not meeting expectations, find someone else. Grantees also report that working with community leaders is a valuable means for strengthening community ties and gaining acceptance.
- Many grantees and sub-grantees work hard to identify creative partnerships that can assist with conducting outreach and help stretch outreach funds through in-kind donations and reduced prices. Many of these partnerships can provide instant credibility or a captive audience that the program otherwise could not obtain.
- Grantees and sub-grantees report that the successful implementation of an outreach strategy also depends on the building of strong partnerships and cooperative relationships between local government departments and across jurisdictions. It is critical that the health and housing departments cooperate closely, have open lines of communications, present a unified message to the community, and appear seamless to participants and community members.

4) What methods were less effective based on grantees' experience and why?

- Grantees reported mixed success with media outreach activities, such as radio and TV PSAs, cable access television programs, newspaper articles and advertisements, billboards, and others. These activities are not seen as effective for generating program applications, and in many instances, it is hard to ensure that they reach the program's target population. Although tracking applications or behavior changes from these activities is very difficult, and generally not done, some grantees report that these activities have an important role to play. These activities can raise awareness of the general population, they give the program increased recognition and respect, and they can be valuable components of a multi-pronged outreach strategy.
- As mentioned earlier, having outreach workers who "look like and understand" the community are important to success. The opposite is true as grantees and sub-grantees report that when their staff who interact with the public did not reflect the target community, they were less successful in conducting outreach. It is also necessary for outreach workers and sub-grantees to speak credibly about lead and the grant program.

Replicability of Activities

5) What materials have grantees and sub-grantees developed that could be readily used or adapted by other grantees?

- Many materials, especially brochures and written materials are program specific and may not be relevant to other grantees. However, a few grantees, such as Kansas City, have developed illustration-only brochures for participants with low-literacy, or non-English speakers. Others, such as Charlotte, have developed brochures with text at a 4th grade reading level. These brochures may have illustrations or text that would be appropriate for other grantees to utilize. Electronic versions could also be made available to allow other grantees to customize or tailor them.

Meeting the Needs of Linguistic Minorities

Organizacion Civica y Cultural Hispana Americana (OCCHA) is a local Hispanic speaking organization that has helped the Mahoning County, OH grantee target the hard to reach Hispanic population in the City of Youngstown. OCCHA has provided translation services for the county's printed outreach materials and provides on-site translators to help families who do not speak English work with the County to get lead work done on their homes. The sub-grantee also helps coordinate health fairs in the Spanish-speaking neighborhoods. OCCHA has been a good working partner for the grantee and has been successful because it is bridging language gaps in the county.

- Many grantees have developed program specific brochure and flyers, usually translated into Spanish and other languages. However, several grantees rely almost entirely on existing HUD and EPA materials, plus materials from a State program. Grantees generally did not use or share materials with other grantees. Several grantees found that materials do not always translate easily and clearly from English to another language. The existence of different dialects within a language may result in some readers not fully understanding the translation or believing the material has a poor quality translation. This difficulty in producing high-quality translations can make it difficult to effectively communicate with non-English speaking populations through written materials.
- Grantees and sub-grantees report that a majority of the outreach activities or methods they use can be easily replicated in other communities. These methods and activities do not require specialized skills or knowledge or unusually high resource requirements to develop and implement. Some activities or methods may be more or less appropriate for another grantee or sub-grantee given the characteristics of the target population or the nature of the sub-grantee's skill-level and organization, but the methods and activities can be applied by most grantees or sub-grantees.

Other Lessons

6) What other lessons can be drawn from the experience of these grantees/sub-grantees?

- Most grantees and sub-grantees see educational outreach to the general public and outreach to potential program participants as essentially indistinguishable. Grantees and sub-grantees do not appear to plan outreach activities differently based on which audience they are trying to reach. However, for some grantees and sub-grantees general outreach is targeted to a broad geographic region, while program outreach focuses on reaching populations within the target areas.
- Grantees and sub-grantees are not particularly concerned about having a formal outreach plan, beyond what was in the workplan. Grantees and sub-grantees report they had a sense of where they were on outreach and what they needed to do, even if there were not formal milestones/benchmarks. Beyond general enrollment goals and perhaps a target for the number of community events attended, grantees do not set goals for specific outreach activities. The quarterly report is requiring them to track outreach more formally now.
- Several grantees indicate that whether the grant was based in a housing or a health department influenced how it conducted outreach. In general, grantees based in housing departments stated that outreach activities often require a different “mentality” than their traditional housing program activities. These grantees thought that they do better with outreach specific to the program enrollment, but less well improving general awareness of lead. However, grantees based in health departments characterized themselves as putting more emphasis on lead awareness outreach activities than enrollment activities. This is not to say that either type of “home” excluded the other type of outreach, but rather it is a generalized recognition of what types of activities each department is traditionally most comfortable performing.

Section IV: Outreach - Practical Lessons and Best Practices for Grantees and Sub-Grantees

Lessons for Grantees and Sub-Grantees

The findings offer several implications for how grantees and sub-grantees plan and implement their outreach activities or strategy to be most effective. Many of the implications are most relevant for potential grantees and sub-grantees to address during the planning stages of a program, while others are directly applicable to existing grantees and sub-grantees.

Potential grantees and sub-grantees should consider the following when developing their grant applications. Likewise, existing grantees and sub-grantees can address some of these issues if they are in the process of developing their workplan or have just recently received their grant. Existing grantees and sub-grantees may not have the ability to revisit their planning process, but there are steps they can take to improve their outreach activities, if needed.

Future grantees and sub-grantees

- Clearly define and understand your target community. Grantees and sub-grantees should clearly define their target area and have an in-depth understanding of this community. This is necessary in order to clearly define the target population and to design strategies most appropriate to the characteristics of the neighborhood and target population. As part of its planning process, grantees and sub-grantees should give serious consideration to speaking with members of the target community to get their input on what outreach activities would work best to reach residents in the community.
- Tailor outreach plans for hard-to-reach target populations. Grantees and sub-grantees should develop outreach plans specifically tailored to hard-to-reach target populations. A single message to a diverse neighborhood may not have the same impact as a set of coordinated messages addressed to different populations within the neighborhood.
- Set specific outreach goals with measurable objectives. To better understand the effectiveness of outreach strategies, grantees and sub-grantees should set specific goals for their outreach strategies with measurable objectives. HUD's new benchmarking requirements are assisting grantees in this process. However, establishing meaningful goals and tracking the results needs to be balanced with reasonable flexibility for grantees to make adjustments to their plan and must be achieved efficiently given available resources.
- Conduct periodic reviews of outreach activities. Grantees and sub-grantees should schedule periodic reviews of their outreach approaches. This review should help a grantee and its sub-grantees consider if the plan is meeting its objectives, if enhancements or new approaches are needed, if current partners are effective, and if new partners are needed. This review should also help a grantee to examine the demographic make-up of its target communities to ensure that their strategies are effectively reaching new or growing populations.
- Identify an outreach coordinator. Grantees should consider assigning a staff person with responsibility for serving as an outreach coordinator. Attending

community meeting, giving presentations, overseeing outreach activities of sub-grantees, and implementing the many other elements of an outreach plan is time consuming. Grantees that have a dedicated coordinator are best able to implement an outreach plan and become known and respected in the target community. An outreach coordinator or any staff who interacts often with the public, must be a good public speaker who can interact comfortably with groups of people and can quickly establish a level of trust. The person should be a good “networker” who can approach unfamiliar groups and individuals to engage them in a discussion about the lead program and scheduling a time for a presentation.

- **Establish core outreach activities first.** Grantees and sub-grantees should start with a set of “core” outreach activities that provide a sound basis for early success and momentum, and then move onto more challenging activities as their program grows. Programs need to get off to a quick start regarding program enrollment, other otherwise they risk falling behind. Identifying outreach activities that can be implemented quickly and produce program applications is important for success. As the program grows, grantees and sub-grantees can strengthen and expand their activities that are part of their longer-term outreach success.

Recommendations for New Grantees and Sub-Grantees

Here are the top 10 considerations for new grantees and sub-grantees before they undertake outreach activities.

- 1) **Know your community.** Do not just read the demographic and housing data, but understand emerging trends. Become a familiar face in the community, not just an occasional visitor.
- 2) **Identify strong sub-grantees and partners who know the community.** Ideal sub-grantees have three key characteristics: a) they are known and respected in the target community; b) their mission and activities are consistent with the goal of protecting families from lead hazards; and c) they have strong leaders. Look for sub-grantees that have these characteristics and consider interviewing sub-grantees before submitting a grant application.
- 3) **Talk to community members before developing an outreach plan.** Listen to what types of outreach activities community members think will work well and what will not.
- 4) **Hire diverse, committed staff and volunteers.** Program staff and volunteers performing outreach should reflect the demographic characteristics of your target population.
- 5) **Borrow and learn from other grantees and sub-grantees.** Use existing materials to the greatest extent possible and adapt them as necessary for your program. Do not spend valuable start-up time recreating materials that exist elsewhere.
- 6) **Develop an outreach plan with clear goals.** Identify measurable goals and clear outcomes for your outreach activities.
- 7) **Build strong governmental partnerships.** These partnerships will grow over time, but start early working to build good working relations with other governmental departments that can help accomplish your outreach goals.
- 8) **Do not try and do it all at once.** Your outreach activities will grow and evolve over time. Start by establishing your core activities and make sure staff and partners do those well.
- 9) **Be flexible.** Your outreach activities often may not go as originally planned. Be willing to adjust your approach to improve your effectiveness.
- 10) **Prepare to “hit the ground running.”** To be able to quickly develop a pipeline of program participants, make preparations to start outreach shortly after the grant award. Have draft or preliminary agreements in place with sub-grantees so they can be finalized quickly; identify which outreach activities can be implemented quickly and that will result in program applications and plan to do those first; and identify existing relationships that can be quickly activated that can support outreach activities.

Current Grantees and Sub-Grantees

- Use and borrow from existing resources when possible. Grantees and sub-grantees will need to allocate some staff time and budget resources to develop program-specific written materials and have materials translated. But to the extent that grantee/sub-grantees can use existing quality materials (from HUD, EPA, State agencies, and other grantees), they can conserve staff time and other resources for performing outreach. Grantees and sub-grantees could save resources by sharing text, graphics, and designs among themselves. If the information were readily available in a useable format, new grantees and sub-grantees would benefit from having the permission to adopt materials developed by other grantees and sub-grantees for their program.
- Hire a diverse and motivated staff. As face-to-face interaction is seen as the most effective approach to recruitment, the skill and commitment of the staff that interact with potential participants is a critical factor for success. Programs should ensure that staff are well trained, motivated, committed to the program, and reflect the characteristics of the community.
- Consider the amount of time and money spent on media activities. Grantees and sub-grantees should carefully evaluate any investment of significant outreach funds or staff time on media activities, especially in an effort to generate program applications. However, to the extent grantees can generate free publicity or obtain low-cost or in-kind support, media activities should be seen as an important supporting approach, primarily achieving an increase in awareness. Also, these activities can give a program greater visibility and credibility in a community.
- Outreach efforts will strengthen will perseverance and time. It will take new grantees and sub-grantees time to craft and implement a successful outreach approach. Most of the successful grantees that were interviewed have received more than one grant from HUD. These grantees have had the time to learn about what works in their communities and to strengthen their outreach plans. Solidifying partnership, establishing roles, and improving coordination between agencies take time and are key underlying factors of success.

Best Practices

When developing an outreach strategy, there are three key questions that grantees and sub-grantees need to consider. By addressing each question, grantees and sub-grantees will form the foundation for their outreach strategy. Selecting the activities under each question that are most effective and more appropriate for the characteristics of the community, is by itself a best practice for developing an outreach strategy. The three questions that grantees and sub-grantees should consider are:

- What are the ways the program will reach people and attract their attention?
- What materials and information will the program provide to people?
- How will the program communicate with people who want information about the

program?

Under each of these questions, the evaluation findings result is a series of best practices for grantees and sub-grantees to consider when planning and implementing their outreach activities. These best practices are based on direct reporting from grantees and sub-grantees about an activity that results in strong enrollment, meets program goals, or results in tangible outcomes where a grantee or sub-grantee can provide evidence to show the impact.

1. Ways to Reach People and Attract Their Attention

A. Small Group Meetings

Uses: Grantees and sub-grantees give presentations at community meetings because it is one of the best opportunities they have to educate community members about lead hazards. Grantees and sub-grantees often have 20 to 30 minutes or more to talk about lead safety issues, actions people can take to be lead safe, describe the grant program, and answer questions.

Common Challenges: Grantees and sub-grantees report two main challenges concerning giving small group presentations. First, hiring and keeping staff, who are strong public speakers, friendly, and knowledgeable can be challenging, especially given expected salaries and the need to work frequent evenings. Second, even though the presenter has a relatively long time to convey information to the meeting participants, it is still challenging to change people's behavior.

Best Practice: Give meeting participants a way to implement what they have learned. Providing participants with a bucket of cleaning supplies, with environmentally safe cleaners, or other such giveaway allows people to go home and implement what is taught during the presentation.

Example: The Healthy Homes Network in Kansas City provides participants of small group meeting with a cleaning bucket of supplies, in addition to the program's brochures and printed materials. Their presentations focuses on both healthy homes and lead issues, and the bucket of supplies allows people to clean their homes in a safer and healthier manner.

Implementation Lesson: There are busy and slow times for giving presentations to small groups. Grantees and sub-grantees need to have flexible staffing to handle a surge in presentations as well as to keep staff busy on other activities during slow periods.

B. Door-to-Door Canvassing

Uses: Grantees and sub-grantees conduct door-to-door canvassing to increase enrollment in the program as well as to educate community members. This approach is used to reach out to residents in a targeted community that the grantee or sub-grantee may not be able to reach through other outreach methods.

Common Challenges: One of the biggest challenges to door-to-door canvassing is to quickly establish trust and credibility with the resident. Without establishing this trust and credibility, the resident will treat the canvasser as a "solicitor" and quickly end the interaction.

Residents who have a negative perception or fear of the government also are hard to reach through a door-to-door campaign.

Best Practice: Use community volunteers. Using volunteers from the target community or neighborhood allows the volunteer to quickly establish trust because the person is knocking on the door as a neighbor, not as a representative of the local government or an unknown organization.

Example: The Belmont CDC in Charlotte, NC recruited and trained 13 community volunteers to canvass the entire Belmont community, which has about 5,000 properties. Volunteers receive a small stipend for every signature from a resident certifying that the volunteer provided them with a packet of information about lead hazards and the lead grant program. The Belmont CDC reports that only one resident refused to sign the acknowledgement form, but the rest of the residents have been providing their name and contact information. They are doing so, believes Belmont CDC director Michelle Allen, because the people providing the information and asking for a signature are their neighbors, not someone from the local government.

Implementation Lessons: When implementing a door-to-door campaign, there are supporting activities that can make the canvassing more successful. First, before going into a community and knocking on doors, get the word out that you will be in the neighborhood. If residents expect that someone may be knocking on their door, they will be more receptive when it happens. A second lesson is to ensure that there is sufficient oversight of canvassers, especially when using volunteers. Volunteers need competent oversight and support to ensure that they can perform their jobs well and that any logistical or technical issues that arise can be quickly addressed.

C. Community Event and Fairs

Uses: Grantees and sub-grantees attend community events and fairs as a way to increase their visibility in the community, provide basic program information in an effort to generate enrollment, and in some cases conduct lead blood screening. Grantees and sub-grantees attend existing events, making participation in these events relatively low-effort.

Common Challenges: At most community events and fairs, there are numerous booths and activities to attract participants. Especially when the other booths have food, arts and crafts, games, or other activities that naturally appeal to participants, it can be challenging to entice people to stop by a booth about lead safety. Attracting people to a booth and providing them with information that has “staying power” can be a challenge for grantees and sub-grantees.

Best Practice: Use a mascot or unique giveaway to attract attention. A mascot can help attract young children and their parents, a prime audience for lead programs. Once people are drawn to the booth, the staff still need to provide program information and some quick education, but a mascot or unique giveaway will increase foot traffic to the booth.

Example: The Kansas City, MO grantee, working through its sub-grantees such as the Healthy Homes Network, brings a mascot, Leady the Leadosaur, to community and school events to attract children. Leady has become well known in the target community and serves as a draw to bring families over to the program’s booth at community events.

Implementation Issues: For small community events, only one or two staff persons are needed to staff a booth. However, for larger events, especially when the grantee or sub-grantee will be handing out lots of giveaways, is using a mascot, or providing blood screening, or other services, it may be necessary to have three to five staff people at the event.

D. Referrals from Existing Community Services/Networks

Uses: Grantees use sub-grantees and partners that have an existing network to provide information about lead hazards and to recruit participants for the program. The networks that these sub-grantees and partners have established often reach the community members the program is seeking to reach. By tapping into these networks, grantees and sub-grantees can efficiently educate and recruit an already captive audience.

Common Challenges: A common challenge for grantees and sub-grantees is to identify existing networks that match well with the grantee's target population and to work with the sub-grantee or partner to incorporate information about lead hazards and the lead rehabilitation program into the network's program.

Best Practice #1: Tap into first time homebuyer education programs. Homebuyer education programs allow the grantee or sub-grantee to educate consumers before they purchase a home, so that the homebuyer can understand lead disclosure laws and be smart about acting lead safe before doing any renovation.

Example: The Lowell, MA grantee uses the Merrimack Valley Housing Partnership (MVHG) as a sub-grantee to tap into the MVHG's new homebuyer education classes. As a sub-grantee, MVHG incorporates a session on lead issues, including information about the Lowell grant program, to participants of its 10-hour homebuyer class. MVHG is also able to follow new homebuyers through the home buying process and can track how participants in the class act as smart consumers about lead hazards when purchasing their first home.

Best Practice #2: Establish a referral program with local pediatricians and clinics. When providers inform a grantee or sub-grantee of any child who tests higher than 0 micrograms per deciliter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{dL}$), the grantee or sub-grantee can provide direct follow-up with the family.

Example: The Sustainable Resources Center (SRC) in Minnesota has agreements with four urban clinics. The clinics refer to the SRC any patient with a blood lead level above 0 $\mu\text{g}/\text{dL}$ for whom the county will not intervene. SRC will then organize a risk assessment and refer the house to a remediation program. They also have Lead Days when anyone can go to the clinic and have a lead blood test done.

Implementation Issues: Depending on the nature of the network a grantee or sub-grantees looks to utilize, it is necessary to determine how and where the lead issue fits into the networks program. Getting the network to incorporate lead issues into protocols or materials can require lots of upfront negotiations, but once established can quickly turn into a low-effort activity.

E. Media and Advertising

Uses: Grantees and sub-grantees use the media and advertising to increase awareness about the grant program and often to reach a special population, such as residents of a specific neighborhood or ethnic group.

Common Challenges: Developing and airing paid advertising on the television or radio, or placing advertisement on billboards can be expensive, especially since they often do not directly result in program applications. Having an effective, low-cost media and advertising campaign can be a challenge.

Best Practice #1: Use media partners. Be creative in identifying partners that can provide in-kind services. A partnership that can provide increased visibility or resources can add to the effectiveness of media and outreach efforts.

Example: In Charlotte, NC, the Carolina Panthers Professional football team sponsors public service announcements at all home games. These announcements reach the approximately 72,000 people attending the games. In addition, a popular team member is featured on billboard advertisements promoting lead awareness. This partnership with the Carolina Panthers raises the profile of Charlotte's Lead Hazard Control program and enhances its credibility in its target community. Not every city has a professional sports team, but the best practice is to think creatively about what partnerships in a community could increase the effectiveness of an outreach campaign.

Best Practice #2: Hold media events to attract media attention. Hold an event that provides the media with something interesting or symbolic to see to generate positive media coverage.

Example: The Childhood Lead Action Coalition in Rhode Island held a press event in conjunction with lead awareness month and took the media on a tour of a local multi-family building to spotlight issues of lead safety. The tour attracted the media as it provided a visual for the media to use with a story on lead awareness month.

Implementation Issues: When television and radio stations donate air time for public service announcements, the PSAs are often aired during "off-hours." Grantees need to determine whether an additional cost for airing PSAs in more favorable time slots is worth the extra cost.

2. What Information and Materials to Provide

A. Brochures, Flyers and Printed Resource Materials

Uses: Successful outreach involves providing prospective program participants with information about how to qualify for and access services through grantee programs. It also involves sharing information about the actions that families can take to protect themselves from lead hazards, grantees and sub-grantees provide a variety of informational printed materials to participants through community outreach activities. These materials supplement and reinforce the messages provided verbally during presentations and demonstrations. They also provide information that people can take home with them about lead hazards, lead and home safety, and the lead grant program.

Common Challenges: Grantees and sub-grantees often face several challenges when developing and distributing printed materials. Often, materials need to be translated into several

languages and a straight translation of the materials may not be the best language for connecting with a particular population. The development and printing of materials can also be expensive, even though they are a critical element of conducting outreach.

Best Practice #1: Work with cultural groups to tailor messages to particular communities.

Example: Organizacion Civica y Cultural Hispana Americana (OCCHA) in Mahoning County, OH helped the County translate materials into Spanish and worked to fine tune the message so that the materials would have the greatest impact in the Latino community.

Best Practice #2: Use existing materials as the foundation for program materials. Use materials developed by other grantees and sub-grantees by using text, layout and graphics for the foundation of materials that can be customized to a grantee's or sub-grantee's program.

Example: The Kansas City grantee relies heavily on materials developed at the State level, but it also borrowed materials from the Alameda County, CA grantee, which it used as a basis for its own materials.

Implementation Issues: Materials that are poorly designed, hard to read, and have too many messages make it hard for people to take effective action. Grantees and sub-grantees need to find a way to develop easy-to-read, effective, and attractive materials within reasonable budget limitations.

3. How to Communicate with People Interested in the Program

B. Key Support Systems for Outreach

Uses: Grantees and sub-grantees conduct outreach with the target community that is not face-to-face, or which results in residents taking information away from an event. In these circumstances, residents need a way to get back in touch with the grantee or sub-grantee to ask about enrolling in the program or to seek more information. The two most common ways for this to happen is through the telephone or a web site. These are two basic infrastructure support systems that are essential to maintaining open lines of communication with the public.

Common Challenges: All grantees have a telephone number and web site where the public can obtain more information. However, the challenge for some grantees is to have a customer-friendly system that is well publicized so that the public knows how to contact the grantee or sub-grantee and can obtain the information they need when they do use one of these systems.

Best Practice: Spend time developing good infrastructure systems. A sub-grantee that has strong technology qualifications may be best positioned to create a user-friendly web site that is easy for the public to find.³

³ HUD: We are aware of several grantees that have put resources into developing a quality telephone hotline and web site. These grantees indicate that these systems are critical for success. If you are interested in more detailed examples of best practices the team can pursue further details from these grantees.

Section V: Conclusions & Recommendations

Successful LHC grantees and sub-grantees offer valuable insights about conducting outreach effectively, particularly outreach to support enrollment in the grantee's program. This section describes the Project Team's conclusions about grantee outreach and recommendations for HUD.

The conclusions presented in this section by the Project Team address the objectives established by OHHLHC for the evaluation.

A. Targeted Outreach Strategies vs. Comprehensive Outreach Strategies

The grantees and sub-grantees examined in this evaluation focused on defined communities and target populations. In some cases, the communities and target populations were relatively large, while in others they were relatively small. In either case, the populations targeted were well defined and understood by the both grantee and sub-grantee, and a clear need for the lead hazard identification or reduction services offered by the grantee had been clearly established.

The grantees and sub-grantees all use outreach strategies that are best described as "targeted." These strategies were designed to reach a certain population with a message specific to them and a defined need. Such strategies stand in contrast to "comprehensive" strategies, which seek to reach a broader population with a common message.

B. Extent to Which Grantees/Sub-Grantees Designed A Targeted Outreach Strategy that Maximized Implementation of Work Plan and Objectives.

The grantees and their sub-grantees all were able to clearly articulate a consistent outreach strategy that was understood by all. Most grantees and sub-grantees indicated that they had revised or adapted their outreach activities over time to improve them.

However, grantees reported that they did not have a specific written outreach strategy beyond the descriptions in their work plans, and adjustments to outreach activities by a grantee or sub-grantee generally appeared to be due to anecdotal information or feedback rather than an examination of a more systematic measurement of the results of outreach efforts. In the Project Team's view, brief written descriptions of a grantee's outreach strategy (approximately two to three pages) that included a description of the target population, specific outreach goals, planned activities, the responsible parties, anticipated measures, and the timing and procedures for examining their impact would enable grantees to more readily tell if their outreach strategy was helping them maximize the implementation of their work plan.

C. Effect of Targeted Outreach/Education on Enrollment, Behaviors, Or A Reduction in Lead Hazards

Most grantees and sub-grantees were able to point to some type of evidence of the impact of their outreach methods and activities on enrollment or behavior. However, the

evidence, while credible, tended to be anecdotal rather than systematic and directly linked to program objectives. A finding of particular interest was that sub-grantees and grantees often could describe modest additional actions that would yield more systematic data and enable them to measure whether outreach activities were having the intended impact.

D. Demonstrating Success in Linking Program Outcomes to Outreach Activities

Similarly, few grantees were directly measuring the link between outreach activities and program outcomes. Some sub-grantees were able to describe anecdotal evidence of the link between outreach and program outcomes. Remarks by sub-grantees and grantees suggest that modest additional actions would enable some to measure the link between outreach and program outcomes.

E. Outreach Activities Considered Best Practices Replicable By Other Grantees

The experience of sub-grantees suggests a number of best practices that could be readily replicated by other grantees, and help improve their performance and impact. Section IV of this report describes a number of best practices for grantees or sub-grantees.

F. Recommendations

The Project Team offers the following recommendations to HUD based upon the experience of the grantees and sub-grantees examined for this study, and the project objectives.

1. Develop and distribute guidance and informational resources about effective outreach strategies and methods to prospective applicants and new grantees. This guidance could summarize the key lessons and best practices described in this report, plus additional lessons identified by HUD. Case studies describing successful outreach efforts would also be helpful to applicants and new grantees as they plan their programs and work plans. This guidance and any resources could be made available with the NOFA when it is published annually; provided as part of any training, workshops, or satellite broadcasts to assist applicants in responding to the NOFA; or presented in a written program guide for grantees or workshops offered as part of new grantee orientation sessions.

2. Collect hard copy and electronic versions of outreach materials from successful grantees. The Project Team is providing a set of materials gathered from the grantees studied for this evaluation. These materials can be supplemented with the additional items assembled by HUD staff in the future. For example, HUD GTRs could ask grantees to submit copies of new outreach materials with their quarterly reports. To minimize the burden on GTRs, HUD may also be able to use an electronic tool, such as the Electronic Exchange described in Recommendation 3A, to gather electronic copies of outreach materials. HUD staff should review all materials gathered to check that the message and content is consistent with its desired program messages before sharing these documents with other grantees.

3. Make sample outreach materials and commonly-used outreach documents available to applicants or grantees via the OHHLHC web pages or a CD-ROM distributed to

all new grantees and their sub-grantee/partners. Where feasible, these materials should be made available in an electronic format that can be easily modified so that grantees and sub-grantees can readily customize or tailor for their specific use. HUD could develop two tools to assist in this effort.

a. Electronic Exchange. OHHLHC should consider establishing an electronic forum, similar to the Healthy Homes Electronic Exchange, which allows grantees, sub-grantees, and other authorized users to share information and electronic files related to outreach activities.

b. Starter Outreach Kit. As part of the OHHLHC Program Guide to be developed, or as a separate product, OHHLHC should consider developing a collection of tools, templates, and graphics that a grantee can use to help create its own outreach materials and activities. The starter kit could be put on CD-ROM or other appropriate electronic format.

4. Ask grantees to develop brief, written outreach strategies to be attached to their work plan. The strategy should describe:

- a. Grantee outreach goals;
- b. Target population;
- c. Planned outreach methods/activities;
- d. Sub-grantees and partners supporting outreach;
- e. How enrollment and impact will be measured; and
- f. How and when the grantee will reassess whether the activities are achieving the intended results.

HUD should develop a template and sample outreach strategy that can be provided to future and new grantees to assist grantees develop a meaningful outreach strategy.

5. Convene an advisory group of successful grantees, CBOs and sub-grantees.

This group could provide input about the guidance, case studies, and best practices, as well as helping to identify new resources. A stipend may be helpful in attracting the participation of former grantees who no longer have active grant, but have valuable experience to share with HUD and current grantees.

6. Identify practical ways that grantees/sub-grantees can track the impact of different types of outreach activities and share these methods with grantees. Several methods are described in this report based on the interviews conducted for this evaluation. Additional methods could be identified by asking grantees to describe the methods that they or their sub-grantees use in their quarterly progress reports. Finally, the advisory group could also serve a source of these methods. This guidance would assist applicants and grantees in better tracking enrollment and program outcomes.

7. Develop guidelines and resources for HUD GTRs to assist them in tracking and supporting outreach activities. The lessons from this evaluation and other studies should be summarized for GTRs, together with recommended actions for GTRs to track grantee performance in conducting outreach, and a list of resources to share with grantees. If

appropriate, the guidelines and resources could be incorporated into the Desk Guide used by OHHLHC.

Appendix A: Summary of Evaluation Approach

This appendix outlines the approach that the ICF Project Team took to conduct the evaluation. This section briefly discusses:

- Background and OHHLHC's objectives for the evaluation
- Evaluation questions and development of the survey instrument
- Selecting participants
- Interviewing participants
- Analysis

For are more detailed discussion of the approach, please see the Project Team's Evaluation Design.

Background and OHHLHC's Objectives for the Evaluation

The Project Team's approach to conducting this evaluation was designed based on OHHLHC's objectives for the study. The major objectives were to determine the extent to which LHC grantees and sub-grantees have.

- 1) Conducted comprehensive outreach resulting in either recruitment and enrollment of units in lead hazard treatment programs or corrections of lead hazards by owners using other resources;
- 2) Conducted a targeted outreach strategy resulting in either recruitment and enrollment of units in lead hazard treatment programs or corrections of lead hazards by owners using other resources;
- 3) Designed a targeted outreach strategy that has maximized implementation of the work plan and objectives;
- 4) Developed outreach activities that could be deemed, "best practices" and could be reproduced by other grantees/sub-grantees;
- 5) Determined the extent to which targeted outreach and education activities positively affect an increase in enrollment, behaviors, and/or a reduction in dust lead levels and have identified why and how these activities have been successful;
- 6) Demonstrated the success of linking program outcomes with targeted outreach activities; and/or
- 7) Developed, implemented, and documented specific techniques or methodologies that achieve the objectives described in 1, 2, 5, or 6 above.

To achieve these objectives, HUD directed the Project Team, to focus on the outreach activities of a limited number of grantees and sub-grantees that have been successful not only in addressing lead-based paint hazards in their states and local communities, but also have been successful with outreach activities. This evaluation examines the outreach activities of these grantees and sub-grantees to better understand:

- 1) The methods and materials that worked well in addressing common information needs;

2) The key factors contributing to grantee success; and

3) The lessons from the experience of these grantees and sub-grantees while performing outreach in their states or communities.

Evaluation Questions and Development of the Interview Guides

Based on OHHLHC's overall objectives and discussions with the GTR and other key HUD staff, the ICF Project Team developed six fundamental evaluation questions that served as the basis for the evaluation design, and then guided the data collection and analysis activities. The six questions are as follows:

- What are the populations and information needs that successful grantees/sub-grantees have targeted?
- What outreach methods/materials have worked most effectively for these grantees/sub-grantees in addressing common information needs in communities?
- What factors are important to the success of these methods and materials?
- What materials have grantees developed that could be readily used or adapted by other grantees/sub-grantees?
- What methods were less effective based on grantees'/sub-grantees' experience and why?
- What other lessons can be conveyed to OHHLHC grantees and sub-grantees, particularly new grantees?

Using these six evaluation questions as a base, the Project Team developed an interview guide for grantees and an interview guide for sub-grantees that covered the key aspects of planning, implementing, and evaluating outreach activities. For the full interview guide, see the Evaluation Design.

In accordance with the evaluation design, after the first three interviews, the interview guides were reviewed to see if any changes were needed. However, the Project Team and HUD were satisfied with the results of these interviews and no changes were made to the interview guides.

Selecting Participants

The time period for the project did not permit the Project Team to prepare and obtain OMB approval for an Information Collection Request, so interviews could only be conducted with a maximum of nine grantees and nine sub-grantees. To select grantees with a diverse range of characteristics and experiences, the team worked with HUD to identify and group fifteen grantee characteristics into three different levels of importance, and then create a set of selection criteria. LHC program GTRs initially recommended 26 grantees that they believed to be successful in conducting outreach activities. Reviewing the grantees against the selection criteria, the team then narrowed this list down to 15 grantees.

For these 15 remaining grantees, the Project Team reviewed available work plans and quarterly reports to complete a data matrix. This matrix facilitated the comparison of the different grantee programs in light of the priority characteristics. From this pool, the team recommended

the following four cities, four counties, and one state organization to be interviewed, and OHHLHC approved this list:

Cities:

- Charlotte, North Carolina,
- Kansas City, Missouri,
- Lowell, Massachusetts,
- Phoenix, Arizona,

Counties:

- Alameda County, California,
- Madison County, Illinois,
- Mahoning County, Ohio,
- St. Paul/Ramsey County, Minnesota.

State:

- State of Rhode Island,

NOTE: Initially, Hartford, Connecticut was among the grantees selected for interviews. However, because the program director recently left the program, Hartford was dropped with OHHLHC approval and replaced with Madison County, Illinois.

Following HUD approval of the nine grantees, individual program GTRs notified grantees that they had been selected for the evaluation and asked that they participate. At this point, the Project Team set up telephone interviews with the nine grantees. While scheduling an interview time, grantees were also asked to identify successful sub-grantees that perform outreach. None of the grantees included these sub-grantees in the telephone interviews due to time constraints. Grantees did provide information about sub-grantee activities and accomplishments based on their knowledge of the sub-grantees' performance.

In order to speak directly with sub-grantees for their insights into the impact of the outreach activities that they conduct, the Project Team took the following steps.

- The team reviewed the results of the grantee telephone interviews and contacted the grantee to identify the grantee's most successful sub-grantees that are community-based organizations. The team asked for the grantee's permission to contact the sub-grantee.
- The team used a separate interview guide for sub-grantees that focused on understanding the impact of their outreach activities.
- The team reviewed available information about the sub-grantee and the activities it conducts as part of the LHC grant.
- The team contacted the sub-grantees and arranged a time for a brief telephone interview.
- The team conducted telephone interviews with up to nine sub-grantees. Following each interview, the interviewer recorded the participant's responses in writing. These results were combined with the results of the grantee interviews as part of the data analysis.

Interviewing Participants

The Project Team took several steps to reduce the time burden on grantees prior to the interviews. First, the team conducted research on each grantee using data from OHHLHC's Grantee Quarterly Reporting System and grantee workplans. This research provided the team with important background information such as the tenure of the grantee's LHC grant and what types of outreach activities they have conducted, and the types of outreach activities conducted by sub-grantees. The background information allowed the team to focus on two to four of the most prominent outreach activities for each grantee. Finally, the telephone interviews were designed to be completed in one hour or less.

Two Project Team members with knowledge of the LHC grant program participated in each interview to ensure that grantee responses were noted thoroughly and accurately. In addition, the team emailed grantees a copy of the interview guide prior to the interview and asked them to forward copies of any outreach materials that they had available.

Following each interview, written notes of the interviewee's responses were prepared and reviewed by both team members.

Analysis

During the design of the evaluation, the Project Team and HUD defined four major performance criteria—Level of Impact, Level of Resources, Commonality, and Replicability—to determine what outreach methods and materials have worked most effectively for grantees. The set of indicators was applied to each activity. The method for assessing the extent to which an activity has met each performance criterion is outlined below.

Level of Impact. Each outreach activity is rated for its impact with regard to two primary outreach objectives: a) generating program applications for enrollment; and b) increasing public awareness and knowledge about lead hazards. For each goal, the level of impact is rated as high, moderate, or low. The following performance indicators were used to determine an activity's level of impact.

- | **1.2.** **Number of people enrolled.** Did the activity result in the intended audience enrolling in the program? Did the grantees meet or exceed their self-determined outreach targets?
- | **2.3.** **Effectiveness with "hard to reach" populations.** Did the activity reach its target population, especially different ethnic groups or non-English speaking populations? Did the grantees meet or exceed their self-determined targets?
- | **3.4.** **Coordination with other programs and resources.** Did the activity use, support, benefit from, or coordinate with other related programs/activities in its geographic area?
- | **4.5.** **Documentation of success.** Has the grantee documented what actions they have taken and measured the results from those actions?

Based on an analysis of these indicators, the team determined whether an activity has had high impact, moderate impact, or low impact.

- **High impact:** The activity is effective in generating program applications or increasing the knowledge and understanding of the target audience. Grantees

and sub-grantees coordinate with other programs as appropriate and can document success.

- **Moderate impact:** The activity enabled grantees and sub-grantees to achieve some of their goals for generating program applications or increasing the knowledge and understanding of the target audience. Grantees and sub-grantees coordinated with other programs to some extent and may be able to document success.
- **Low impact:** Grantees and sub-grantees reported that the activity generated only a limited number of program applications or had limited impact in educating the target audience. Grantees and sub-grantees coordinated with other programs to a limited extent and may be able to document success.

Level of Resources. For each activity, the team identified three types of resources: staffing levels, expertise/skill level, and materials/services cost. To the extent feasible given the grantee responses, the team identified a midpoint that reflects the resources grantees needed to implement the activity. This analysis does not attempt to categorize these costs as high, medium, or low because circumstances vary widely depending on the pool of resources available to each grantee, the population they are targeting, and the local circumstances.

Commonality. Activities are given a degree of commonality across grantees interviewed: high, moderate, or low. Based on an analysis of these indicators, the team determined whether an activity has had high commonality, moderate commonality, or low commonality.

- High commonality: Activities conducted by five or more grantees.
- Moderate commonality: Activities conducted by three to four grantees.
- Low commonality: Activities conducted by one or two grantees.

Commonality is applied across grantees and was not be considered for an individual grantee activity.

Replicability. Activities are given a degree of replicability: high, moderate, or low. The replicability criterion analyzes the extent to which others can replicate activities.

Using the indicators described below, the team determined whether an activity has had high replicability, moderate replicability, or low replicability.

- **High replicability:** Activities that had materials or processes that could be readily transferred to other grantees with minimal modifications
- **Moderate replicability:** Activities that would require more than a small amount of customization or adaptation by other grantees.
- **Low replicability:** Successful activities attributable to unique circumstances or outside forces that are difficult to re-create, or activities that would be highly time-consuming to adapt.

The ICF Project Team developed two spreadsheet tools to categorize all of the quantitative and

qualitative information collected during the interviews and background research. The first tool is the data collection spreadsheet for each grantee interview found in Appendix C. Each activity described by grantees is broken down by the elements in the performance criteria defined above. This document contains the activity data that was used for the analysis. Second the team created a consolidated data analysis spreadsheet organized by activity, located in Appendix B. This chart shows which grantees conducted each activity and serves as the basis for making a determination for how to score each activity for each of the four performance criterion.

Limitations

This evaluation approach allowed the team to collect high quality data within the short timeframe allocated for the study. However, it has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results.

First, the interviews were conducted by telephone because that was the quickest and most cost effective means to collect the necessary data. However, this type of interview does not yield the depth or range of data that can be gathered through an on-site visit.

Second, because the time available was insufficient to obtain OMB clearance, the sample size was limited to no more than nine grantees, and no more than nine sub-grantees. Therefore, the evaluation reflects the experience of the nine grantees and seven sub-grantees interviewed, but is not designed to reflect the experience of the entire population of grantees.

Further, only high-performing grantees were selected as the most efficient way to identify best practices. However, by limiting the assessment to grantees with strong performance, the study does not provide lessons learned from grantees whose outreach programs are not meeting their targets. Nor can the evaluation provide a comparison of activities between grantees with strong performance and grantees whose performance is not as strong.