



Success Factors, Challenges, and Early Impacts of the POWER Initiative

An Implementation Evaluation

October 2019 | Final Report

Authors

Molly Chamberlin, Ph.D.

Nicole Dunn, M.P.A.

with

Abigail Kelly-Smith and Dorinda Byers

Prepared under Contract

PW-19412-18 for:



**APPALACHIAN
REGIONAL
COMMISSION**



This page intentionally left blank.





Contents

- Acknowledgements iii
- Executive Summary iv
 - About the Evaluation iv
 - Implementation Themes v
 - Early Impact..... vi
 - Recommendations for ARC vi
 - Planned for Additional Study vii
- Introduction 1
 - About the POWER Initiative 2
 - About the Evaluation 3
 - Summary of Key Themes and Findings 11
- Key Themes of Project Implementation 14
 - Theme 1. Target Beneficiary Recruitment and Engagement..... 15
 - Theme 2. Organizational Capacity 22
 - Theme 3. Partnerships and Collaboration 30
 - Theme 4. Community Capacity 38
- Early Impacts of POWER Implementation 44
- Recommendations for ARC 50
 - Planned for additional study 52
- Appendix 53
 - Appendix A: Implementation Analysis Methodology 54
 - Appendix B: Interview Protocols 61
 - Appendix C: Grantees Evaluated in Year 1..... 63
 - Appendix D: Projects Not Included in Year 1 Evaluation 68
 - Appendix E: Definitions of POWER Outputs and Outcomes 72

Tables

Table 1: Evaluation Sample – Project Categories and Types	5
Table 2: Outputs for Evaluated Sample	7
Table 3: Outcomes for Evaluated Sample	9
Table 4: Additional Definitions of Success by Project Category	11
Table 5: Participant Type by Grantee Type	15
Table 6: Strategic Recruitment Examples (n=46)	16
Table 7: Tailored Programming Examples (n=45)	17
Table 8: Demonstrating Possibilities Examples (n=26)	18
Table 9: Multiple Media Examples (n=25)	19
Table 10: Participant Reluctance Examples (n=38)	20
Table 11: Beneficiary Funding Examples (n=17)	21
Table 12: Competition Examples (n=16)	21
Table 13: Internal Resources Examples (n=41)	23
Table 14: Experience/Reputation Examples (n=40)	24
Table 15: Creative Culture Examples (n=9)	25
Table 16: Project Management Examples (n=37)	26
Table 17: Staffing Examples (n=32)	27
Table 18: Financial Constraints Examples (n=27)	28
Table 19: Grants Management Examples (n=24)	29
Table 20: History Examples (n=36)	31
Table 21: New Opportunities Examples (n=34)	32
Table 22: Partner Fit Examples (n=31)	33
Table 23: Common Priorities Examples (n=26)	34
Table 24: Effective Communication Examples (n=18)	35
Table 25: Process Differences Examples (n=23)	36
Table 26: Level of Commitment Examples (n=18)	36
Table 27: Partner Personnel Examples (n=15)	37
Table 28: Self-Determination Examples (n=44)	39
Table 29: Community Leadership/Pipelines Examples (n=22)	40
Table 30: Influence/Presence Examples (n=19)	40
Table 31: Shallow Pools Examples (n=27)	41
Table 32: Social/Environmental Examples (n=13)	42
Table 33: Physical Infrastructure Examples (n=12)	43
Table 34: Power of POWER Examples (n=27)	46
Table 35: Progress Toward Impact Examples (n=49)	47
Table 36: Social Change Examples (n=33)	48
Table 37: Economic Development Examples (n=30)	49



Acknowledgements

The authors at Chamberlin/Dunn LLC are grateful for the many people who supported the evaluation of the Partnerships for Opportunity and Workforce and Economic Revitalization (POWER) Initiative. We would like to recognize implementers of the 88 evaluated projects for their time, participation, and willingness to share their perspectives. We are particularly grateful to POWER grantees at site visit locations for graciously hosting the authors, coordinating visits and conversations with partners, and otherwise supporting data collection. We are grateful to the state-level and foundation personnel who provided their perspective to inform the evaluation's design. We thank the staff and leadership of the Appalachian Regional Commission, especially the Research & Evaluation team, communications staff, and the POWER Coordinators who provided vital perspective, guidance, and insight both during the design phase and throughout the year-long effort. This evaluation would not have been possible without their contributions.

Executive Summary

The Partnerships for Opportunity and Workforce and Economic Revitalization (POWER) Initiative “is a congressionally funded program that provides resources to assist communities and regions adversely affected by job losses in coal mining, coal power plant operations, and coal-related supply chain industries due to the changing economies of America’s energy production.”¹ As of October 2019, the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) has funded 239 projects to help empower communities to create more diverse and sustainable economies under the POWER Initiative. These projects, which touch 312 counties in 11 states, are as diverse as the Appalachian region itself, deploying nearly as many different strategies as there are POWER projects, across six categories:



Business Development projects support access to capital, business incubators, business site development, business technical assistance, entrepreneurship education, and export development.



Education & Workforce Development projects support adult education, career and technical education, educational achievement/attainment, teacher training, and workforce training.



Asset-Based Development projects support arts/culture/tourism and sector-based strategies.



Community Development projects support community facilities, community infrastructure, community revitalization, and transportation.



Civic Entrepreneurship projects support community capacity and organizational capacity.



Health projects support access to care and health promotion/disease prevention.

About the Evaluation

This evaluation was designed to help ARC and its stakeholders learn from program implementation successes and challenges; identify technical assistance needs; and report on the qualitative impact of investments made, to date, with POWER funds. The evaluation prioritized open implementation grants funded in fiscal year (FY) 2018 and earlier, to capture the experiences of grantees who were in the process of, or had recently concluded, project implementation. Over FY2019, the evaluation sought to:

- Understand grant progress, accelerators, barriers, and outcomes for the portfolio of POWER-funded projects;
- Leverage evaluation as an opportunity for learning, improvement, and course-correction, for existing and future grantees;
- Understand the impact of ARC funds on regional economic development plans and strategies; and
- Identify grantee technical assistance needs.

¹ <https://www.arc.gov/funding/POWER.asp>

A sample of 88 grantees was selected for document review, the completion of an open-ended pre-interview questionnaire focused on their experiences with implementation, and a telephone or in-person interview. Additionally, the evaluators conducted full site visits with nine grantees, which included interviews with additional staff, partners, and, in some cases, participants.

Implementation Themes

Despite their differences, projects share common objectives of economic diversification, job creation, capital investment, and workforce development and reemployment. Through this year-long evaluation of the implementation of 88 POWER projects, it is clear projects also share many common successes and challenges in the processes and experiences of implementation, including those related to target population recruitment and engagement, organizational capacity, partnerships and collaboration, and community capacity.

Target Population Recruitment and Engagement – *The recruitment of beneficiaries (e.g., trainees, businesses, communities, tourists, etc.), as well as the retention and continued engagement of those beneficiaries throughout the project.*

Common challenges included participant reluctance, competition among organizations, and access to funding and capital. Common factors that accelerated success were strategic recruitment, the use of multiple media, tailored programming, and demonstrating progress.

Organizational Capacity – *The wherewithal of grantee organizations to capitalize on strengths related to internal management and human and financial resource capacity to support effective project delivery and accountability.*

Common challenges were project or time management, staffing, financial management, and grants management. Common factors that accelerated success were internal resources, organizational experience and reputation, and promoting a creative and nimble organizational culture.

Partnerships and Collaboration – *The external relationships and the extent to which partner organizations could be utilized to execute projects successfully.*

Common challenges were differences in organizational processes among partners, differing levels of commitment, and partner turnover and lack of capacity. Common factors that accelerated success were partnership histories, development of new partnerships, ensuring “fit,” a focus on common priorities, and effective communication.

Community Capacity – *The willingness and ability of communities, and those businesses and individuals within the communities, to participate in funded projects in a way that would lead to achievement of project outcomes.*

Common challenges were a shallow pool of community resources, social and environmental barriers, and community infrastructure. Common factors that accelerated success were the building of community self-determination, building a pipeline of future leaders, and increasing grantee presence and connections with communities.

Early Impact

This evaluation of POWER focuses on project implementation, with the main objectives of understanding grantee experiences and lessons learned to date as well as identifying strategies for ARC and grantees to improve the likelihood of success and mitigate challenges. The nature of the large-scale, transformative change POWER intends to effect means it is too early to quantify impact beyond short-term outputs and outcomes. However, grantees described long-term vision for economic transformation that is driven, in part, by social change – the building of hope and the shifting of mindsets in areas that have endured severe economic distress. With a recognition that it may take many years to realize true economic transformation, grantees stated they have started to see shorter-term outcomes and impacts that they believe will result in longer-term impacts over time:

The “power of POWER” to set vision and build hope

“[T]he POWER initiative has really helped rekindle hope that things can get better. This has been phenomenally good for our region.”

Progress toward potential long-term change

“On a voluntary feedback survey, 95% of respondents intend to continue entrepreneurship efforts [in their schools]. Community colleges are reporting increased enrollment, increased matriculation, and that’s vital to keeping our youth in Appalachia.”

Social change

Some folks...are beginning to realize there is a true economic development component to helping people live longer and be more productive. You can recruit a factory...but if you don’t have a healthy workforce capable of stepping into those jobs, you haven’t done anything. This work is creating healthier people, but also a culture of awareness around what is local.

Economic development

People are realizing there is a value and history in our heritage. Our communities’ main streets are changing – they are now filling up with tourist attractions. Tourists are creating jobs.

Recommendations for ARC

To promote effective recruitment and engagement of program beneficiaries:

- Require additional market analysis from grantees at the time of POWER application
- Encourage the development of detailed recruitment and retention plans
- Conduct frequent check-ins with grantees during the critical start-up period
- Continue open communication and allowing strategic pivoting when needed
- Encourage grantees to budget for marketing and communications, including staffing
- Continue to provide technical assistance around measuring and communicating progress locally, regionally, and statewide
- Continually communicate the avenues for sharing stories with ARC

To help grantees strengthen organizational capacity:

- Offer technical assistance around resource mapping (internally and externally) to help grantees think about current capacity and how to extend/expand it
- Provide tools and resources for assessing organizational readiness for POWER
- At start-up, remind grantees and partners about processes and implications of reimbursement funding, as well as the possibility to request advances
- Remind grantees to plan for accountability and financial data collection and maintenance, both internally and with partner organizations
- Challenge grantees to think about and report on a variety of sustainability efforts
- Explore the establishment of a grantee mentorship network for new grantees to connect with more experienced grantees
- Consider ARC's role in connecting grantees to additional sources of funding

To support collaboration and the development of partnerships:

- Encourage grantees to establish regular communication channels and schedules
- Share practices and tools for vetting partners; establishing common vision, priorities, and goals; delineating roles and responsibilities; and identifying partner assets and resources that benefit the project or fill gaps in grantee expertise or experience

To develop community capacity:

- Continue to invest in leadership and capacity building
- Continue to invest in projects that encourage collaboration and break down traditional jurisdictional and regional boundaries
- Communicate POWER's impacts, and help grantees do the same

To further improve the internal management of POWER:

- Establish a more prescriptive narrative reporting format
- Consider having future grantees set and report on interim progress targets
- Consider methods for measuring results by geography

Planned for Additional Study

In FY2020, ARC plans to work with C/D to study the following topics:

- Collect, analyze, and respond to grantee and partner implementation experiences (new grantees not studied in Year One of the evaluation)
- Assess the implementation and outcomes of technical assistance projects
- Conduct a deeper assessment of high-priority topics, including projects focused on substance use disorder, multi-state and other complex projects, and projects in "high competition" areas with many POWER projects operating simultaneously
- Track and measure the short-, medium-, and long-term results of POWER over time

The Chamberlin/Dunn LLC (C/D) team issued monthly reports to ARC documenting early observations and impressions. Following the completion of interviews, C/D recoded and thematically analyzed all data collected and compiled the results into this report.

Success Factors, Challenges, and
Early Impacts of the POWER Initiative
An Implementation Evaluation

October 2019

About the POWER Initiative

The Partnerships for Opportunity and Workforce and Economic Revitalization (POWER) Initiative “is a congressionally funded program that provides resources to assist communities and regions adversely affected by job losses in coal mining, coal power plant operations, and coal-related supply chain industries due to the changing economies of America’s energy production.”² As of October 2019, the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) has funded 239 projects to help empower communities to create more diverse and sustainable economies, with over \$190 million in POWER funding awarded. POWER projects have touched 312 counties in 11 states across Appalachia.³

The POWER initiative is unique in comparison to other types of ARC-funded projects, in that it generally encourages a broader focus, looking particularly for projects that reach across communities and engage a variety of partners, including projects that engage multiple regions or states. In addition, the POWER initiative allows entities to apply directly to ARC to compete for POWER funding as opposed to dollars provided to states through a block-grant formula.

The primary objective of POWER is to invest in economic and workforce development projects and activities that will produce one, or a combination, of the following outcomes:

- Economic diversification: diversify the commercial and industrial bases of local and regional economies;
- Job creation: create high-quality, well-paying jobs in new and/or existing industries;
- Capital investment: attract new sources of job-creating investment (both public and private); and
- Workforce development and reemployment opportunities: provide a range of workforce services and skills training, including paid work-based learning opportunities, resulting in industry-recognized credentials for high quality, in-demand jobs.

POWER implementation projects are grouped into six categories:⁴



Business Development projects support access to capital, business incubators, business site development, business technical assistance, entrepreneurship education, and export development.



Education & Workforce Development projects support adult education, career and technical education, educational achievement/attainment, teacher training, and workforce training.



Asset-Based Development projects support arts/culture/tourism and sector-based strategies.

² <https://www.arc.gov/funding/POWER.asp>

³ Ibid

⁴ POWER has also funded Research & Evaluation and State & Local Development District Administration projects.



Community Development projects support community facilities, community infrastructure, community revitalization, and transportation.



Civic Entrepreneurship projects support community capacity and organizational capacity.



Health projects support access to care and health promotion/disease prevention.

Even within categories, projects vary widely in implementation strategies. To illustrate, POWER has funded the renovation of a welding lab, the training and employment of community health workers who help patients build healthy habits, and the expansion of water service to an airport site that could serve as the best developable land in the region. POWER funds have supported the building of new trails to capitalize on Appalachia's nature tourism opportunities; the training of community leaders to support local entrepreneurs as they take new business ideas to market; and the establishment of initiatives as varied as food hubs, workforce training centers, business incubators, and one of only two schools of optometry in the Appalachian region.

Although strategies for economic transformation are varied, grantees within and across categories share common aims and common vision. As is detailed in [POWER Project Categories](#), grantees of multiple types are working toward serving and improving participants, communities, businesses, and organizations; creating plans and reports for future development; creating new jobs; and leveraging private investment, among other outputs and outcomes. In addition to formal output and outcome measures, grantees responded with significant overlap to an open-ended question about definitions of long-term success. Grantees envision their projects creating broad and long-term economic impact, developing viable career paths and financial futures for local residents, and building community capacity to carry out future work.

This implementation evaluation of the POWER Initiative seeks to understand and document the experiences of grantees as they have worked toward their visions for economic transformation.

About the Evaluation

Purpose and Objectives

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, ARC sought an external evaluator to assess POWER implementation. After a competitive request for proposal (RFP) process, Chamberlin/Dunn, LLC ("C/D") was selected and began the evaluation in October 2018. The evaluation was designed to help ARC and its stakeholders learn from program implementation successes and challenges; identify technical assistance needs; and report on the qualitative impact of investments made, to date, with POWER funds. The evaluation focused on grants funded in fiscal year (FY) 2018 and earlier, as the evaluation team and ARC determined that grants first funded in FY2019 would not be far enough in implementation to meaningfully contribute to implementation evaluation.

The stated objectives of the evaluation are:

- Understand grant progress, accelerators, barriers, and outcomes for the portfolio of POWER-funded projects;
- Leverage evaluation as an opportunity for learning, improvement, and course-correction, for existing and future grantees;
- Understand the impact of ARC funds on regional economic development plans and strategies; and
- Identify grantee technical assistance needs.

Evaluation Questions and Methodology

Evaluation questions were designed by the C/D evaluation team and reviewed and revised with ARC staff. The research questions are:

- To what extent are POWER grantees progressing toward their stated performance outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent are there common characteristics among grantees across POWER project categories? If there are common characteristics, what are they?
- What factors appear to contribute to a) strong performance, b) improved performance, and c) lagging performance?
- What technical assistance could ARC provide to improve performance?
- Given POWER grant performance, and grantees' experiences, are there better ways for ARC to measure, monitor, and evaluate grantee success in the future?

C/D ultimately selected 88 grantees for inclusion in the FY2019 implementation evaluation sample.⁵ C/D then analyzed data collected through three means:

1. **Document review**, including project narratives, approval memos, stated outputs and outcomes, and quarterly reports submitted to ARC through its online portal, ARCnet.
2. **Pre-interview questionnaires** issued to site visit and phone interview grantees, to prepare for interviews.
3. **In-person interviews** for a select group of grantees that represent the range of POWER-funded projects, and **telephone interviews** for remaining selected grantees. During interviews, the evaluation team used a semi-structured interview process with an interview protocol developed in collaboration with ARC staff.

Data collected through questionnaires and interviews were analyzed using a general inductive approach, which is particularly useful in drawing clear links between research questions and objectives and data collection results. Emerging themes were developed through a review of qualitative data collected, as well as information obtained through document review. C/D completed monthly internal reports for ARC, in which identified themes were categorized into successes and accelerators of success; challenges and barriers; potential impacts; and ARC feedback and/or technical assistance needs. For this

⁵ C/D originally identified 96 grantees, but it was determined that eight grantees were too early in the implementation process. The full project selection methodology is described in Appendix A.

final evaluation report, themes identified through qualitative data analysis for monthly reports were re-reviewed and recategorized into the [Key Themes](#) identified in this report, with qualitative data components reviewed to identify keywords associated with each theme and placed into an analysis matrix. The final step of the analysis was for each member of the evaluation team to review the analysis matrix, collaboratively adding contextual details and revising any categorizations as necessary. [Appendix A](#) provides more detailed information about project selection and analysis methodology.

POWER Project Categories

POWER projects included in the FY2019 evaluation sample covered each of the six POWER project categories: Business Development (n=40), Education and Workforce Development (n=27), Asset-Based Development (n=12), Community Development (n=5), Civic Entrepreneurship (n=2), and Health (n=2). Within each category, the sample included projects in each of the project types. Table 1 provides a breakdown of each project category and type and the number of grantees evaluated in each.

Table 1: Evaluation Sample – Project Categories and Types

 <p>Business Development (n=40)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19 Business Technical Assistance • 9 Access to Capital • 7 Business Site Development • 4 Business Incubator • 1 Export Development 	 <p>Community Development (n=5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Community Infrastructure • 2 Community Revitalization
 <p>Education and Workforce Development (n=27)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 Workforce Training • 4 Career and Technical Education • 1 Adult Education • 1 Education Achievement/Attainment • 1 Teacher Training 	 <p>Civic Entrepreneurship (n=2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Community Capacity
 <p>Asset-Based Development (n=12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 Arts-Culture-Tourism • 6 Sector-based Strategies 	 <p>Health (n=2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Health Access

ARC requires grantees to identify projected outputs and outcomes for their projects, for which they must report progress on a regular basis. In addition, as part of the semi-structured interviews, grantees were asked to describe how they defined success for their projects, outside of set outputs and outcomes. Tables 2-4 provide an overview, by grant type, of common outputs and outcomes, as well as a summary of common grantee definitions of success (aggregated by grant type). Note that outputs, outcomes, and definitions of success in Tables 2-4 are limited to the 88 evaluated grantees.

Tables 2 and 3 list each grant type, as well as the outputs and outcomes that were selected by those grantees; the number of grantees selecting each output or outcome; and the total number anticipated to be reached by that output or outcome (e.g., how many total businesses were anticipated to be created, etc.). Outputs and outcomes selected, number of grantees selecting, and total planned counts are based on data obtained through ARCnet, ARC's data collection and reporting system, as of September 2019.⁶ Definitions of outputs and outcomes listed in Tables 2 and 3 are provided in Appendix E.







Outputs

As shown in Table 2, there were similarities in outputs selected across project categories. All evaluated project types with the exception of Health selected Participants Served and Communities Served, and four of six types selected Businesses Served, Plans/Reports, Organizations Served, and Square Feet. In total, evaluated grantees aimed to serve 9,793 participants; 595 communities; 8,301 businesses; and 232 organizations across Appalachia. Evaluated grantees aimed to complete 293 plans/reports and construct or improve 149,515 square feet.

The most commonly selected output for Business Development projects was Businesses Served (selected by 88 percent of evaluated grantees), followed by Participants Served (selected by 40 percent) and Communities Served (selected by 38 percent). For Education and Workforce Development projects, Workers/Trainees Served was selected by 74 percent of evaluated grantees, followed by Students Served (selected by 44 percent). Communities Served was the most common output for evaluated Asset-Based Development projects (58 percent); half selected Businesses Served. Communities Served and Businesses Served were selected by 80 percent of evaluated Community Development projects. Both Civic Entrepreneurship projects selected Communities Served, and both Health projects selected Patients Served as outputs. Other outputs and planned output numbers are listed in Table 2.

⁶ Actual output and outcome numbers are not listed in this report, as most grantees evaluated were still in the process of implementation. While some had interim progress recorded in ARCnet, many did not, and the evaluation team determined that actual numbers recorded in ARCnet as of September 2019 may not be accurately representative of numbers to date.

Table 2: Outputs for Evaluated Sample

Project Type	Outputs Selected	Projects ⁷	Planned Outputs
 Business Development (n=40)	Businesses Served	35	6,255
	Participants Served	16	5,711
	Communities Served	15	333
	Plans/Reports	13	223
	Students Served	5	1,190
	Linear Feet	4	46,600
	Workers/Trainees Served	3	1,410
	Households Served	2	335
	Acreage	2	2,017
	Million Gallons Per Day	1	0.1
	New Visitors – Days	1	200,000
	Organizations Served	1	216
	Square Feet	1	27,000
	Access Road Miles	1	0.47
 Education & Workforce Development (n=27)	Workers/Trainees Served	20	10,519
	Students Served	12	36,487
	Businesses Served	10	167
	Communities Served	1	3
	Organizations Served	1	3
	Participants Served	1	130
	Patients Served	1	5,060
	Square Feet	1	36,000
 Asset-Based Development (n=12)	Communities Served	7	201
	Businesses Served	6	732
	Participants Served	5	3,492
	Plans/Reports	5	18
	New Visitors – Days	3	222,750
	New Visitors – Overnight	3	196,627
	Square Feet	2	36,515
Linear Feet	1	79,200	
 Community Development (n=5)	Businesses Served	4	1,147
	Communities Served	4	37
	Households Served	2	4,642
	Linear Feet	2	300,080
	Students Served	2	4,985
	New Visitors – Days	1	250
	New Visitors – Overnight	1	100
	Organizations Served	1	10
	Participants Served	1	300
	Plans/Reports	1	6
	Power – Kilowatts	1	2,000
Square Feet	1	50,000	
 Civic Entrepreneurship (n=2)	Communities Served	2	21
	Participants Served	1	160
	Plans/Reports	1	16
 Health (n=2)	Patients Served	2	12,625
	Organizations Served	1	3






⁷ Grantees with more than one grant for the same project are counted as one grantee. Projects can be counted more than once, as grantees could select more than one output.

Outcomes

As with outputs, Table 3 demonstrates similarities in selected outcomes across project categories. All project categories except Civic Entrepreneurship selected Jobs Created and Leveraged Private Investment as outcomes, and all categories except Health selected Participants Improved and Communities Improved. Four of the six categories (Business Development, Education and Workforce Development, Asset-Based Development, and Community Development) selected Businesses Improved, Businesses Created, and Jobs Retained. In total, evaluated grantees planned to create 6,474 jobs and 982 businesses; leverage nearly \$581 million in private investment; and improve 5,798 participants, 337 communities, and 4,045 businesses, plus retaining 4,147 jobs.

By project type, the most commonly selected outcomes for Business Development were Jobs Created (selected by 90 percent of evaluated Business Development projects), followed by Businesses Improved (83 percent) and Leveraged Private Investment (83 percent). For Education and Workforce Development, 74 percent selected Workers/Trainees Improved, and another 44 percent selected Students Improved. All Asset-Based Development projects selected Jobs Created, and 67 percent selected Businesses Created. Community Development projects were mostly likely to select Businesses Improved and Communities Improved (80 percent each). Both Civic Entrepreneurship projects selected Communities Improved, and both Health projects selected Patients Improved and Jobs Created. Other outcomes and planned outcome numbers are listed in Table 3.

Table 3: Outcomes for Evaluated Sample

Project Type	Outcomes Selected	Projects ⁸	Planned Outcomes
 Business Development (n=40)	Jobs Created	37	4,253
	Businesses Improved	34	3,272
	Leveraged Private Investment	33	\$475,215,846
	Businesses Created	27	675
	Jobs Retained	20	3,105
	Participants Improved	16	4,921
	Communities Improved	15	233
	Students Improved	4	600
	Workers/Trainees Improved	3	1,150
	Programs Implemented	3	7
	Organizations Improved	1	216
	Households Improved	1	65
	Revenues Increased – Export Sales	1	\$20,000,000
 Education & Workforce Development (n=27)	Workers/Trainees Improved	20	7,171
	Students Improved	12	36,109
	Businesses Improved	10	129
	Jobs Created	7	621
	Jobs Retained	4	272
	Leveraged Private Investment	3	\$32,590,000
	Programs Implemented	3	10
	Businesses Created	3	34
	Revenues Increased – Nonexport	2	\$39,867,500
	Communities Improved	1	3
	Organizations Improved	1	3
	Participants Improved	1	130
	Patients Improved	1	5,060
 Asset-Based Development (n=12)	Jobs Created	12	969
	Businesses Created	8	270
	Communities Improved	7	56
	Leveraged Private Investment	7	\$15,188,725
	Businesses Improved	6	307
	Participants Improved	5	467
	Revenues Increased – Nonexport	5	\$66,532,200
	Jobs Retained	3	325
	Programs Implemented	1	1
	Telecom Sites	1	1
 Community Development (n=5)	Businesses Improved	4	337
	Communities Improved	4	24
	Jobs Created	3	602
	Jobs Retained	3	445
	Households Improved	2	1,389
	Leveraged Private Investment	2	\$57,000,000
	Businesses Created	1	3
	Participants Improved	1	200
	Revenues Increased – Nonexport	1	\$560,000
 Civic Entrepreneurship (n=2)	Communities Improved	2	21
	Participants Improved	1	80
 Health (n=2)	Patients Improved	2	12,500
	Jobs Created	2	29
	Students Improved	1	60
	Leveraged Private Investment	1	\$780,000
	Organizations Improved	1	3

⁸ Grantees with more than one grant for the same project are counted as one grantee. Projects could be counted more than once, as grantees could select more than one outcome.

In addition to setting outputs and outcomes, during telephone and on-site interviews, grantees were asked to define success in their own terms, beyond projected outputs and outcomes. Table 4 provides a summary overview of other definitions of success, based on the evaluation team's grouping of other definitions of success into themes.

Grantees tend to report seeing the "big picture" beyond projected outputs and outcomes and frequently define success in terms similar to those ARC uses to describe the goals and objectives of the POWER Initiative overall. The most common definition of success (noted by just under 40 percent of grantees) was creating a broad economic impact, including attracting new businesses and industries, investors, and visitors to the region; diversifying economies; and helping people get jobs that lead to workers staying in the region. Economic impact was particularly mentioned among Business Development (nearly half of these grantees) and Asset-Based Development grantees (over half of these grantees).




Further, just under 40 percent of grantees mentioned a desire to support not just jobs, but viable and enjoyable career paths and financial futures (comments included fulfilling careers, high-paying jobs, and being able to support families). This definition was noted especially among Education and Workforce Development grantees (over two-thirds).

Building community capacity, including building networks within communities to carry out the work, increasing community-based activism and leadership, and rallying communities around a common goal was mentioned by just below 20 percent of grantees. Both Civic Entrepreneurship grantees discussed this aim, as did a number of other grantees across all other project types except Health.

Three additional definitions of success themes were related to building creative or positive strategies or feelings within communities. About 16 percent of grantees defined success as creating new ways of thinking in communities, including promoting innovative ways of considering business and economic development; using asset-based approaches; and shifting mindsets about career opportunities. Nearly 14 percent of grantees mentioned building hope, excitement, or engagement within communities. In addition, just over 10 percent cited improvements in quality of life, which included improvements in healthcare, nutrition, and recreation options.

Finally, about 10 percent of grantees felt that the overall sustainability of their project, beyond the life of the POWER grant, would be a definition of success.

Table 4: Additional Definitions of Success by Project Category⁹

Project Type	Other Definitions of Success
 Business Development (n=40)	Economic impact (18) Viable careers/financial futures (10) New ways of thinking (9) Building community capacity (7) Building hope/excitement (6) Sustainability (6) Quality of life (3)
 Education & Workforce Development (n=27)	Viable careers/financial futures (18) Economic impact (6) New ways of thinking (4) Building community capacity (3) Building hope/excitement (2) Quality of life (1) Sustainability (1)
 Asset-Based Development (n=12)	Economic impact (7) Quality of life (4) Viable careers/financial futures (3) Building community capacity (3) Building hope/excitement (2) Sustainability (2) New ways of thinking (1)
 Community Development (n=5 evaluated)	Building community capacity (2) Quality of life (2) Economic impact (1)
 Civic Entrepreneurship (n=2 evaluated)	Building community capacity (2) Economic impact (1) Building hope/excitement (1) Viable careers/financial futures (1)
 Health (n=2 evaluated)	Building hope/excitement (1) Sustainability (1)

Summary of Key Themes and Findings

Evaluators identified four main themes that were common across all grant types and thus are the focus of this report.

Target Population Recruitment and Engagement: Recruitment of beneficiaries (e.g., trainees, businesses, communities, tourists, etc.), as well as the retention and continued engagement of those beneficiaries throughout the project. Common challenges included participant reluctance, competition among organizations, and access to funding and capital. Common factors that accelerated success were strategic recruitment, the use of multiple media, tailored programming, and demonstrating progress.

⁹ Projects may be included in more than one definition of success, as some grantees listed multiple additional definitions of success.

Organizational Capacity: The wherewithal of grantee organizations to capitalize on strengths related to internal management and human and financial resource capacity to support effective project delivery and accountability. Common challenges were project or time management, staffing, financial management, and grants management. Common factors that accelerated success were internal resources, organizational experience and reputation, and promoting a creative and nimble organizational culture.

Partnerships and Collaboration: External relationships and the extent to which partner organizations could be utilized to execute projects successfully. Common challenges were differences in organizational processes among partners, differing levels of commitment, and partner turnover and lack of capacity. Common factors that accelerated success were partnership histories, development of new partnerships, ensuring “fit,” a focus on common priorities, and effective communication.

Community Capacity: The willingness and ability of communities, and those businesses and individuals within the communities, to participate in funded projects in a way that would lead to achievement of project outcomes. Common challenges were a shallow pool of community resources, social and environmental barriers, and community infrastructure. Common factors that accelerated success were the building of community self-determination, building a pipeline of future leaders, and increasing grantee presence and connections with communities.

Finally, while it is too early to measure the true **impact** of POWER funding and POWER projects, grantees described long-term vision for economic transformation driven, in part, by social change that includes the building of hope and the shifting of mindsets in areas that have seen severe economic distress. Reported early impacts include the power of POWER to set vision and build hope; progress toward potential long-term change; social change; and economic development.

Each theme is discussed in more detail in the [Key Themes](#) section, along with successes and challenges related to each theme and lessons learned. The [Early Impacts](#) section offers a description of perceived and anticipated impacts at this point in POWER implementation.

Evaluation Notes and Limitations

While the C/D team worked closely with ARC to ensure that evaluation methodology was appropriate to answer all evaluation questions, as with all evaluations, there are certain limitations that should be noted.

The evaluation was primarily an implementation evaluation, as most projects had not concluded during the Year One evaluation period, or those that had concluded were recently finished. As such, this evaluation only covers project outcomes and impacts from a limited standpoint (namely, reviewing output and outcome numbers reported by grantees, as well as grantees' perceptions about early impacts). Future iterations of POWER evaluations should cover longer-term project impact, comparing it against desired goals and objectives for POWER.

In addition, the 88 POWER projects reviewed for this evaluation were at various stages of implementation during evaluation. Some projects had just begun, some were in the middle of implementation, and some were drawing to a close or had recently closed. As part of the monthly evaluation reports to ARC, C/D provided information on the point in implementation at which the project was evaluated;¹⁰ however, because projects were at various stages of implementation, conclusions drawn about project implementation may not be valid for all projects.

Because the evaluation utilized primarily qualitative methods, it also has standard limitations associated with qualitative analysis. C/D employed techniques to minimize these limitations to the extent possible.

Finally, because data were gathered through a semi-structured inquiry process, frequencies reported for success, challenges, and impacts tables in the report indicate the number of grants for which the experience or perception was specifically mentioned. A lack of response should not be interpreted to mean an experience or perception was absent from, or did not apply to, a project. Rather, it simply indicates the factor was not affirmed through the data collection and analysis process.

A full description of limitations, and techniques employed to address limitations, is provided in [Appendix A](#).

¹⁰ A measure of percentage calculated based on the number of months that had passed since grant approval, divided by number of approved implementation months.



Key Themes of Project Implementation

The following themes emerged through qualitative data gathered via document review, open-ended questionnaires, and semi-structured interview responses from program staff and/or partners implementing the 88 evaluated grants. While grantees across all project types are represented in each theme and most subthemes, subthemes where only certain types of projects were represented are noted.

Theme 1. Target Beneficiary Recruitment and Engagement

"In this market, you have to get out there and talk to people."

"Many [potential participants] were either waiting for the mine to reopen or weren't open to the idea of retraining for another position that paid less than their previous jobs."

This theme focuses on the recruitment and engagement of participants (program beneficiaries) across all POWER grant categories. Given the nature and variety of project focus, the term "participant" is considered very broadly for this evaluation. Table 5 shows the different types of participants, as well as the grant type primarily serving them.

Table 5: Participant Type by Grantee Type

Participant Type	Primarily Served by:
Workforce trainees	Education & Workforce Development
Students (K-12 or higher education)	Education & Workforce Development Business Development
Businesses (both small and large)	Business Development
Tourists and recreation enthusiasts	Asset-Based Development
Entrepreneurs	Business Development
Communities	Community Development Civic Entrepreneurship
Healthcare service recipients	Health

Recruitment included grantees' abilities to identify and involve their desired beneficiaries in funded activities and services. Engagement included the ability to keep program participants involved in programming until desired outcomes were achieved (e.g., completion of workforce or education training; full participation in workshops or other skill-building activities; in-depth involvement in activities designed to improve health, community capacity or infrastructure, etc.).

Strengths and Contributing Factors

Grantees that had success at recruitment and engagement typically reported similar factors contributing to those successes. Common factors included:






- Strategic recruitment (n=46)
- Tailored programming (n=45)
- Demonstrating the possibilities (n=26)
- Multiple media (n=25)

Each factor is listed below, along with examples.¹¹

Strategic Recruitment

Over half of the interviewed grantees reported that a major contributor to recruitment success was the utilization of recruitment plans that included identified human and financial resources to support recruitment, particularly targeted to individual communities. Some grantees were able to capitalize on local demand or interest for the project, which included leveraging industry growth or excitement in a particular industry or even turning the lack of resources in a community or region into interest for the project. In addition, some grantees tailored recruitment by engaging the help of local resources and/or tailoring communication to communities with local events or having a local presence. Grantees in all project categories except Community Development provided examples under this theme.

Table 6: Strategic Recruitment Examples (n=46)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (17)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The region has significant demand for [the services offered through] the project...but would only fully utilize these services...by adding personalized service from an individual with a presence in the region." - "The growing demand for solar in the commercial sector is a key thing, a key positive." - "The region is capital starved, and the pent-up demand has really helped this project get off the ground."
 Education & Workforce Development (18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Local...clubs really helped get the word out and shepherd people into our program." - "Partners delivered a robust set of ideas for targeted outreach within the communities. [These efforts], especially at the grassroots community level, tremendously advanced enrollment numbers." - "In the past, it has been challenging to promote interest in manufacturing careers. [However], the current workforce shortage, increased visibility [of our project], and downturn in coal is changing perceptions. Our region is fairly small and word-of-mouth has helped spread the word."
 Asset-Based Development (7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Over the past 5-7 years, there has been a push to support local farmers and engage with agricultural opportunities." - "The big thing with rural economic development in our state is outdoor recreation – we need to advertise ourselves as such, and [there is great potential to build on that]."
 Civic Entrepreneurship (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "There was an openness to diversification that wasn't being captured in the region. We found...a large public interest in economic development diversification strategies and a desire to understand which strategies were viable."
 Health (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The primary [ways in which] patients are recruited is because [of] a respected peer from the community."

¹¹ For all tables that provide examples, the number of grantees mentioning that subtheme is based on themes created by the evaluation team, as well as coding of responses and placing responses into those themes. Frequencies indicate the number of projects for which the experience or perception was specifically mentioned. A lack of response should not be interpreted to mean an experience or perception was absent from, or did not apply to, a project. Rather it indicates the factor was not affirmed through the data collection and analysis process.

Tailored programming

More than half of the grantees across all categories reported that effective recruitment and engagement required ensuring that programming was individualized to meet the needs of target beneficiaries, as well to meet the needs of partners, including local businesses. While grantees adhered to the spirit of their original project plans, they recognized flexibility was necessary to maximize benefits to participants. Grantees also noted that ARC's willingness to allow flexibility and creativity was vital. Examples of approaches included changing curricula, offering training opportunities through various means (in-person and online), offering stipends for participation, and adapting frameworks to suit community needs.







Table 7: Tailored Programming Examples (n=45)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The topography and low population density of some of the remote counties makes it difficult to reach them. Streaming [our] workshops and having them as recordings has addressed this issue." - "[We] focused our technical assistance efforts away from classroom sessions to one-on-one assistance. In this market, you have to get out there and talk to people." - "[We created] a needs assessment for each county and distributed it at an event at each county. [We then based] workshops on each county's needs."
 Education & Workforce Development (18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We found that many employers need either airframe or powerplant certified workers, rather than both. We modified our program so students start with general coursework and then have dual track options. We also developed a high school program." - "We started to see a bottleneck in the pipeline because it was taking too long to see people through the investment stage...so we improved our processes to expedite the assessment and human resource functions." - "[To remove barriers, we purchase] tools for the trainees, and trainees get to keep them upon successful completion of training. A \$250 weekly expense stipend is also given to trainees. Testing/certification fees were also paid by the program to remove this as another barrier for trainees to obtain industry credentials upon completion of training."
 Asset-Based Development (5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The [project] has been adapted to include co-packing, catering, and institutional selling. Our populations have unique needs...This has meant we have to be flexible and adaptable in delivering services." - "[We] changed the requirements of the apprenticeship program to be more flexible, with 20 hours of paid on-the-job training per week, business plan assistance, and exposure to different aspects of the food system."
 Community Development (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Our thinking has evolved, and we have developed a new approach where [we will engage with for-profit entities] to create...employment opportunities. Similarly, we have shifted our focus to engage with nonprofit partners as hosts for our...cohorts. This will allow us to build the capacity of nonprofit leaders, support wage-based employment...and generate potential employees for partners, our own enterprises, and others."
 Civic Entrepreneurship (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[We have tweaked and adjusted approaches based on community needs and preferences]. Whoever is at the table, you have to follow their lead before you can invest the resources."
 Health (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[Programming is very individualized based on the needs of the patient]. We help people navigate, help them choose plans for Medicare, help them jump through hoops of what they need."

Demonstrating the possibilities

Roughly 30 percent of grantees representing all categories felt that the ability to communicate project success could then show potential new beneficiaries the value of participating in the project, particularly when they could show participants others like them who had been successful in the process.






Table 8: Demonstrating Possibilities Examples (n=26)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"[We are] creating the demonstration of former coal miners participating in the new energy economy, hiring people, starting their own visions. Our work is largely about creating tangible demonstrations."</i> - <i>"Clients tell our story best."</i> - <i>"The companies have been so appreciative that they act as ambassadors for our organization, making entry into other businesses so much easier."</i>
 Education & Workforce Development (9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"The [biggest thing here] is an opportunity. If you can see yourself in that opportunity, we get people knocking down the doors. Success breeds success."</i> - <i>"[We got] testimonials from those who obtained employment that it was worth the wait and why they liked the job."</i> - <i>"College stakeholders and the economic development community use the facility as a talking point to speak about the success of current programs and potential to enhance workforce development in the region."</i>
 Asset-Based Development (5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"A big asset we've had with this project is peer-to-peer education, where farmers can really present their results and what they're doing, success and failure, to other farmers."</i> - <i>"Our communities are small and intertwined. Word-of-mouth has helped promote our program and encourage more participation as communities see new social enterprises established or experience health-related programming or services within them."</i>
 Community Development (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"Participants and partners in the program refer others [to the project]. We have not had to market our services much, as we have more interest than we can currently serve."</i>
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"[You have to] leverage successful communities as ambassadors to contextualize what can happen and what the intended outcomes are. Get small victories upfront and build on those successes."</i>
 Health (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"We've been able to travel and demonstrate the model. The providers have caught on [to the model's success]. They see their patients getting better, and the referrals are flowing."</i>

Multiple media

About 30 percent of grantees reported that successful recruitment included identifying ways to use multiple forms of communication for engaging participants. Media included local, regional, or national newspapers and TV; digital and social media; local or organizational newsletters; and networking and social events. Grantees in all categories except Health affirmed topics related to this subtheme.

Table 9: Multiple Media Examples (n=25)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (11)	<p>- "We have had various press attention for our program's efforts within the communities we are working with. This includes [our program coordinator] being given a monthly column in the [local newspaper] to discuss this work."</p> <p>- "Public events have been held in three counties, and a live TV interview was conducted at [one event]. [In addition], networking, community events, and connections and partners to get the word out have been critical."</p> <p>- "A webpage is being developed by a local provider, [and] there will be sub-webpages for each business."</p>
 Education & Workforce Development (11)	<p>- "We've had a lot of press on campus, visits from state representatives, tours."</p> <p>- "Various open houses and events were featured on TV and radio. Digital websites were also created."</p> <p>- The local TV station has visited three times. Elected officials and community members have toured the facility. Newer recruiting strategies are also being tried, [including] more frequent TV and social media advertising."</p>
 Asset-Based Development (1)	<p>- "We [were] slow to gain traction, but marketing [has helped] raise awareness."</p>
 Community Development (1)	<p>- "We have received a significant amount of media attention including features in [local magazines] and a [community college] video."</p>
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<p>- "One partner has a full-time communications person who has created a really wonderful newsletter. It's made us realize how important that is."</p>

Challenges and Contributing Factors

Nearly 60 percent of evaluated grantees reported at least some challenges with finding and recruiting participants, as well as engaging participants at desired levels. Common challenges included:

- Participant reluctance (n=38)
- Beneficiary funding (n=17)
- Competition (n=16)

Participant Reluctance

Over 40 percent of grantees across all project types experienced challenges recruiting and engaging participants who were ready for and interested in programs and services offered. These grantees reported participant reluctance related to risk aversion or skepticism to entrepreneurship, investment, or industry diversification; a sense that coal would return, thus making POWER initiatives unnecessary or undesired; or a perceived sense of hopelessness in their implementation communities.



Table 10: Participant Reluctance Examples (n=38)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (17)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "People have a hard time seeing owning or starting a small business as a viable career path. The mindset is really a challenge." - "Small farming and range operations aren't seen [as viable] businesses. We need to [educate people to see them] as a business, a contributor to the economy and not a hobby. Until we respect it for what it is, it won't be viable." - "Many [potential participants] were either waiting for the mine to reopen or weren't open to the idea of retraining for another position that paid less than their previous jobs."
 Education & Workforce Development (11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "When we talk about prospective jobs for cyber and information technology, we have to be forward thinking, and it can be a hard sell when workforce development activities are ahead of the actual jobs." - "There is a pervasive belief in the region that coal will come back. Some who have worked in coal expect employment/unemployment fluctuations, so they believe this will just be a slow time and not the death of the industry." - "Dislocated workers can face daunting challenges in finding new employment. There are so many who believe there are no opportunities here."
 Asset-Based Development (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Farmers don't move at the speed of light. They step back and see what early adopters do, and what happened to them." - "The western part of [this state] has not been as interested in [our industry of focus] because mining and mill jobs [had always been] readily available. We had to work to generate interest."
 Community Development (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "There is a bit of 'cognitive dissonance' in the region relative to diversifying the economy or getting more mines to open. The change in state and federal administrations has given mixed signals to communities, and communities are resource constrained and cannot afford to do both."
 Civic Entrepreneurship (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "A lot of energy and PR is around 'we're going to open the coal mines again'. You can't point to somebody that's working in their own coffee shop - that doesn't trigger interest, because people are used to looking at coal miners and their money, and that's what they want." - "We are struggling against the current of hopelessness to maintain positivity. People are only going to be engaged if they see some results."
 Health (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "There's a misconception that diabetes is a death sentence, so people throw up their hands and think there is no use doing anything. We have to show them this is not 20 years ago."

Beneficiary Funding

This subtheme is one of the few that applies to just two categories: Education and Workforce Development and Business Development. Roughly 40 percent of Education and Workforce Development grantees noted challenges in recruiting individuals who could afford to participate in education or training activities in lieu of earning wages, or the ability to provide stipends or wage replacement to address this issue. About 15 percent of Business Development grantees cited difficulties in helping participants access the capital needed to engage in the desired business development (typically entrepreneurial) endeavors. If the grantee was not able to help a potential business owner or entrepreneur identify resources to access capital needed, this sometimes resulted in lack of ability to recruit or to engage participants through the training.





Table 11: Beneficiary Funding Examples (n=17)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Businesses have trouble accessing investment dollars in [more rural] communities." - "The most significant challenge is...access to capital. Those networks [to provide it] just don't exist."
 Education & Workforce Development (11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Wage replacement is the first hurdle. [Potential participants] just can't afford to drop their jobs." - "Older workers are not participating...because they lack income during the training period and have no guarantee of a job afterward."

Competition

About 18 percent of grantees across four project categories felt challenged recruiting and engaging beneficiaries due to what they perceived as competition for scarce resources with other grantees and competition with local or other entities.

Table 12: Competition Examples (n=16)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Community 'turfiness' and internal competition due to resource scarcity are often tough to overcome in some communities." - "Some communities will not partner as they see the grant as competition."
 Education & Workforce Development (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Several other tech training/internship programs had much larger awards and offered paid training time while ours did not. This made it a challenge to get the enrollment we'd hoped for."
 Asset-Based Development (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "There was significant apprehension in the community about the program and seeing it as a competitor. This has been overcome, but there is still so much work to be done in building out this approach."
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We've sought to work with each other, but we compete for a lot of the same civic-minded people. In [one region] in particular, there has been a lot of 'noise' because there have been so many POWER projects, and communities have struggled to figure out which project to connect with."

Lessons Learned for Effective Recruitment and Engagement

- 1. Use screening tools.** Some grantees recommended the use of tools to ensure that beneficiaries were the right fit for the project. These included initial participant screenings, background checks, and assessments; intake processes; participation contracts; and tailored needs assessments. They allowed the grantees to zero in on those beneficiaries who would be the most likely to participate fully in and thus be impacted by the project.
- 2. Employ marketing staff.** Grantees found that it can be valuable to invest resources in finding or identifying staff to focus on marketing the value of the project, especially early in implementation. In particular, grantees found it useful to engage communications professionals to tell their stories, but they also noted the value of focusing marketing and recruitment messages for each community. As such, some grantees recommended engaging individuals from local communities to support on-the-ground marketing activities.
- 3. Pilot programs.** Because grantees often were juggling limited financial and staffing resources, some recommended starting small, piloting programming to ensure successful methods and then scaling up or focusing on a particular set of participants for recruitment and engagement rather than being overly broad.

Theme 2. Organizational Capacity

"[We are] a little bit of a risk-taking group. Sometimes that's what we have to do to create change. Trying things that haven't been tried before to make it work."

"We underestimated the challenges in working with traditional educational and social service programming. We also underestimated the time needed to get some of the programming, facilities, and equipment fully in place."

This theme focuses internally, on the ability of grantee organizations to execute grant projects successfully. It includes elements of organizational leadership and staffing; planning and project management; and grants management (such as financial and data tracking).

Strengths and Contributing Factors

Grantees across all project categories reported that human, financial, and organizational resources supported project success, as well as the ability to build on internal organizational factors such as experience, history, or reputation. Additionally, grantees discussed the importance of organizational agility as a strength in this category. Common factors included:

- Internal resources (n=41)
- Experience and reputation (n=40)
- Creative culture (n=9)

Internal resources

Nearly half of all grantees cited internal resources as factors contributing to success. These included human resources, such as leadership, full-time staff, and contractors, as well as the development and implementation of strong hiring or contracting processes. Grantees also mentioned the ability of staff members to work across multiple disciplines for the good of the project. Further, the development or use of existing internal systems for financial and data tracking were identified as vital in strong grant implementation and accountability.




Table 13: Internal Resources Examples (n=41)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (20)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "I have an amazing team that is purposely transdisciplinary (health, arts, education, economic development, planning), and that's been really useful for looking at things through multiple lenses." - "We have individuals including former entrepreneurs, tech execs, HR specialists, who have expertise in helping small businesses and individuals. From a personnel perspective, we had all that." - "Tracking processes, forms, reporting, and other systems and procedures were put into place early on to track business contacts, training provided, and results. Budget forms, monthly invoicing forms, and match report forms were all created to ensure billing and reporting are meeting guidelines from all parties." - "[We had] many of the financial and staff tracking systems [already] in place for the grant."
 Education & Workforce Development (7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The internal team – instructors, finance and accounting staff, IT staff – have shown major dedication to making this project a success." - "The infrastructure for managing the grant just fell in line with [systems] that we already had."
 Asset-Based Development (7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We have some amazing people working on the project, very creative. Nothing is going to work in [this region] unless you're willing to think outside the box." - "[We have] an internal application and spreadsheet to track contacts, outcomes, next follow up, and hires made. Staff gets a weekly task list for follow ups. If you hound local food buyers and farmers too much, you can turn them off. Instead we can use the system] to make notes about when to contact them back, depending on how hot or cold they were."
 Community Development (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Our team is experienced in performing the services required, so no outside contractors needed to be hired and this was a key factor in maintaining the budget." - "With having prior grant experience, we were able to replicate the processes and procedures already in place, allowing data to be collected faster."
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Having access to the [pre-existing] entrepreneurial framework and its resources helped to frame how we worked with communities."
 Health (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [We] put a lot of focus on ensuring the right people were [brought on board]. People from the community, people willing to listen, people who understand it's not a 9-5 job."

Experience and reputation

Just under half of all grantees reported that the collective skills, knowledge, and experience of the organization were tied to successful implementation. This included the grantee's ability to build on existing programming or beneficiary relationships to accelerate success.

Table 14: Experience/Reputation Examples (n=40)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (19)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We are an existing lender known in the community. When marketing...people were familiar with us. Our history of performance was a factor. People check references when they are looking for a loan, and we do what we tell them we will do." - "The longevity [of the organization] has been helpful, as [we] have weathered a number of storms. The brand is seen as having staying power, so more locals are willing to invest in the strategies." - "This project built on...project infrastructure and [a statewide program] previously funded...30 years of experience and relationships with manufacturers were also leveraged. Peers in the network and an existing manufacturer client base made it easier to expand and implement this project."
 Education & Workforce Development (10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "In our experience as service providers in this area, we've had numerous federal and state grants. As a provider of services since 1996, we've gained the trust of those laid off in industry. Our staff is aware of the need for retraining efforts...We have that connection with industry." - "[The organization] has strong leadership and the ability to effectively execute." - "The curriculum [for this project] is already in place; this [project] is really an expansion of existing capacity."
 Asset-Based Development (6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[Our] knowledge of administering federal grants has been invaluable on the project." - "Internal leadership has been crucial in accomplishing state policy work, convening diverse organizations, [and] establishing [programs] which set a framework of locally led public-health and community development projects upon which the POWER grant was based."
 Community Development (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We had prior experience building fiber infrastructures so the design and build costs were already set up and implemented. Major issues [had been] resolved in previous projects."
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Part of the success in [one of the implementation states] was the [previously existing] relationships that the communities had [with the intermediary organization]"
 Health (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[The partner] "has worked with [the grantee] on several projects in the past, and [we] think very highly of [its leader]. [He] has been instrumental in implementation]. It's probably gone faster because of him."

Creative culture

Nine grantee organizations in Business Development, Education and Workforce Development, and Civic Entrepreneurship identified the presence of an innovative and creative organizational culture as a success factor. Although the overall frequency of responses is lower for this subtheme compared to other subthemes, these organizations stressed the difference organizational culture made to their ability to be effective.

Table 15: Creative Culture Examples (n=9)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (4)	<p>- "Our organization has a culture that allows for nimbleness, taking risks, and encourages good ideas to come from multiple levels. Further, we actively facilitate collaboration and teamwork."</p> <p>- "[We are] a little bit of a risk-taking group. Sometimes that's what we have to do to create change. Trying things that haven't been tried before to make it work."</p>
 Education & Workforce Development (4)	<p>- "The potential return correlates with the amount of risk you take. If the big picture is transforming Appalachia, that's what we need to do."</p> <p>- "Our administration and board leadership have been supportive of working on such a project which is slightly outside the realm of our typical area of expertise."</p>
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<p>- "We're willing to be flexible. That flexibility helped us be more successful."</p>

Challenges and Contributing Factors

Nearly three-quarters of grantees across all project categories reported challenges or barriers associated with organizational capacity. These challenges included project management challenges, internal staff issues, financial constraints, and grants management issues. Common challenges included:

- Project management (n=37)
- Staffing (n=32)
- Financial constraints (n=27)
- Grants management (n=24)

Project/Time Management

Project and time management challenges included all aspects of managing the lifecycle of project implementation. More than 40 percent of grantees reported issues in this area, representing all grant categories except Civic Entrepreneurship. Some grantees had challenges managing multiple types of regulatory processes, while others experienced project management issues related to dealing with timelines and delays in implementation. (Delay issues were particularly common for projects that included construction.) Still other grantees had challenges managing the processes of partner collaboration.







Table 16: Project Management Examples (n=37)

Project Category	Examples
 <p>Business Development (16)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Getting things in motion was a challenge. It was a new approach [than we were used to]. Coordinating was not smooth." - "Trying to launch major new programs while also being a nonprofit slows progress. There are just so many systems, processes, etc. to put in place. It's like working on an old farmhouse – you go to change a lightbulb and find 16 other things that need done." - "Mobilizing across the broader service area was delayed by necessary subcontracting due diligence requirements. This has reduced the overall mini-grant implementation timeline." - "[There have been] 13 months of delays at multiple steps. [We have had] difficulties securing right of ways and [have needed] extra steps in going through the public service commission. These delays resulted in higher construction bids, [which created further delays]."
 <p>Education & Workforce Development (13)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Balancing funders and requirements, expectations, community funds, state funds, ARC funds, lots to balance." - "We underestimated the challenges in working with traditional educational and social service programming. We also underestimated the time needed to get some of the programming, facilities, and equipment fully in place." - "Delays in the renovation process created the most significant challenges. The construction bid was overbudget and we had to submit a change of scope to ARC."
 <p>Asset-Based Development (5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "These construction projects had much more significant environmental clearance issues than normal for community development and construction projects. Pre-planning required for design work that we didn't anticipate." - "This project, which contains construction components, was held up until the environmental review was completed."
 <p>Community Development (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The project was rebid twice in the RFP stage, and no vendors would take on the project."
 <p>Health (1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The accreditation process and body was a challenge. The body had a process which required significant due diligence on [our] part."

Staffing

About 36 percent of grantees representing all categories experienced internal staff-related challenges. Hurdles to staffing included difficulty finding and retaining the right people for the project; turnover of existing leadership or staff, delays in hiring, and managing staff duties and capacity.





Table 17: Staffing Examples (n=32)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (17)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The individual we hired to perform marketing tasks did not embrace the [project] in the manner we had hoped. We are looking for a person to fill that position." - "Unfortunately, our project is behind due to leadership changes. [Leadership staff] transitioned out of their roles in mid-2017, but replacements were not hired until near the end of 2017." - "We did not fully appreciate the amount of [staff time for] technical assistance and handholding that [clients would need] through this process [and] how much help [clients] would need to get across the finish line."
 Education & Workforce Development (6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We didn't have any idea how much time the outreach would take. It's such a huge region and it takes a lot of travel time." - "Our team has taken on additional duties while maintaining their current responsibilities to make the project work. We would consider additional staff if we receive future funding."
 Asset-Based Development (5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "In retrospect we didn't do a good enough job of having administrative overhead personnel. Cat-herding types of individuals." - "Over the last 3 months, we have encountered several challenges. Most importantly are staffing issues. We have had a turnover in [two] positions."
 Community Development (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The biggest struggles have been...hiring new staff. Fortunately, we had a slower build-out schedule so we were able to get the right people without having to rush."
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "What's lacking is boots on the ground – organizers to find the people and get a structure [in place]."
 Health (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "It has been somewhat challenging to recruit faculty to the area, so faculty retention will be an ongoing challenge."

Financial Constraints

About 30 percent of grantees representing all categories except Civic Entrepreneurship and Health had challenges with organizational finances. These included issues with match dollars (obtaining the match dollars in a timely manner or getting partners to come through with promised match); challenges with the reimbursement funding or timing of payments; responding to situations when POWER funds and match dollars were not enough to cover the actual costs of the project; and concerns about how to sustain the project beyond POWER and other grant funding.






Table 18: Financial Constraints Examples (n=27)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We have had some delays in our partners bringing in the match funding, due to timelines and plans because of [lack of] bandwidth." - "The project has operated on ARC advances, and this lack of dollars [upfront] can be challenging at times." - "Revenue generation to support the incubator and kitchen will be challenging to make it sustainable. It is hard to balance revenue and expenses in an incubator."
 Education & Workforce Development (11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[Our] match requirements changed, and we had to spend more money upfront than we expected." - "[Reimbursement] payment for activities can be very slow. Reimbursement and timing for payments is a big challenge for small and start-up organizations." - "The aging building has presented ongoing challenges. The demolition cost was almost twice what we anticipated. After work began on one of the buildings, we discovered multiple...issues, [and] the cost of renovations went from \$200K to somewhere between \$1M-\$1.5M."
 Asset-Based Development (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Some of the local [match] share was exaggerated. That gets us all in a bind." - "The collapsing of the [building] roof and the potential environmental aspect issues were not factored into the cost [of renovations] initially."
 Community Development (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The schedule of only three reimbursements per year can create a cash flow strain."

Grants Management

Just over one-quarter of grantees reported issues with grants management, including grantees in all categories except Civic Entrepreneurship. Grants management challenges included data tracking for accountability (e.g., reporting on outputs and outcomes), as well as financial tracking. In some cases, grants management challenges were a result of tracking difficulties on the part of partners or other implementing organizations, rather than the grantee themselves.

Table 19: Grants Management Examples (n=24)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Our program suffered early with system coordination. We stitched together solutions mostly using Google Drive for metrics collection, tracking meeting attendees, and creating shareable files." - "The quarterly reporting process has not worked well. Our coaches are very busy working with entrepreneurs, [so] collecting data so often becomes a real nuisance for them." - "We have had some challenges learning to report together [with our partners]. Keeping track of the data is challenging."
 Education & Workforce Development (7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The reporting was a challenge. Gathering the information was difficult. We have [partners] doing the work, and I don't want them to [have to spend their time] filling out paperwork." - "We don't have a system to track our impact, because we don't have an institutional research office. We had no way to follow [participants] through the whole process. We had to put an internal data collection infrastructure together."
 Asset-Based Development (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The financial reporting has been very challenging. The lack of systems and processes have almost made the grant unmanageable." - "[Some organizational partners] are more mature at collecting data than others. We found that some of the biggest challenges in collecting data are [not having] common tools. You have to think about [what metrics] mean and [how to collect them]."
 Community Development (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Some Internet Service Providers have been more responsive to requests for data than others, and some were more willing to provide data in a usable format than others."
 Health (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Reporting data can be really tough. Data collection is burdensome."

Lessons Learned for Stronger Organizational Capacity

1. Staff appropriately. Grantees who experienced staffing challenges recommended reviewing project needs upfront and "staffing up," recognizing that current staff may not be able to manage the workload of a large project like POWER. Additionally, some grantees recommended hiring staff to ensure a local presence in implementation regions and areas.

2. Develop systems for data tracking. As a number of grantees experienced challenges in data tracking and reporting, particularly for accountability and financials, it was recommended that future grantees invest in quality data tracking systems, as well as clearly identifying and defining data elements needed upfront.

Theme 3. Partnerships and Collaboration

"The thing that gave me the most hope was the willingness of all the partners in [the region] to work together. We understand that we need to get it, and we need to work together."

"There are [three partners], three opinions, three ways of doing things. We had to work through this as being one program with one message."

One of the distinguishing characteristics of POWER is its emphasis on working across jurisdictional boundaries to transform regional economies. To do so, grantees and subgrantees assembled formal and informal partnerships with each other and with partner organizations, often collaborated with business and employers, and frequently worked with state, regional, or local government and other entities necessary for project implementation.

Strengths and Contributing Factors

Grantees representing all project categories reported factors that contributed to strong partnerships and productive collaboration in support of the achievement of project goals.

Factors included:

- Partnership history (n=36)
- New opportunities (n=34)
- Partner "fit" (n=31)
- Common priorities (n=26)
- Effective communication (n=18)

History

Nearly half of the grantees across all project categories cited their history in working with implementation partners as an important factor in implementation success. Some grantees also noted that while they had been working with partners for many years, their POWER project strengthened the partnerships.







Table 20: History Examples (n=36)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (14)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"We worked with many of our partners before POWER. POWER has allowed us to deepen the strength of those partnerships and extend them into new areas of service."</i> - <i>"A strong partnership network has been vital. The partners have all participated as we expected, and many at a much higher level than expected."</i> - <i>"Supportive political and community leadership have been very instrumental. The strong partnership and collaboration with [the local area development council] has been a real benefit. [They are] very engaged with attraction of new business sites as well as marketing of the sites."</i>
 Education & Workforce Development (12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"The region served by the project has a well-established sector partnership...in existence since 2012. The project was able to leverage this sector partnership to establish needs and priorities for equipment, as well as to secure employer support."</i> - <i>"Longstanding relationships with state and federal entities have been key. We believe our relationship of trust has been instrumental in progress to date."</i> - <i>"We have a very active economic development council for the region. They're active in promoting and developing [this] industry."</i>
 Asset-Based Development (7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"[Our region] is unique in terms of how we collaborate together. That has been the defining element of [this project]."</i> - <i>"This grant has strengthened partnerships – we can help people get started with whatever stage they are at. This grant helps deepen those collaborations."</i>
 Community Development (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"[Our organization] initially applied for [the] grant funds because we...knew we could make an economic impact in distressed...counties. We leveraged existing partnerships from this experience [for] this grant."</i>
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"In each of the communities where we've worked, [the partners] have relationships that go back a number of years. There are 30-40 years of organizations working together, and this project created a semblance of networks that could be [leveraged]."</i>
 Health (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"It's a factor that everyone we work with, I've already had a prior relationship with them. Because of that prior relationship and the confidence, they said, 'when can we start?'"</i>

New Opportunities

Nearly 40 percent of grantees in all project categories indicated that they were able to build new partnerships or find new opportunities for partnering as a result of their POWER grants. In some cases, grantees noted that these partnerships were the first of their kind and would not have been possible without POWER. In addition, some grantees felt that the newly created partnerships opened doors for participants.






Table 21: New Opportunities Examples (n=34)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (14)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The network built between businesses and regional support agencies is a success that will live beyond the grant cycle." - "The project has generated a true partnership between workforce development and economic development stakeholders in the region." - "With [our] new partnerships, the project has the ability to reach more local small business owners. The...opportunity has created excitement in businesses, which has been the result of increased revenue to their bottom lines."
 Education & Workforce Development (10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The cooperation and collaboration among economic and workforce development, education, and business and industry is unprecedented." - "Partnerships we've developed will allow us to offer new training and classes and be able to respond to industry needs in real-time. Participation in POWER has created new relationships with training and economic development partners." - "We've brought in partners that we don't really know – there were people we'd never met before. We're at different tables and part of different conversations now."
 Asset-Based Development (5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Partners...have facilitated new opportunities...while also allowing us to leverage their expertise to better serve our farmers." - "We've had some great partnerships built with private industries through this [grant]."
 Community Development (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[We] created new partnerships in the region. These new partnerships facilitated development of the strong project pipeline we currently have. [We] have partnered extensively with other POWER grantees as well."
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "What's been interesting and unique is [new] partnerships with two other states – being able to talk to them throughout the program."
 Health (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[As a result of the project], we now have insurance companies who are willing to partner with us."

Partner “Fit”

More than one-third of grantees attributed implementation success not just to having partners, but also having the right partners for the project. Grantees in all categories except Community Development specifically mentioned the importance of partner “fit.” Partners were the right fit for projects because of experience and leadership in the area of focus; a strong reputation in the region or locality of implementation; the commitment or ability to hire program completers; or other factors. Partners often were engaged to fill roles and gaps for the grantee.






Table 22: Partner Fit Examples (n=31)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “[Success has been accelerated] through an extensive process of assembling high-performing groups – getting the right leadership capability in the room.” - “Our partnerships play into our success greatly, because if we can’t provide the services needed directly, we seek our partners who can.” - “[One of our partners] was used as the primary source of contact with the manufacturing community. They were able to hit the systems they needed to get to, without developing a system from scratch.”
 Education & Workforce Development (12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “This could have been a disaster if we had the wrong partners. But in this case, we had exactly the right partners that allowed us to succeed early on.” - “Having the right partners in the room, others appreciate that [and want to participate more], because they now have access to [this expertise].” - “Partners have been committed to employing [project] graduates since the beginning of the program.”
 Asset-Based Development (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We collect and disseminate lessons learned by partners and ensure their expertise is widely available to our constituents.” - “The sharing of the technical experiences of partner organizations, but also the infrastructure [in the state], being able to build off each other’s infrastructure...has been a great output of this process.”
 Civic Entrepreneurship (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The [implementation partner] brought in legitimacy and credibility and expertise that we don’t have here.”
 Health (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The partnerships have been key. The project has demonstrated what can be done to meet a community need when committed partners pull together.”

Common Priorities

Just under 30 percent of grantees in all categories except Community Development mentioned the ability to focus on a common goal or having common priorities across partners as an accelerator in engaging existing partners or building buy-in for creating new partnerships. In some cases, grantees stressed the importance of the project being aligned with other local, state, or regional initiatives, funding, or workforce or economic development planning.

Table 23: Common Priorities Examples (n=26)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “[The project] is part of the long-term economic development strategy for the region, including tourism and establishing a food culture. - “Strong partnerships with other people and organizations who understand the vision and value of growing the local food economy in the region [have been a factor of success].” - “This project is part of the overall city strategy to diversify the economy and to grow advanced manufacturing and healthcare jobs.”
 Education & Workforce Development (7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “We [have] created a skilled program that benefits the entire [industry] cluster rather than just one employer. Every company in the...[field] is on our...[advisory committee].” - “The [programming] is a result of shared commitment and vision. The County Commission worked together and [we] have been moving in the same direction – everybody working for one common goal.”
 Asset-Based Development (6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The thing that gave me the most hope was the willingness of all the partners in [the region] to work together. We understand that we need to get it, and we need to work together.” - “[We have created networks] of people [passionate about trails] who wouldn’t necessarily be sitting down together, and it brings them together to talk about trails.”
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The commitment [among intermediary organizations to the common goal] made them more willing students, more coachable, more committed.”
 Health (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Almost all of our partners are federally qualified health centers and...patient-centered medical health has been a big push [for them]. It was really helpful for that to already be in place.”

Effective Communication

About 20 percent of grantees representing five project categories credited frequent and meaningful communication across partners as a factor of successful partnerships and collaboration. This included regular in-person meetings with targeted agendas, focused committees, and electronic communication.

Table 24: Effective Communication Examples (n=18)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We know our strengths and weaknesses, and we're honest with each other. Consistent follow-up is crucial, including formal and informal." - "We kept the lines of communication open [with our partner], even when things did not go according to plan."
 Education & Workforce Development (7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[We have] regular partner meetings to assess progress against project milestones and facilitate cross-site sharing, [which has] boosted the effectiveness of outreach and recruitment strategies." - "[Our] task force has been a great way of constant communication. We include follow-up [to do] documents after each meeting."
 Asset-Based Development (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We have board meetings in different counties every two months to [talk about issues and progress and share resources]."
 Community Development (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We have built good communication with [internet service] providers."
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "One way [success] has happened is regional sharing and learning. We organize quarterly regional team meet-ups where they share project success."

Challenges and Contributing Factors






Nearly half of all grantees reported challenges in working and collaborating with partners. They represented all project categories except Health. Challenges included:

- Process differences (n=23)
- Level of commitment (n=18)
- Partner personnel (n=15)

Process Differences

Just over one-quarter of grantees experienced challenges in working with partners due to organizational differences, such as differing processes in hiring and data collection; speed of implementation; or organizational mindsets.





Table 25: Process Differences Examples (n=23)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "This is an ecosystem which includes many partners, many agendas, and many egos. Our coaches and their host agencies are all very different from one another, and that gives us strength in many ways, but it also creates challenges creating and managing consistent expectations and messages." - "There are [three partners], three opinions, three ways of doing things. We had to work through this as being one program with one message." - "[The college partner]'s hiring processes were too slow and cumbersome for the grant and were more academically-oriented than entrepreneurially-oriented."
 Education & Workforce Development (8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "You have industry culture that moves fast, but nonprofit, education, and government move slow, and we all have to work together."
 Asset-Based Development (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "There was confusion among partners regarding federal guidelines and expectations. This has been most challenging for private sector partners [who aren't used to these]."
 Community Development (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Fiscal year [definitions] are different between our agencies, and this has been somewhat difficult"
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "There were multiple instances where [the implementation partner] made the site visit organization more challenging, because of disorganization and lack of coordination on their end."

Level of Commitment

About 20 percent of grantees experienced some challenges in working with partners due to uncertainty in roles or expectations for project implementation, or a sense from the grantee that some partners were more committed than others and that initial levels of commitment were not being met.






Table 26: Level of Commitment Examples (n=18)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We received feedback that [some] state trade offices didn't have the capacity to recruit or conduct outreach. [As a result], we had to build target lists and reach out to businesses that didn't know us from Adam, and we weren't expecting that." - "The employer partner backed out at the 11th and a half hour, after all other components [of the project] were in place."
 Education & Workforce Development (7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We were a little ambitious about how many people the employer partner thought they could hire. They couldn't absorb that many – they [just] didn't have the work." - "Getting partner attention has been challenging – [some partners are more engaged than others]. There is not a sense of urgency around the facility except within [the grantee organization]."
 Asset-Based Development (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[We had some] ancillary partners that didn't deliver as well [as we had anticipated or hoped]."
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[Implementation partner] consultants were not equally committed and engaged with site visits [across implementation sites]."

Partner Personnel

In addition to sometimes experiencing internal staffing issues with turnover and capacity, over 15 percent of grantees had challenges with turnover among partner personnel (including leadership or staff), which sometimes led to lack of expected commitment or the need to consistently re-build buy-in. In addition, some grantees found issues with lack of partner staffing capacity.

Table 27: Partner Personnel Examples (n=15)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (4)	- "Partners have limited bandwidth, [particularly for things like tracking and reporting]."
 Education & Workforce Development (5)	- "[One partner] recently hired a new director after almost a year without one. Due to this vacancy, their direct involvement and match is not where we expected." - "While our community college partners have performed well, staffing changes at some of them caused us to have to rebuild new relationships and/or approach the K-12 system directly."
 Asset-Based Development (3)	- "What complicated [things] was there was a lot of turnover [at a partner agency]. People were moving around the agency; we've had 5 different managers. They were changing every few months."
 Community Development (2)	- "Staffing changes and turnover in cooperative agencies have slowed the process at times, although this is to be expected with multiple cooperative agencies and entities, both public and private, participating in a one-year project."
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	- "Key leaders [have left], and there has been this recurring pattern of having to regroup and restart the process."

Lessons Learned for Effective Collaboration

1. Planning and vetting. Grantees who encountered partner challenges, especially those related to level of commitment and staff capacity or turnover, strongly suggested engaging in planning and vetting with partners prior to grant implementation. This include detailed discussions of roles and responsibilities, defining expectations around areas such as recruitment and engagement, and engaging in written agreements.

Theme 4. Community Capacity

*"Residents are being empowered to
'be the change'
in their communities."*

*"The leadership base is thin.
There are rising stars in these
communities, and many times
we go back to them time and time
again, and they are overwhelmed."*

Grantees reported their implementation was affected by a community's ability to participate in projects, including its human capital; social and environmental factors; availability and existence of supporting organizations; and physical infrastructure.

Strengths and Contributing Factors







Grantees across all project categories were able to capitalize on factors unique to the communities in which they were working. Factors that commonly contributed to success included:

- Building self-determination (n=44)
- Expanding community leadership (n=22)
- Grantee influence and presence (n=19)

Building Self-Determination

Half of the grantees representing all project categories felt that their projects had been successful in working to build self-determination and implementation capacity within the communities. Efforts to increase self-determination included creating mechanisms for project sustainability by building replicable and sustainable skills, systems, and frameworks; creating train-the-trainer models; and improving the capacity of communities to seek their own funding and create new programming on their own.





Table 28: Self-Determination Examples (n=44)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (23)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We train local people in how to get their own help. I've seen in [these counties] a new view – they can apply for this grant [themselves]. It's taken the fear and uncertainty away." - "The technical assistance provided to the businesses has equipped them to diversify customers and markets to reduce dependence on the coal industry for ongoing and new revenue." - "In a region like this that does not have large employers, being able to mobilize the economy from the ground up provides a catalytic effect in local communities." - "The toolkit gives [participants] a language to talk about what they are doing, and for investors, it gave a decision-making framework."
 Education & Workforce Development (9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "I know of other programming coming down to the area because of these offerings [from the project]. A larger program...is going to set up an incubation aspect for [this industry] because of the foundation laid by the train-the-trainer model and what the school can now offer." - "A workforce infrastructure to advance the region has been created, and with teachers training other teachers, it can be sustained. The more students who are trained will also grow and create the skilled workforce needed to attract new businesses to the region." - "[We are committed to] helping [the region] help itself. The people of the region have to own this and move it forward."
 Asset-Based Development (6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Residents are being empowered to 'be the change' in their communities." - "We've spent time building a regional process to uniformly go through steps with the different construction components, and that's been helpful for the smaller communities who have never done projects like this. It's brought them up to a higher level of operations when implementing projects."
 Community Development (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We are laying the groundwork for years to come. We anticipate future business growth and individuals can also connect with family and friends."
 Civic Entrepreneurship (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[We have supported] great projects through the mini-grant portion [of the POWER project], which have seeded some ideas around effective development in the communities."
 Health (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We connect our participants, help them find food. We want them to understand we're not there to handhold, to do everything for them. We want to foster autonomy."

Expanding Community Leadership/Building Pipelines

About one-quarter of grantees found success in building up the existing or potential leadership base in communities, particularly those that currently have a limited pool of leaders. In addition, grantees had success building pipelines of future innovators, entrepreneurs, and community leaders through education and training. Grantees noting success in this area represented project types of Business Development, Education and Workforce Development, Asset-Based Development, and Civic Entrepreneurship.






Table 29: Community Leadership/Pipelines Examples (n=22)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (8)	<p>- "Partnerships with the K-12 school systems have been developed, and these are exposing young people to entrepreneurship to try to establish an entrepreneurial mindset at a younger age."</p> <p>- "[Our project] has created an environment that has encouraged younger leaders to become engaged in community development."</p>
 Education & Workforce Development (9)	<p>- "Teachers are taking on active leadership roles within schools on committees and offering professional development workshops. Some teachers have presented at national conferences."</p> <p>- "[We are] attempting to shape the next generation's perception around the future value of education in the region."</p> <p>- "As an organization, we think about how to strengthen our members. If we want them to be seen as leaders, what do we need to arm them with?"</p>
 Asset-Based Development (3)	<p>- "Starting the [regional conference] has been a driving force in getting resources to regional farmers. Most of the sessions are led by regional farmers, allowing farmers to connect and learn from life experience."</p>
 Civic Entrepreneurship (2)	<p>- "Developing a deeper bench of leaders is a high priority. A lot of community members at first had a hard time seeing what their role was in supporting entrepreneurship. [Through the project], we've gotten individuals who have grown, built [leadership skills] and capacity."</p>

Grantee Influence and Presence

Over one-fifth of grantees in all categories except Community Development felt that the POWER grants had been successful in building their organization's influence in implementation communities, increasing their presence in the communities, and helping to deepen or enhance the organization's connections to or understanding of the communities.

Table 30: Influence/Presence Examples (n=19)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (8)	<p>- "[Through this project], we have taught our own organization how to engage in the community."</p> <p>- "[The project] has enabled us to get in front of the community and be part of it on a level that we haven't before. We've got a sense of pride – we're solving problems."</p>
 Education & Workforce Development (7)	<p>- "POWER funding helped us create a niche in the community. We are now owning and understanding the role we have in this region."</p> <p>- "[Our higher education institution] has learned how to better engage with companies. The program has also been helpful in informing faculty and staff at the college as to employer needs [within the community]."</p>
 Asset-Based Development (1)	<p>- "Surrounding states are taking notice of the project...and have asked how they can replicate it. Food and agriculture has never experienced this kind of attention before [in this region]."</p>
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<p>- "The project deepened our understanding of how to do the coaching work well, and the needs of the communities we work with and the motivation for changing the economy."</p>
 Health (2)	<p>- "[This facility] has become a shining star in the region. The university is better engaged with the community and local medical facilities and is seen as a true community partner meeting critical community capacity challenges, not just educational needs."</p>

Challenges and Contributing Factors






Over 45 percent of all grantees across all project categories cited challenges associated with community capacity. Challenges in this area included:

- Shallow “pools” of resources (n=27)
- Social and environmental barriers (n=13)
- Physical infrastructure (n=12)

Shallow Pools

Just over 30 percent of grantees in all categories except Community Development reported difficulties with community capacity in terms of shallow pools of human resources, organizations, and financial resources with which to work. This in turn created challenges in rallying support or ensuring that participants could access necessary resources.







Table 31: Shallow Pools Examples (n=27)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (13)	<p>- “In rural communities there are a lack of revenue streams to support programming – they don’t have as many companies to sponsor.”</p> <p>- “There aren’t many conventional lenders we can tap into, and the region lacks business development services.”</p> <p>- “There has been an opportunity for larger impacts in some areas [rather than others], due to those areas having stronger partner support and networks.”</p>
 Education & Workforce Development (8)	<p>- “There has been a challenge having sufficient numbers of employers to generate job openings for the trainees, and some trainees are [having to] commute outside the region 45 minutes to an hour for employment.”</p> <p>- “Implementation and impact have been clustered to where employers are. It has been more challenging to recruit students from more rural areas; there are also fewer companies in those areas to hire students or generate projects.”</p>
 Asset-Based Development (2)	<p>- “More rural areas have struggled with fewer vendors and resources to expand or launch projects. There are also more entrepreneurs in urban areas than rural.”</p>
 Civic Entrepreneurship (2)	<p>- “The leadership base is thin. There are rising stars in these communities, and many times we go back to them time and time again, and they are overwhelmed.”</p>
 Health (2)	<p>- “It is a challenge to schedule an adequate number of patient encounters for students.”</p>

Social and Environmental Barriers

Just under 15 percent of grantees cited external social and environmental barriers to community capacity, but grantees represented all project categories. They encountered challenges particularly related to drug addiction and the opioid crisis, but also poverty, health issues, and homelessness.






Table 32: Social/Environmental Examples (n=13)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “[This region] is poorer than most other areas and contains some of the poorest counties in the state.” - “Many [prospective clients] fell off the radar after learning they may be subjected to drug testing by a potential employer...The opioid epidemic and drugs in general were a big issue.”
 Education & Workforce Development (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Drugs are an ongoing challenge in the region. Some trainees refused [to take] or couldn’t pass the drug test.” - “Participants have difficulty balancing life events with school. This is especially true when students experience big challenges that require consistent and dedicated attention and energy.”
 Asset-Based Development (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The opioid epidemic is very challenging for the region, and some communities have experienced such a dramatic downturn that revitalizing them is providing much more challenging than anticipated.”
 Community Development (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Another challenge has been to understand and appropriately respond to the deep personal challenges faced by [some participants]. Many of these challenges are what have prevented trainees from successfully becoming employees and include issues such as food insecurity, homelessness, lack of transportation, recovery/re-entry, and undiagnosed learning disabilities.”
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The opioid epidemic is creating a sense of hopelessness in some communities.”
 Health (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Our region has devastating health outcomes. People are struggling to get their heat turned on, and issues around managing their conditions takes a backseat.”

Physical Infrastructure

Roughly 14 percent of grantees across all project types except Civic Entrepreneurship reported having challenges with infrastructure in the communities or regions in which they were implementing their projects. Infrastructure issues primarily dealt with broadband, although some grantees mentioned water and transportation.

Table 33: Physical Infrastructure Examples (n=12)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[Lack of broadband and internet] is a barrier for rural business development." - "The community has, at times, been reluctant to embrace technology due to lack of infrastructure, such as broadband."
 Education & Workforce Development (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Hooking into broadband is very expensive and one significant barrier. Without reliable internet, it is almost impossible to provide state-of-the-art cybersecurity training. In addition, our trainees will also struggle to land employment if they seek remote opportunities that require broadband."
 Asset-Based Development (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "One of the real barriers we had up front was telecommunications. It has been a struggle to get good cell and broadband service."
 Community Development (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Continued financial support for broadband in underserved and unserved rural areas would be helpful."
 Health (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We don't have transportation opportunities for people [to come to us], so we have to go to them."

Lessons Learned

Most lessons learned related to community capacity overlap with other themes. As detailed in the Recruitment and Engagement theme, grantees stressed the importance of tailoring programming to meet the needs of the community and ensuring that marketing and recruitment messages were a good fit for the community. As indicated in the Organizational Capacity theme, some grantees suggested establishing a local presence through staffing. Further, as noted in the Partnerships and Collaboration theme, grantees recommend ensuring community buy-in early in the project by engaging local partners and conducting pre-planning, including needs assessments or community readiness assessments.



Early Impacts of POWER Implementation

*"I think the POWER initiative has really helped rekindle hope that things can get better.
This has been phenomenally good for our region."*







POWER projects aim to create fundamental changes in Appalachia. As grantees themselves noted, this type of change takes time, particularly in projects that are focused on planting seeds of entrepreneurship in communities (e.g., in K-12 or community college settings); those that are focused on developing leadership and capacity within individual communities; and those that are building upon natural assets within the region. As one grantee described, "A lot of times with these projects, we're building things that won't have an impact until the next generation comes along." However, grantees described long-term vision for economic transformation driven, in part, by social change that includes the building of hope and the shifting of mindsets in areas that have seen severe economic distress. With a recognition that it may take many years to realize true economic transformation, many grantees stated that they had started to see shorter-term outcomes and impacts that they believed could result in longer-term impacts over time. Early impacts include:

- The power of POWER to set vision and build hope (n=27)
- Progress toward potential long-term change (n=49)
- Social change (n=33)
- Economic development (n=30)

The Power of POWER

Grantees mentioned the overall vision and guiding principles of POWER as having impact in and of themselves, particularly in helping build their reputations and credibility, as well as in building new collaborations and partnerships. Some grantees also noted the value of POWER funds in accelerating activities that were already planned or in place. Others cited the importance of POWER in building hope for revitalization.

Table 34: Power of POWER Examples (n=27)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "I think the POWER initiative has really helped rekindle hope that things can get better. This has been phenomenally good for our region." - "The POWER grant has helped to give the project and organization credibility. [It has] given us the range and leverage to focus on our goals. We were moving along incrementally, but we've had this shot of rocket fuel." - "POWER has raised the profile of entrepreneurship and other foundations are getting involved. POWER has tremendously helped start the revitalization of Appalachia due to the downturn of the coal industry." - "When ARC said 'We want to see big, we want to see impacts, we want to see large changes in the economy, multi-state, multi-county collaborations – that's an external factor, that's the new mandate – think regionally. That's been big. That lens in which ARC asked people to look through has been huge in terms of an indicator of making our program successful."
 Education & Workforce Development (11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The POWER initiative has been important and helpful, and it's good to see the broad strokes the initiative has funded in terms of the types of projects." - "Implementation of this ecosystem vision throughout the region can make a decade of change and create economic opportunities that currently do not exist. We are attracting attention from government and major corporate sponsors...to invest in our initiative and region. This was not possible before the POWER grant."
 Asset-Based Development (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The POWER grant has helped build credibility [for our project and organization]."
 Community Development (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "By providing broadband, we have helped companies grow their businesses. This also allows people to have a work-from-home option. [We had wanted to do the project] but the cost to build was our largest holdback. The grant was able to provide the help required to get the project started."
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The POWER grant gives people a chance. You have a chance every day to make a positive difference."
 Health (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The school could not have opened without POWER."

Progress Toward Potential Long-Term Change

As described in Tables 2 and 3, ARC requires all grantees to identify estimated or projected outputs and outcomes for their projects, as well as report on progress toward achieving these. However, building on these shorter-term outputs and outcomes, over half of grantees described what they saw as longer-term potential impact that could result from achieving shorter-term project outputs and outcomes.

Table 35: Progress Toward Impact Examples (n=49)

Project Category	Examples
 <p>Business Development (18)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"The new products we are developing for companies will generate sales, and the newly trained employees will sustain their jobs far into the future."</i> - <i>"The project has accelerated the value of start-ups and significance of small business growth for the economy. The university has changed its curriculum and has changed programming to be more focused on innovation."</i> - <i>"The companies and people that attended [the TAI] workshops are continuing to think about this topic. Economic opportunities in the supply chain are definitely on their minds. Many are pursuing opportunities independently and looking at what they can do differently to help support this."</i> - <i>"People are investing in new equipment based on long-term viability in the farmers' market. It is good to see private businesses on the market making capital investments because they believe the market will be home for many years to come."</i>
 <p>Education & Workforce Development (15)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"The program allows people to get certification and work remotely for companies all over the country, [good jobs with good wages], but they can stay in the region [and contribute to the regional economy]."</i> - <i>"On a voluntary feedback survey, 95% of respondents intend to continue entrepreneurship efforts [in their schools]. Community colleges are reporting increased enrollment, increased matriculation, and that's vital to keeping our youth in Appalachia."</i> - <i>"Students hired as interns have been hired full time, [but also] these projects and workers allow [local] companies to implement new technologies [that] ensure their competitiveness in the global marketplace."</i> - <i>"Success in this program in many ways has already been achieved. The project has introduced a new way to think about social service delivery, educational attainment and progress, career development, and community-based learning."</i>
 <p>Asset-Based Development (8)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"Nineteen jobs created is not a huge amount. However, if you look at one of the farmers who has another full-time job but is also a farmer, he is going to be making about \$20K more this year. He hasn't created a job or hired anybody, but what this is doing is allowing people to have more expendable income. Creating excess income means things like going to college, buying books and supplies. So that's a long-term contribution to the region."</i> - <i>"The private industry partnerships have been exciting, because that's long-term hope. ...You start to see what might it take to make them successful so that the people on the other end of the supply chain can also be successful."</i>
 <p>Community Development (4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"To date, 61 jobs have been created and 67 retained, but also the project has helped increase community college enrollment, raising educational attainment and an educated workforce in the region."</i>
 <p>Civic Entrepreneurship (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"We have started to get small businesses and organizations to talk to each other and work together. Some event participants have seen an uptick in business and traffic on social media."</i>
 <p>Health (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"The effect [of our project] is a healthier workforce, people from rural communities having a job they didn't have before. In order to get the companies to move to town, you need a healthy workforce. This project is doing that."</i>

Social Change

Nearly 40 percent of grantees reported perceived impacts in the area of social change, which included creating a sense of hope. In addition, some grantees felt they had demonstrated impacts in changing conventional wisdom about economic development. Others felt their project had begun to start a culture of entrepreneurship and innovation in their regions and communities.

Table 36: Social Change Examples (n=33)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (17)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"There is more openness in the community to accept change. We make it happen. Growing a curious community is a long-term benefit. We're having conversations we never would have had without this project."</i> - <i>"Economic development is now considering entrepreneurship a viable part of their toolkit and approach to growing the region."</i> - <i>"The work we have done and are doing is creating an entrepreneurial mindset that has not existed before. Through [our efforts] we are building a 'yes we can' attitude for hopeful entrepreneurs."</i> - <i>"A lot of these companies, all they did was sell domestically to the mining industry. To get them to think outside that world they knew and look at international and take out the fear factor - that's huge. Getting them to take that step forward is huge."</i>
 Education & Workforce Development (10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"[T]his helps people to see that the future looks different and that things won't always be the way they have been."</i> - <i>"The impact of the project is paying off. Now children aren't growing up thinking they'll finish high school and go into the mines. [The project] is breaking the family system addiction to coal for employment."</i> - <i>"Success involves hope for the region. The region had lost hope for improvement and this project has reignited a sense of hope. There is a palpable sense of excitement about [this project]. It's important to maintain the excitement and hope."</i>
 Asset-Based Development (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"People and organizations are getting involved in public policy and economic diversification to effect change. Dreams, and backing for those dreams, is in short supply in the region. This project has provided both."</i> - <i>"Some folks in the economic development sector are beginning to realize there is a true economic development component to helping people live longer and be more productive. You can recruit a factory...but if you don't have a healthy workforce capable of stepping into those jobs, you haven't done anything. This work is creating healthier people, but also a culture of awareness around what is local, what is healthy."</i>
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"Working with small businesses, we can get a cultural shift and a narrative shift around what's possible. We have helped community members realize that they can make a difference."</i>
 Health (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"Success is giving the region a sense of hope. Our residents are seeing the region as a place where world class healthcare can be available, and [it's] a desirable place for others to live."</i>

Economic Development

Over a third of grantees reported seeing some early impacts in economic development, including industry diversification. The reported result has been interest and excitement in moving away from reliance on traditional industries, such as coal or coal supply chain, and into new industries, including agriculture and food production, gas and energy, and tourism. Potential impacts for economic development also included improvements in quality of life and quality of place, potentially keeping or attracting more people and businesses.

Table 37: Economic Development Examples (n=30)

Project Category	Examples
 Business Development (15)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"We've effected change in areas we never thought we'd impact. This area has been tied to industry, manufacturing, but there was never any emphasis on what we can do to impact other segments of the economy. We've seen a change in that [as a result of the project]."</i> - <i>"Many manufacturers are considering how they can become part of the supply chain for the shale petrochemical industry and create new products to meet new demand."</i> - <i>"The TA provided to the businesses has equipped them to diversify customers and markets to reduce dependency on the coal industry for ongoing and new revenue."</i> - <i>"People are realizing there is a value and history in our heritage. Our communities' main streets are changing – they are now filling up with tourist attractions. Tourists are creating jobs."</i>
 Education & Workforce Development (8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"The top success has been helping diversify and grow local industry while providing local talent. Manufacturing is being rejuvenated and is growing in the area."</i> - <i>"[There is a] statewide benefit from the relationships that have been built. They are building a tech sector from the ground up."</i>
 Asset-Based Development (5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"Just like all grants, we are looking at traditional metrics, but one of the more intangible metrics is the discussion around local and craft foods as an option now. We are in a renaissance for craft beverage creation, and what we've been able to help harness is local sourcing. Moving the discussion of local foods into the forefront...has been an important [impact]."</i> - <i>"Generating more interest in local food and agriculture in [the region] has been a major benefit, as agriculture [has been previously] ignored in this state."</i>
 Community Development (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"The project contributes to economic revitalization and diversification in the region through social enterprise growth."</i>
 Civic Entrepreneurship (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"A lot of the same sectors that our teams identified saw an interest in local arts and agriculture. A lot of these different sectors and avenues, we have seen communities look to them after going through this process."</i>



Recommendations for ARC

Based on successes, challenges, lessons learned, and early impacts identified for the 88 evaluated POWER grantees in Year One of the evaluation, C/D proposes the following recommendations.

To promote effective recruitment and engagement of program beneficiaries:

- Require additional market analysis from grantees at the time of POWER application
- Encourage the development of detailed recruitment and retention plans, reminding grantees that the recruitment pool likely must be larger than output and outcome targets (to handle participant reluctance, competition, and potential attrition)
- Conduct frequent check-ins with grantees during the critical start-up period
- Continue open communication and allowing strategic pivoting when needed.
- Encourage grantees to budget for marketing and communications, including staffing
- Continue to provide technical assistance around measuring and communicating progress locally, regionally, and statewide
- Continually communicate the avenues for sharing stories with ARC

To help grantees strengthen organizational capacity:

- Offer technical assistance around resource mapping (internally and externally) to help grantees think about current capacity and how to extend/expand it
- Provide tools and resources for assessing organizational readiness for POWER
- At start-up, remind grantees and partners about processes and implications of reimbursement funding, as well as the possibility to request advances
- Remind grantees to plan for accountability and financial data collection and maintenance, both internally and with partner organizations
- Challenge grantees to think about and report on a variety of sustainability efforts
- Explore the establishment of a grantee mentorship network for new grantees to connect with more experienced grantees
- Consider ARC's role in connecting grantees to additional sources of funding

To support collaboration and the development of partnerships:

- Encourage grantees to establish regular communication channels and schedules
- Share practices and tools for vetting partners; establishing common vision, priorities, and goals; delineating roles and responsibilities; and identifying partner assets and resources that benefit the project or fill gaps in grantee expertise or experience

To develop community capacity:

- Continue to invest in leadership and capacity building
- Continue to invest in projects that encourage collaboration and break down traditional jurisdictional and regional boundaries
- Communicate POWER's impacts, and help grantees do the same

To further improve the internal management of POWER:

- Establish a more prescriptive narrative reporting format
- Consider having future grantees set and report on interim progress targets
- Consider methods for measuring results by geography



Planned for additional study

ARC plans to work with C/D in FY2020 for additional study of the following:

- Collect, analyze, and respond to grantee and partner implementation experiences
- Assess the implementation and outcomes of technical assistance projects
- Conduct a deeper assessment of high-priority topics, including projects focused on substance use disorder, multi-state and other complex projects, and projects in "high competition" areas with many POWER projects operating simultaneously
- Track and measure the short-, medium-, and long-term results of POWER over time

Appendix

- A. Implementation analysis methodology
- B. Interview protocols
- C. Grantees evaluated in Year 1 and interview schedule
- D. Grantees not included in Year 1 evaluation
- E. ARC definitions of POWER outputs and outcomes

Appendix A

Implementation Analysis Methodology

Evaluation Questions and Data Collection Methodology

This evaluation was designed as an implementation study, to answer key implementation evaluation questions. Evaluation questions were designed by the C/D evaluation team and reviewed and revised with ARC staff. The questions are:

- To what extent are POWER grantees progressing toward their stated performance outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent are there common characteristics among grantees across POWER project categories? If there are common characteristics, what are they?
- What factors appear to contribute to a) strong performance, b) improved performance, and c) lagging performance?
- What technical assistance could ARC provide to improve performance?
- Given POWER grant performance, and grantees' experiences, are there better ways for ARC to measure, monitor, and evaluate grantee success in the future?

In order to answer the evaluation questions, C/D originally selected 96 grantees¹² using the methodology described in the Project Selection section. C/D then analyzed data collected through three means:

1. **Document review**, including project narratives, approval memos, stated outputs and outcomes, and quarterly reports submitted to ARC.
2. **Pre-interview questionnaires**, to prepare for interviews.
3. **Semi-structured interviews** via site visit, in-person stops, or telephone for grantees that represent the range of POWER-funded projects, using a predesigned interview protocol.

Document review

The evaluation team gathered information, primarily available through ARCNet, to get a general sense of the purpose of the grant; definitions of grant success through stated outputs and outcomes, as well as through project narratives; and descriptions of implementation efforts, which typically included successes and challenges to date. Where available, evaluators also reviewed information provided about implementation partners. Data analyzed through document review was used to prepare for telephone and on-site interviews, as well as to populate information in grant project summaries (described in the Analysis and Reporting Methods of this Appendix).

Pre-interview questionnaires

Questionnaires were sent to grantees via email the month before the scheduled telephone or in-person interview. Questionnaires included questions to obtain recent perspectives from grantees (more recent, typically, than those available in quarterly reports) on notable

¹² Although 96 grantees were originally selected, the final number of grantees evaluated was 88, as it was determined that eight of the selected grantees were too early in the implementation process.

successes and challenges; any shifts to activities (and why activities may have shifted from what was planned); descriptions of the most significant partner entities and their roles; ways in which ARC could better support the grantee; and updates on planned outcomes and outputs. Grantees were asked to submit responses via email prior to their scheduled interviews. As with document review, evaluators used pre-interview questionnaire responses to prepare for telephone and on-site interviews, as well as to populate information in project summaries.

Semi-structured interviews

During telephone calls or while on-site, evaluators used predesigned interview protocols to conduct semi-structured interviews. The evaluation team created interview questions designed to help answer overarching evaluation questions. The first draft of interview questions was shared with key ARC POWER staff. Based on conversations with ARC staff, interview questions were then revised for clarity, resulting in the final interview protocol. Interview protocols were shared with grantees prior to telephone or on-site discussions. The full set of pre-interview questionnaire and semi-structured interview questions is provided in Appendix B.

Project Selection

Because the evaluation was primarily focused on learning about implementation as it was occurring to identify opportunities for course correction and improvement (as needed), C/D adopted the following strategies to identify grantees for evaluation.

First, C/D selected grantees to include in the evaluation. In selecting projects for interviews, the evaluation team considered the objectives of understanding grant progress, accelerators, barriers, and outcomes for a range of grant characteristics, including types, stages, locations, and performance levels, as well as focusing the evaluation on opportunities for improvement and correction. As such, the evaluation team, in collaboration with ARC staff, excluded grants that were deemed to be too new (those approved or begun in Fiscal Year 2019) and grants that were closed. Further, technical assistance projects were excluded, as it was determined that they did not align well with the evaluation objectives for this evaluation.¹³ This process resulted in 96 grants preliminarily identified for participation in the evaluation. After further review, the evaluation team determined that eight of the 96, despite being approved prior to FY2019, were too early in implementation to be included. Thus, 88 grantees remained and were included in the evaluation. A full list of grantees evaluated is provided in Appendix C.

Once projects had been identified for inclusion in the evaluation, projects were then identified for site visits; in-person visits in lieu of calls; or telephone calls. The evaluation team followed the processes detailed in the next section to determine whether grantees were selected for full site visits; in-person visits (stops); or telephone interviews.

¹³ Technical assistance grantees, along with 2019 grantees, will be evaluated in a Year 2 evaluation to be conducted in 2019-2020.

Site Visits

To identify candidates for full site visits, the C/D evaluation team considered the following criteria and priorities:

- Extent to which the project is representative of POWER grant categories, types, and funded regions;
- Level of complexity – number of partners, projected footprint, use of multiple techniques or innovations;
- ARC investment (size of grant);
- Length open in relation to total implementation time (in other words, not too new);
- Distance to completion – ensuring that a mix of those earlier in the implementation process were included, as well as those nearing completion;
- Potential or anticipated benefit to distressed counties, primary or substantial, and coal-impacted counties;
- Range of development focus (e.g., different types of industries, different types of lead grantees, different types of partners, etc.).

Using the listed criteria, grantees were initially selected by the C/D evaluation team, and then selections were reviewed or revised with input from ARC. Full site visits included on-site interviews with grantee staff (one or more individuals who were involved with implementing the grant), as well as interviews with grant partners. If feasible and applicable, the evaluation team also toured grant implementation sites. A total of seven grantees were selected for full site visits.

In-Person Stops in Lieu of Calls

Once site visits grantees had been selected, the C/D evaluation team identified additional grantees that were located in close proximity to the selected site visits grantees, in order to maximize efficiency. Grantees selected for in-person stops participated in on-site interviews with grantee staff (one or more individuals who were involved with grant implementation). A total of 10 grantees were selected for in-person stops.

Phone Calls

Grantees selected for telephone interviews participated in a 60-minute interview with the evaluation team, with one or more grantee staff responding to interview questions. The grantees selected for telephone interviews were remaining projects that had not been closed as of January 2019 but that had been awarded prior to January 2019; were not technical assistance projects; and had not been selected for full site visits or in-person visits. A total of 71 grantees were selected for phone interviews.

Finally, after projects had been classified as full site visits, in-person visits, and phone calls, the evaluation team organized calls and visits by topic (e.g., Education and Workforce Development; Business Development, etc.) and, based on topic organization, selected grantees to be evaluated each month (January-August) of 2019.

Data Analysis and Reporting Methods

Qualitative data gathered from the pre-interview questionnaires and semi-structured interviews was then entered into an online tool to group and aggregate raw notes into sections including purpose of the project; grantee's definition(s) of project success; implementation locations and partners; key successes/accelerators and contributing factors; key challenges/barriers and contributing factors; grantee's perception of impacts to date, including unanticipated successes or benefits; creative approaches and lessons learned; plans for sustainability; and feedback for ARC. Data collected through document review, pre-interview questionnaires, and telephone or on-site interviews were analyzed using a general inductive approach, which is particularly useful in drawing clear links between research questions and objectives and data collection results. More specific detail on the approach used to analyze data is provided below.

Monthly Reports

Once data had been entered into the online tool, lead evaluators further grouped sections into subthemes related to successes/factors of success; challenges, barriers, and contributing factors; early impacts; and ARC feedback. Supporting data for identified themes was compiled into monthly reports for ARC, starting in January and concluding in August. Each month, the evaluation team discussed newly collected data and existing themes, to identify the extent to which new data fit identified themes; whether new themes had emerged; or whether any new data had been collected to contradict existing themes. Where supporting data was identified for a new set of grantees each month, evaluators included this within the appropriate theme. If an existing theme was not supported by new data collected in a subsequent month, that theme was noted in the monthly report as having no data collected that month to support it. Where contradictory data for existing themes was identified, evaluators reported contradictory information under existing themes in the appropriate monthly report. Where new themes were identified, evaluators reported supporting data for new themes first in the month in which the new theme was identified, and then in subsequent months if and where additional data was collected to support the new themes.

In addition to theme-based monthly reports, a summary was created for each grant project interviewed in a given month, and grant project summary reports were provided for the grant project as supplements to the monthly theme-based reports. Grant project summaries included information more specific to the individual grant project (as opposed to the theme-based report, which focused on similarities across grantees in a given month). Individual grant summaries included amount of funds received; grant timeline; summary of project purpose and definition(s) of success, including defined outputs and outcomes; location(s) of implementation; key partners; summaries of implementation successes and contributing factors, as well as challenges and contributing factors; creative approaches; qualitative evidence of impact, as well as updates on outputs and outcomes; and other lessons learned. Monthly reports were shared electronically with ARC staff, followed by a telephone call to answer any questions related to the report.

Final Report

For this final report, the evaluation team re-reviewed all monthly reports (January–August), as well as raw notes for each grantee. Subthemes for successes, challenges, and impacts were regrouped into Key Themes, based on individual review by lead evaluators and subsequent discussions to finalize key themes and ensure inter-rater agreement. Once key themes had been identified, each evaluator reviewed raw notes from a predetermined set of grant projects and selected keywords, phrases, and quotes to create subthemes and validate identified key themes. Subthemes and keywords, phrases, and quotes were then placed into a matrix by grant project and project category to allow for crosstabulations and further validation of subthemes. During this review, if potential additional subthemes were identified, the evaluation team had discussions to determine and finalize whether potential additional subthemes warranted being added, or whether they belonged as part of a previously identified subtheme. Once the matrix, with key themes, subthemes, and supporting keywords, phrases, or quotes was finalized, the evaluation team conducted a final review of raw notes per grantee to ensure that all data was appropriately captured.

Finally, the evaluation team reviewed and vetted identified key themes and subthemes with key ARC staff, to ensure that themes seemed appropriate based on prior monthly reports and discussions, as well as to ensure that themes were well-understood and to provide clarification for any remaining questions. The evaluation team provided a final presentation on key themes and grantee examples for broader ARC POWER staff and used additional feedback from that presentation to finalize this report.

Limitations

As with any implementation evaluation using primarily qualitative data collection and analysis methods, this evaluation has several limitations that should be considered when reading and applying this final report. Limitations are as follows:

Implementation only

Because the evaluation was designed to focus on implementation and utilized primarily qualitative data collection and analysis methods, it does not rigorously analyze project outcomes or impact. While evaluators did review reported outputs and outcomes, these numbers were analyzed from a descriptive standpoint only. Further, specific questions about perceived impacts were included in semi-structured interviews to allow evaluators to obtain and analyze grantees' and partners' perceptions of impacts. However, impacts discussed in this report are not based on rigorous statistical analysis. As such, while it may be interpreted that grantees perceive or have seen evidence of early impacts, causation should not be interpreted from this evaluation.

Varying timelines

The 88 POWER projects reviewed for this evaluation were (by design) at varying stages of implementation (beginning, middle, or nearing closure) at the time they were interviewed. As such, grantee perspectives provided for this evaluation, particularly for those interviewed at the beginning or middle stages of implementation, may be different from what their perspectives would have been at closure. In addition, because grantees were at various

stages of implementation, conclusions drawn and themes about grantee implementation may not be valid or generalizable for all grantees. In order to clarify timelines, as part of the monthly evaluation reports (grantee summaries), C/D provided information on the percent complete for each grantee (number of months grant dollars were awarded compared to the month in which the evaluation was conducted).

Partial and biased findings

Qualitative and perceptual research and analysis methods are, by nature, partial and biased. To attempt to address this limitation, the evaluation triangulated data collected through multiple sources, including quarterly reports, pre-interview questionnaires, and semi-structured interviews, as well as through post-interview discussions within the evaluation team and with ARC staff. Where grantee partners were interviewed along with grantees themselves, the evaluation team triangulated information collected from these partners against information collected from the grantees.

Selection bias

Selection bias is common in any form of design that does not involve random sampling or random assignment. The evaluation team included 88 POWER grantees in this evaluation. While the evaluation team employed a pre-defined method to identify the 88 grantees (described in the Project Selection section of this Appendix) in an attempt to ensure that grantees were the right fit to answer implementation study questions, selection bias may still be present. Further, grantees were required to participate in the evaluation as a condition of receiving POWER funds. While this requirement reduces the possibility of non-response, it also introduces the potential for participants to feel pressured to speak favorably about project implementation and the funder (ARC). To try to mitigate this, the evaluation team informed interview participants that their feedback would be confidential in the case of discussing challenges (while challenges may be associated with grant projects, comments would not be associated with individual interview participants) or anonymized in the case of feedback about ARC. Neutral, negative, and sometimes critical feedback from a wide variety of grantees and partners supports the notion that grantees felt comfortable to share their experiences, both positive and negative.

Researcher interview bias

Although a semi-structured interview protocol was used for each telephone and on-site interview, it is possible that an individual researcher's methods for asking initial or follow-up questions may have inadvertently introduced bias into responses. To attempt to mitigate this issue, the evaluation team reviewed the interview protocol questions collaboratively prior to conducting any interviews. The same protocol was used for all interviews. Four evaluation team members covered all interviews and shared notes in a common system. The evaluation lead, Dr. Molly Chamberlin, completed monthly and final quality reviews of all notes and conclusions. Where necessary, evaluation team members met to discuss any issues associated with carrying out the interview protocol and adjust interviewing techniques as needed. In addition, evaluation team members reviewed findings and interpretations collaboratively, as discussed in the next section, researcher extrapolation bias.

Researcher extrapolation bias

Analysis conducted within an interpretative analytical framework is threatened by the fact that researcher interpretation is personal and may go beyond what is present in and supported by actual data. As described in the Data Analysis and Reporting Methods section of this Appendix, indeed the evaluation team employed its own interpretations of data collected through multiple methods, including using POWER-specific findings coupled with findings and experiences of evaluations previously conducted by the team. To mitigate researcher extrapolation limitations, the evaluation team individually reviewed and analyzed raw data collected through interviews; identified themes were collaboratively discussed and refined as a team; and evaluators introduced and discussed any contradictory evidence for themes as it arose. However, recommendations and lessons learned that were identified through this evaluation may not be suitable for all POWER grantees.

Appendix B

Interview Protocols

Pre-Interview Questionnaire

1. Please describe your grant's 1-2 most notable successes.
2. Please describe the 1-2 most significant challenges you and your implementation partners have experienced.
3. Have you shifted any of your activities in response to successes or challenges? If so, please describe how your approach has evolved.
4. Who are the 2-5 most significant other entities (organizations, businesses, people, etc.) most actively involved in implementation? Are any partners not involved or less involved than anticipated?
5. At this point, how can ARC serve you better?
6. Is there anything else we should know about implementation prior to our discussion?
7. ARC would like us to gather updated outputs and outcomes figures, as of the end of this month, if available. Please either include below (or as an attachment to this form) or be prepared to discuss them on the call.

Onsite and Telephone Interviews

Context, Progress, and Lessons Learned

1. Please give us the 30 second "elevator speech" about your project: In your own words, what is it about, in what locations is implementation occurring, and what does it seek to accomplish?
2. Are your outputs and outcomes where you expect them to be at this stage of implementation? Why or why not? (Note: the team will ask for updated figures, if applicable and if not already provided)
3. What infrastructure (processes, procedures, systems) has been developed and implemented to ensure grant success?
4. Can you describe how implementation has varied across your proposed region?
5. How has impact varied across your proposed region?
6. What factors have contributed most to your successes so far? (Accelerators)
 - o What internal factors have led to success?
 - o What external factors have helped you be successful?
7. What factors have led to barriers to progress?
 - o What external factors have negatively impacted progress, or prevented even more progress than you've made so far?
 - o What internal barriers have arisen that have prevented additional progress?
8. How might you have designed your program differently, knowing what you know now?
9. What do you anticipate might be the biggest risk to the project having a lasting impact in the region?

Results

10. Beyond the established outputs and outcomes, how do you define success for the program?
 - Are/how are you tracking and measuring that progress?
 - Have you had any public events or press attention that shows the public has recognized your progress?
11. What unanticipated successes or benefits have occurred as a result of implementation?
12. How is this POWER grant affecting economic progress in the region(s) covered? (May vary across region)
13. Please describe how you think about sustainability for the grant.
 - Are any elements sustainable beyond funding?
 - What lasting effects do you anticipate?
14. How, if at all, does POWER complement other development initiatives and activities?
15. Beyond what you've already shared, is there anything else ARC can do to better support you? What assistance might help you overcome barriers?
16. Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about your POWER project?

Appendix C

Grantees Evaluated in Year 1

(Note that implementation states in the last column represents states in which the grantee planned to implement the project).

Full Site Visits (n=7)

Eval Month	Grant Number	Grantee Name	Project Name	Implementation States
Jan	PW-18600-IM	EKCEP	TechHire Eastern Kentucky (TEKY) Initiative	KY
Jan	PW-18700-IM	Fahe	Appalachia HEAT Squad	KY
Mar	PW-18626-IM	Shoals Business Incubator	Shoals Shift	AL, MS, TN
Apr	PW-18916-IM	Washington Greene County Job Training Agency	Transitioning from Black to Blue	OH, PA
Apr	PW-18926-IM	Washington Greene County Job Training Agency	ARCODE Initiative	PA, WV
May	PW-18729-IM	Center for Rural Entrepreneurship	Building Entrepreneurial Communities	KY, OH, WV
Jun	PW-18787-IM	Marshall University Research Corp.	Sustainable Employment for Community Health Workers in Coal-Impacted Communities	KY, OH, WV

In-Person Stops (n=10)

Eval Month	Grant Number	Grantee Name	Project Name	Implementation States
Jan	PW-18727-IM	Appalachian Wildlife Foundation	Appalachian Wildlife Center – Infrastructure	KY
Jan	PW-19379-IM	Appalachian Wildlife Foundation	Appalachian Wildlife Center – Wastewater	KY
Jan	PW-18622-IM	MACED	Economic Transition for Eastern KY (E TEK) Initiative	KY
Jan	PW-18789-IM	Fahe	UPLIFT Appalachia Recovery	KY
Jan	PW-19397-IM	Hazard Community & Technical College	Welding Technology	KY
Jan	PW-19124-IM	Hazard Community & Technical College	Intergenerational Training Center	KY
Mar	PW-18921-IM	Southern Research Institute	The Prosperity Fund	AL
Mar	PW-18939-IM	Launch TN	Launch TN's Entrepreneurial Education & Workforce Development	TN
Apr	PW-18895-AM and PW-18895-BM	Region 4 Planning & Development Council	Linking Trails and Communities to Spawn Economic Growth – The Southern WV Bike Trail Network	WV
Jun	CO-18307	Williamson Health and Wellness Center	Health Innovation and Food Hub	WV

Telephone Interviews (n=71)

Eval Month	Grant Number	Grantee Name	Project Name	Implementation States
Jan	PW-18616-IM	Southwest VA Community College	REDI Center for Dislocated Coal Miners	VA
Jan	PW-18642-IM	Southwest VA Community College	Southwest Virginia Regional Cybersecurity Initiative	VA
Jan	PW-18726-IM	Hocking College	Appalachia RISES	OH, WV
Jan	PW-18790-IM	Big Sandy Community & Technical College	Eastern Kentucky Coal County Transformation	KY
Jan	PW-18801-IM	Mountain Empire Community College	Power Linemen Career Education at Mountain Empire (PLCEME)	VA
Jan	PW-18920-IM	PRIDE Community Services	BuildJobs Initiative	WV
Jan	PW-18925-IM	Buckeye Hills Regional Council	Innovation Gateway Network of Appalachian Ohio	OH
Jan	PW-18657-IM	Industrial Development Authority	Virginia Emerging Drone Industry Cluster Project	VA
Feb	PW-18635-IM	RAIN Source Capital	Appalachian Angel Investor Network	AL, KY, MD, NC, OH, PA, TN, VA, WV
Feb	PW-18922-IM	Appalachian Partnership, Inc. (APEG)	Appalachian Ohio – Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI) Formation	OH
Feb	PW-19395-IM	WV Community Development Hub	Mountain State Capital: Filling the Critical Venture Capital Gap in West Virginia	WV
Feb	PW-18699-IM	Center for Rural Health Development	WV Rural Health Infrastructure Loan Fund	WV
Feb	PW-18800-IM	Kentucky Highlands Investment Corp.	Kentucky Highlands Employment and Financial Training Program	KY
Feb	PW-18497-IM	Natural Capital Investment Fund, Inc.	Growing Triple Bottom Line Small Businesses in Coal Impacted Communities in Central Appalachia	WV
Feb	PW-18786-IM	Woodlands Community Lenders	Financing Entrepreneurship in Randolph, Barbour, and Tucker Counties	WV
Feb	PW-18792-IM	Virginia Community Capital	New Economy Loan Fund	VA
Feb	PW-18594-IM	Pennsylvania Wilds Center for Entrepreneurship, Inc.	Nature Tourism Cluster Development in the PA Wilds	PA
Mar	PW-18599-IM	New River Gorge Regional Development Authority	New River Gorge Region – Developing an Entrepreneurial Economy	WV
Mar	PW-18606-IM	Hatfield McCoy Regional Recreation Authority	Southern Coalfields Sustainable Tourism & Entrepreneurship Program	KY, VA, WV
Mar	PW-18610-IM	Ohio University	Leveraging Innovation Gateways and Hubs Toward Sustainability (LIGHTS)	KY, OH, WV
Mar	PW-18777-IM	Southern Alleghenies Planning & Development Commission (SPARC)	The Alleghenies Entrepreneurial Ecosystem	PA
Mar	PW-18714-IM	Southwestern Pennsylvania Corporation	Southwestern Pennsylvania Economic Gardening Initiative	PA
Mar	PW-18740-IM	Marshall University Research Corp.	Appalachian Hatchery	WV
Mar	PW-18918-IM	Ohio University	Social Enterprise System II	OH, WV

Eval Month	Grant Number	Grantee Name	Project Name	Implementation States
Mar	PW-18941-IM	Southeast Kentucky Community & Technical College	Selling to the World Initiative	KY, TN, VA
Apr	PW-18943-IM	Youngstown State University	Excellence Training Center – an Advanced Manufacturing Training and Education Center	OH, PA, WV
Apr	PW-18741-IM	Bevill State Community College	Bevill State Community College POWER 2017	AL
Apr	PW-18755-BM	West Alabama Chamber Foundation, Inc.	WAW's 2020 Initiative Construction	AL
Apr	PW-18847-IM	Canaan Valley Institute	Sustainable Jobs Initiative	WV
Apr	PW-18940-IM	Southeast Kentucky Community & Technical College	Southeast Kentucky Revitalization Project	KY
Apr	PW-18916-IM	Bluefield State College	Center of Excellence in Manufacturing Education (CEME) at Bluefield State	VA, WV
May	CO-18306	Appalshop, Inc.	Mines to Minds: Southeast Kentucky High Tech Workforce Training	KY
May	PW-18791-IM	UMWA Career Centers, Inc.	New Start Retraining Initiative for Dislocated Coal Workers	PA, WV
May	PW-18928-IM	Pierpont Community & Technical College	Powering Up the Aerospace Workforce in Coal-Impacted Communities in West Virginia	WV
May	PW-18614-IM	Consortium for Entrepreneurship Education	EntreEd K-14: Every Student Every Year	KY, OH, TN, VA, WV
May	PW-18923-IM	Morehead State University	Shaping Our Appalachian Region Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (SOAR STEM)	KY
May	PW-18612	Marion County	Marion County Regional Center for Higher Education Phase II & III	TN
May	PW-18670-TA	West Virginia Community Development Hub	Economic Diversification Mentoring for Innovation Acceleration Strategy	WV
May	PW-18609-IM	University of Pikeville	Kentucky College of Optometry	KY, VA, WV
Jun	PW-18590-IM	University of Kentucky Research Foundation	Downtown Revitalization in the Promise Zone	KY
Jun	PW-18685-IM	Innovation Works, Inc.	Revitalization of Southwest PA Coal-Impacted Communities through Innovation and Entrepreneurship	PA
Jun	PW-18778-IM	Southwest Virginia Alliance for Manufacturing, Inc.	The Heart of Appalachia Economic Transition Project	VA
Jun	PW-18779-IM	West Virginia University Research Corp.	Manufacturing Value Stream for Shale	OH, PA, WV
Jun	PW-19338-IM	Catalyst Connection	PA MAKES: Mini-Grants for Small Manufacturers	PA
Jun	PW-18795-I-TA	Jobs for the Future	Career Online High School: A Learning Strategy for Appalachian Communities	KY, TN, WV
Jun	PW-18707-IM	Town of Unicoi	Unicoi – Mountain Harvest Kitchen Incubator & Entrepreneurial Training Program	NC, TN
Jun	PW-19371-IM	West Virginia Forest Products Cooperative, Inc.	West Virginia Forest Products Cooperative	WV

Eval Month	Grant Number	Grantee Name	Project Name	Implementation States
Jun	PW-19372-IM	Southwest North Carolina Economic Development Commission	WNC Farmers Market Value-Added Manufacturing & Training Center	NC
Jun	PW-18317-I	Southern Alleghenies Planning & Development Commission (SAPDC)	Export Promotion for the Mining Equipment Supply Chain	All ARC states
Jul	CO-18311-I	Friends of Southwest Virginia	RESOURCE FULL: A Consortium Approach to Workforce and Economic Development in Southwest Virginia	VA
Jul	PW-18728-AM and PW-18728-BM	Friends of Southwest Virginia	Building Appalachian Spring: Growing the Economy of Southwest Virginia through Outdoor Recreation	VA
Jul	PW-18771-IM	SEDA – Council of Governments	Central PA Asset-Based Economy: Adaptive Reuse of Coal-Impacted Recreation as an Economic Engine	PA
Jul	PW-18794-IM	City of Whitesburg	Whitesburg Daniel Boone Hotel Stabilization	KY
Jul	CO-18305	Kentucky Center for Agriculture and Rural Development	Local Food Supply Chain Development in Eastern Kentucky	KY
Jul	PW-18690-IM	Marshall University Research Corp.	Sprouting Farms	WV
Jul	PW-18793-IM	West Virginia Healthy Kids and Family Coalition	Growing Social Enterprises and Healthy Communities	WV
Jul	PW-18917-IM	Natural Capital Investment Fund, Inc.	Growing Food System Capacity and Scaling Economic Impact in Central Appalachia	KY, OH, TN, VA, WV
Jul	PW-18942-IM	Fayette County Community Action Agency	Southwestern Pennsylvania Development of a Local Food Shed	MD, PA, WV
Aug	PW-18817-IM	Huntington Municipal Development Authority	Polymer Technology Center of Huntington (P-TeCH) Project	WV
Aug	PW-18919-IM	Community Ventures Corporation	Community Ventures – Build Appalachia Loan Fund	KY, WV
Aug	PW-19342-IM	Coalfield Development	SEED-LIFT: Social Enterprise and Economic Diversification – Leveraging Investment for Transformation	WV
Aug	PW-18756-IM	Somerset County	Somerset County Fiber Extension Project	PA
Aug	PW-18678-IM	Erwin Utilities	Erwin Utilities – Temple Hill & Bumpus Cove Broadband	TN
Aug	PW-19336-I-TA	West Virginia Geological & Economic Survey	State of West Virginia Broadband Development Hub	WV
Aug	PW-18611-IM	Bluewell Public Service District	Mercer County Regional Airport Development and Diversification Initiative	VA, WV
Aug	PW-18620-IM	Randolph County Development Authority	Hardwood Cluster Manufacturing Expansion Project	WV
Aug	PW-18799-I-TA	Unlimited Future	Beefing Up the Local Food Economy	KY, OH, WV
Aug	PW-18924-IM	Alfred State College	Biorefinery Development and Commercialization Center	NY
Aug	PW-19402-IM	LENOWISCO Planning District Commission	Project Intersection Site Development	VA
Aug	PW-19315-BM	Volunteer Energy Cooperative	Volunteer Energy Cooperative IoT Innovation Ecosystem Project	TN



Eval Month	Grant Number	Grantee Name	Project Name	Implementation States
Aug	PW-18601-IM	Appalachian Sustainable Development	The Central Appalachian Food Enterprise Corridor	KY, OH, TN, VA, WV

Appendix D

Projects Not Included in Year 1 Evaluation¹⁴

Project Type	Grant Number	Grantee Name	Project Name
Business Development – Access to Capital	PW-18458-HM	Erwin Utilities	Cool & Connected Downtown Erwin Entrepreneurs Business Grant
	PW-19352-IM	Lawrence Economic Development Corporation	Building Technical Capacity for Angel Investment in the Tri-State Region of Ohio, Kentucky, and West Virginia
	PW-19370-IM	Natural Capital Investment Fund	Downtown Appalachia Redevelopment Initiative (REDI)
	PW-19399-IM	Virginia Community Capital, Inc.	Impact Appalachia: A Market-Making Fund for Central Appalachia
Business Development – Business Incubator	PW-18674-I-TA	Reconnecting McDowell, Inc.	Reconnecting McDowell
	PW-18777-IM	Southern Alleghenies Planning & Development Commission (SAPDC)	The Alleghenies Entrepreneurial Ecosystem
Business Development – Business Site Development	PW-18617-I-TA	West Virginia Development Office	Hobet Strategic Plan
	PW-18654-I-TA	Rural Action	Appalachian Ohio Solar Supply-Chain Initiative
	PW-18711-I-TA	Round the Mountain: Southwest Virginia's Artisan Network	Grant-Writing Assistance for "A Bolder Brew, a Brighter Bouquet: Strengthening the Craft Beverage Cluster Across Southwest Virginia"
	PW-18720-I-TA	Region 4 Planning and Development Council	UKV Revitalization Plan
	PW-18780-I-TA	Tri-County Council for Western Maryland, Inc.	I-68 Regional Economic Partnership
	PW-18781-I-TA	Appalachian Voices	Southwest Virginia Renewable Energy and Economy Project
	PW-18782-I-TA	Virginia Coalfield Coalition, Inc	Virginia Coalfields Telecommunications Planning Grant
	PW-18783-I-TA	Northwest PA Regional Planning and Development Commission	Northwest PA Broadband Assessment
	PW-18784-I-TA	Armstrong County Industrial Development Council	Armstrong County 2017 POWER Technical Assistance
Business Development – Business Technical Assistance	CO-18314	Rural Action, Inc.	Emerging Opportunities in Social Enterprise Development
	PW-18632-I-TA	West Virginia Connecting Communities Inc	Linking Trails and Communities to Spawn Economic Growth and Wellness: The Southern West Virginia Bike Trail Network
	PW-18655-I-TA	Webster County Economic Development Authority	Central WV ATV Trail System Feasibility Study
	PW-18706-I-TA	Randolph County Development Authority	Hardwood Industry Cluster Strategic Plan
	PW-18785-I-TA	Grayson LandCare, Inc.	Blue Ridge Plateau Abattoir Regional Partnership
	PW-18788-IM	WV Regional Technology Park Corp.	Green Mining Model Business Program
	PW-18918-IM	Ohio University	Social Enterprise Ecosystem: SEE

¹⁴ Based on list of approved or pending projects sent by ARC on 10/11/2018.

Project Type	Grant Number	Grantee Name	Project Name
	PW-19315-BM-	Upper Cumberland Development District	Volunteer Energy Cooperative IoT Innovation Ecosystem Project
	PW-19373-IM	Mountain BizCapital, Inc. dba Mountain BizWorks	Growing Outdoors: Expanding the Outdoor Gear Manufacturing Sector
	PW-19376-IM	Innovation Works	Western PA Small Business Services for Coal-Impacted Communities
	PW-19432-IM	People Incorporated Financial Services	New Market Tax Credit Project Growth in Appalachia
Business Development – Entrepreneurship Education	PW-18580-I-TA	Southern Research Institute	Fostering Entrepreneurial Activity in Coal Impacted Communities in Alabama
Education & Workforce Development – Adult Education	PW-19038-I-TA	Southern Appalachian Labor School	Entrepreneur Coalfield Alternative Opportunity (ECAO)
Education & Workforce Development – Career and Technical Education	CO-18304	Shaping Our Appalachian Region, Inc.	UNLEASHING THE POWER OF THE I-WAY: Capacity Building for Economic Development Professionals
	PW-18713-I-TA	UMWA Career Centers, Inc. (UMWACC)	ARC POWER TA Grant Application Development
	PW-18755-AM	West Alabama Chamber Foundation, Inc. dba West Alabama Works	WAW's 2020 Initiative Admin
	PW-18770-IM	Maysville Community and Technical College	KY-WV Regional Drone Technology Workforce Project
	PW-18802-I-TA	Alabama Center for Sustainable Energy (ALCSE) DBA ENERGY ALABAMA	Alabama Advanced Energy Economic Impact Report (AAEEIR)
	PW-18864-I	American Association of Community Colleges	Industry-Informed Infrastructure in Appalachian Colleges
	PW-19330-I-TA	Mayland Community College	Redeveloping Coal Impacted Communities within the Appalachian Region: The Role of Community Colleges in Entrepreneurial Training and the Opioid Crisis
	PW-19331-I-TA	Piedmont Triad Regional Council	Dream. Career. Academy. Workforce Development Training and Education Hub Plan
	PW-19332-IM	Community College of Beaver County	TEAMING Up to Build Pathways to Jobs
Education & Workforce Development – Educational Achievement / Attainment	PW-19393-I-TA	Appalachian Community Federal Credit Union	"Funding the Future" Pre-Implementation Study
Education & Workforce Development – Workforce Training	PW-18499-I-TA	The EdVenture Group	Grant-Writing Assistance for CODE: Creating Opportunities, Diversifying Economy Project Proposal
	PW-18507-I-TA	National Association of Counties Research Foundation	Stronger Economies in Coal-Reliant Places
	PW-18511-I-TA	Youngstown State University	Advanced Manufacturing Innovation & Commercialization Center
	PW-18730-I-TA	Williamson Health and Wellness Center	Healthy Workforce Initiative: Workforce Empowerment and Opioid Recovery Center

Project Type	Grant Number	Grantee Name	Project Name
	PW-18798-I-TA	Workforce Initiative Association	Coal Business United Resource Network (Coal BURN) Real-Time Insights for Real-Time Actions
	PW-18914-I-TA	KVC Health Systems, Inc.	KVC Health Systems College
	PW-19333-IM	Golden Triangle Planning & Development District, Inc.	East Mississippi Power Initiative 2018
	PW-19334-IM	Keystone Community Education Council	Northwest Pennsylvania Diversifying the Regional Economy
	PW-19343-IM	AL Community College System	Alabama S.T.R.O.N.G.-Skills Training to support Real Opportunities for New job Growth
	PW-19368-IM	Marshall University Research Corporation	Creating Opportunities for Recovery Employment (CORE)
	PW-19382-IM	BridgeValley Community and Technical College	Workforce Construction, Telecommunications, & Energy (CCE) Training Center
	PW-19392-I-TA	Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement	Benefit U: An Entrepreneur's Guide to Financial, Health Insurance & Retirement Solutions
	PW-19406-IM	The Center for Rural Development	Community Oriented Access to Learning (COAL)
Asset-Based Development – Arts-Culture-Tourism	PW-18458-EM-	Portsmouth Murals Inc.	Portsmouth Floodwall Murals Digital Access Project
	PW-18794-IM	Whitesburg, City of	Whitesburg Daniel Boone Hotel Stabilization
	PW-18927-I-TA	Eastern Kentucky PRIDE, Inc.	Restoring PRIDE in Kentucky's Appalachia
	PW-19341-I-TA	National Coal Heritage Area Authority	Tug Fork River Water Trail Access Plan
	PW-19357-I-TA	Pennsylvania Environmental Council	Erie to Pittsburgh Trail and PA Wilds Loop - Feasibility Study
	PW-19378-I-TA	Southeast Kentucky Community & Technical College	Creative Capital Investment Assessment: Southeastern Kentucky
	PW-19384-I-TA	Region II Development Council, Inc.	Appalachian Heartland Highway Initiative
	PW-19433-I-TA	Carr Creek Alumni Association	The Magic of Carr Creek: A Community Revitalization Project
Asset-Based Development – Sector-based Strategies	PW-18496-IM	Coalfield Development Corporation	Appalachian Social Entrepreneurship Investment Strategy
	PW-19359-IM	Appalachian Artisan Center, Inc.	Troublesome Creek Stringed Instruments Company No Go
Community Development – Community Facility	PW-18458-FM	Town of Jonesville	Cool & Connected – Jonesville
	PW-18458-GM	Town of Pennington Gap	Cool & Connected – Pennington Gap
Community Development – Community Infrastructure	PW-18458-BM	Williamson Health & Wellness Center, Inc.	Downtown Wi-Fi Access in Williamson, WV
	PW-18458-CM	Haleyville, City of	Haleyville Cool & Connected
	PW-18458-I	US Environmental Protection Agency	Cool & Connected Broadband Program
	PW-19335-I-TA	SEDA – Council of Governments	Central PA Rural Broadband Coverage and Feasibility Study
	PW-19337-I-TA	Buckeye Hills Regional Council	U.S. 33 Corridor Broadband Feasibility Project
	PW-19411-IM	Youngsville Television Corporation	NWPA Regional Broadband Deployment Initiative

Project Type	Grant Number	Grantee Name	Project Name
Community Development – Community Revitalization	PW-18458-AM	Zanesville, City of	Zanesville Cool & Connected Broadband Program
	PW-18458-DM	Bluefield, City of	Bluefield – Cool & Connected
Community Development – Transportation	PW-19396-I-TA	Growth Partnership for Ashtabula	Rail and Port Transportation Strategic Plan
Civic Entrepreneurship – Organizational Capacity	PW-18982-I	Oak Ridge Associated Universities	Technical Assistance Support for POWER Grantees
Health – Healthcare Access	PW-19369-IM	Ohio University	Appalachian Ohio Opiate Initiative
Health – Health Promotion/ Disease Prevention	PW-18587-I	National Institute on Drug Abuse	ARC/National Institutes of Health Interagency Agreement on HIV, HCV, and Opioid Overdose
	PW-18587-C1	National Institute on Drug Abuse	ARC/National Institutes of Health Interagency Agreement on HIV, HCV and Opioid Overdose: Year 2
Research & Evaluation	PW-18673-I	West Virginia University Research Corporation	Economic Analysis of Coal Industry Ecosystem in Appalachia
	PW-18688-IM	Region 1 – Planning and Development Council	Coalfields Cluster Mapping Initiative
	PW-18705-I	Downstream Strategies	Strengthening Economic Resilience in Appalachian Communities
	PW-19412-I	Chamberlin/Dunn, LLC	POWER Monitoring and Evaluation
State & LDD Administration	PW-18477-I	Kentucky Department for Local Government	Kentucky Power Initiative Supplemental Consolidated Assistance Grant
	PW-18625-C1	NC Department of Commerce	North Carolina POWER Initiative Supplemental Consolidated Technical Assistance
	PW-18625-I	NC Department of Commerce	North Carolina POWER Initiative Supplemental Consolidated Technical Assistance
	PW-18634-I	PA Department of Community & Economic Development	Pennsylvania POWER Initiative Supplemental Consolidated Technical Assistance
	PW-19075-I	VA Department of Housing & Community Development	VA DHCD Administrative Costs for Appalachian Spring POWER Project

Appendix E

ARC Definitions of POWER Outputs and Outcomes

Outputs

Metric Name	Definition
Access Road Miles	The length of the access roads constructed as part of the project, in miles or decimals of miles.
Acreage	The number of acres impacted by an ARC site-development or reclamation project, such as the number of acres graded and prepared for development at an emerging industrial park, the number of acres open to future development, or the number of acres remediated in a reclamation project.
Businesses Served	The number of businesses served by an ARC project. For infrastructure projects, this includes either the number of non-residential entities <i>with access to</i> new service (e.g., water, sewer, gas line, or telecommunications) or improved service (e.g., improvements in health or safety, compliance with environmental quality, improved water pressure). For business development projects, this includes businesses receiving technical assistance or participating in training, entrepreneurship, export, or other business development and improvement programs.
Communities Served	The number of communities served or impacted by an ARC project, including projects that address planning, civic participation, infrastructure, educational opportunities, and community capacity. For consolidated technical assistance grants, the number of communities served is the number of projects submitted by state ARC program offices.
Data—Megabits per Second (Mbps)	The data transfer capacity of a telecommunications/broadband network, in megabits per second. This includes the data transfer capacity of a new network, or the increase in data transfer capacity of an existing network due to renovation, new equipment, or other improvements. This measure may be expressed in decimals.
Data—Terabytes (TB)	The fixed data storage capacity of a server room or data center, in terabytes. This measure may be expressed in decimals.
Gas—Million Cubic Feet (MMCF)	The fixed storage capacity of a gas pipeline or gas system, in millions of cubic feet. This measure may be expressed in decimals.
Gas—Million Cubic Feet per Day (MMCFD)	The flow capacity of a gas pipeline or gas system, in millions of cubic feet per day. This includes the flow capacity of a new gas pipeline or system, or the increase in flow capacity of an existing gas pipeline or system due to renovation, new equipment, or other improvements. This measure may be expressed in decimals.
Heat—Million BTU (MMBTU)	The fixed heating capacity of an energy system, including a gas system, in millions of British Thermal Units (BTUs). This measure may be expressed in decimals.

Metric Name	Definition
Heat—Million BTU per Day (MMBTUD)	The capacity of heat flow generated, transmitted, consumed, or conserved by an energy system, including a gas system, in millions of British Thermal Units (BTUs) per day. This includes the heat flow capacity of a new combined heating and power (CHP) system. It also includes the increase in heat flow capacity of an existing HVAC system or the reduction in heat consumption by a facility due to renovation, new equipment, energy efficiency measures, or other improvements. This measure may be expressed in decimals.
Households Served	The number of households served by an ARC infrastructure project. This includes either the number of households <i>with access to</i> new service (e.g., water, sewer, gas line, or telecommunications), or improved service (e.g., improvements in health or safety, compliance with environmental quality, improved water pressure).
Linear Feet	The number of linear feet of pipe, wire, cable, trails, etc. to be constructed or installed.
Million Gallons (NG)	The fixed storage capacity of a water tank or sewage lagoon, in millions of gallons. This measure may be expressed in decimals.
Million Gallons per Day (MGD)	The flow capacity of a water or sewer system, in millions of gallons per day. This includes the flow capacity of a new water or sewage treatment plant, or the increase in flow capacity of an existing plant due to renovation, new equipment, or other improvements. This measure may be expressed in decimals.
New Visitors: Days	The number of new daytime visitors to a tourism destination times the number of days they visit, within one year of project implementation.
New Visitors: Overnights	The number of new overnight visitors to a tourism destination times the number of their overnight stays, within one year of project implementation.
Organizations Served	The number of organizations served by an ARC project, including hospitals, schools, churches, non-profits, non-governmental organizations, and government agencies (use when number of businesses or households does not apply).
Participants Served	The number of individual participants served or targeted by an ARC project (use when patients, students, or worker/trainee measures do not apply). This can include the number of attendees at a meeting, workshop or conference. For example, the number of individuals participating in a planning process; participating in a leadership program; or the number of individuals attending health promotion activities.
Patients Served	The number of unique patients receiving clinical services one or more times as a result of an ARC health project. For equipment projects, report the number of unique patients served by that equipment during the project period and one year after the equipment is deployed. For health projects that do not provide clinical services (such as health promotion activities), use the measure "participants served."

Metric Name	Definition
Plans/Reports	The number of plans or reports developed as a result of an ARC project. This could include strategic plans, master plans, concept plans, or plans for infrastructure improvements or new programs, as well as research reports, feasibility studies, etc. This measure is often paired with the outcome "Programs Implemented," since a program or specific activity is often implemented as a result of a planning process.
Power-Kilowatt-Hours (kWh) Per Year	The capacity of power flow generated, transmitted, distributed, consumed, or conserved by an energy system; in kilowatt-hours per year. This includes the flow capacity of a new power plant or new power line. It also includes the increase in power flow capacity of an electric grid or the reduction in power consumption by a facility due to renovation, new equipment, energy efficiency measures, or other improvements. This measure may be expressed in decimals.
Power—Kilowatts (kW)	The fixed power generating capacity of an energy system, including a renewable energy system, in kilowatts. This measure may be expressed in decimals.
Square Feet	The number of square feet constructed or improved by an ARC project, such as the square footage of a renovated community center, a newly constructed parking lot, a reconfigured interior space, etc.
Students Served	The number of students served by an ARC education project, measured during the project period, when possible (e.g., the number of students served by a science and technology program in a given semester or year). For projects that are not fully operational during the project period, the measurement time period may be extended up to three years after the project end date. Projects that expand existing programs count only the additional number of students served.
Waste—Tons per Day Reduced/Reused/Recycled (TPD)	The flow capacity of waste reduced, reused, or recycled by a waste processing facility. This includes the flow capacity of a new waste-to-energy plant, or the increase in flow capacity of an existing landfill or recycling center due to renovation, new equipment, or other improvements. This measure may be expressed in decimals.
Waste—Tons Reduced/Reused/Recycled	The number of tons of waste reduced, reused, or recycled at a landfill, brownfield site or recycling center; within one year of project implementation.
Workers/Trainees Served	The number of worker/trainees served by an ARC training project, measured during the project period when possible. For example, the number of worker/trainees the project will be able to enroll in a new workforce education program. For projects that are not fully operational during the project period, the measurement time period may be extended up to three years after the project end date. Projects that expand existing programs count only the additional number of workers/trainees that the project will be able to serve.

Outcomes

Metric Name	Definition
Businesses Created	The number of new businesses created as a result of an ARC project. This measure is used for business development projects such as entrepreneurship training, value-added agriculture, access to capital, and business incubation programs (including seed accelerators). This measure should only be used to measure new business creation, not the number of existing businesses recruited or otherwise relocated from other areas. The grant applicant should estimate how many new businesses will be created within three years of the project end date.
Businesses Improved	The number of businesses with a measurable improvement as a result of an ARC project. For new service infrastructure projects, the output (served) is the number of non-residential entities with access to the infrastructure service while the outcome (improved) is the number of non-residential customers that are connected to the infrastructure service. For improved service projects (e.g., improvements in health or safety, compliance with environmental quality, improved water pressure), all non-residential customers served are also considered improved. For business development projects, the grant applicant and ARC project manager must agree on what constitutes "measurable improvement" and a method for measuring the degree of improvement must be provided. For each project this number is always a subset of, or the same as, the "businesses served" output measure.
Communities Improved	The number of communities with a measurable improvement as a result of an ARC project, including projects that address planning, civic participation, infrastructure, educational opportunities, and community capacity. For community capacity projects, this is the number of communities with enhanced capacity. This measure should also be used for consolidated technical assistance grants. The grant applicant and ARC project manager must agree on what constitutes "measurable improvement" and a method for measuring the degree of improvement must be provided. For each project, this number is always a subset of, or the same as, the "communities served" output measure.
Costs Reduced	The amount of costs reduced as a result of project activities, within one year of project implementation. For example, small business technical assistance may help a business streamline and cut costs, or an energy-efficiency program may help to reduce energy costs, through a renegotiated flat fee for energy use or through a reduction in kilowatt hours used. See the output measure "energy capacity."

Metric Name	Definition
Households Improved	The number of households with measurable improvement as a result of an ARC project. For new service infrastructure projects, the output (served) is the number of households with access to the infrastructure service while the outcome (improved) is the number of residential customers that are connected to the infrastructure service. For improved service projects (e.g., improvements in health or safety, compliance with environmental quality, improved water pressure), all residential customers served are also considered improved. For each project, this number is always a subset of, or the same as, the "households served" output measure.
Housing Units Constructed/Rehabbed	The number of housing units constructed or rehabilitated as a part of an ARC housing or community development project.
Jobs Created	The number of jobs created (direct hires, excluding construction jobs) as a result of an ARC project, measured during the project period and up to three years after the project end date. Part-time and seasonal jobs should be converted to full-time equivalents and rounded up to whole numbers. Note: for infrastructure projects, employers must provide letters stating their intention to create a specific number of new jobs; for non-infrastructure jobs, grant applicants should estimate the number of jobs that will be created by the organizations expected to benefit from the project.
Jobs Retained	The number of jobs retained as a result of an ARC project. These are existing jobs that would be lost or relocated if the ARC project were not undertaken. Note: for infrastructure projects, employers must provide letters explicitly stating the number of jobs at risk, due to relocation or loss of competitiveness, without the project. Existing jobs benefitting from an infrastructure upgrade cannot be counted as jobs retained. For non-infrastructure projects, grant applicants should estimate the number of existing jobs that would be at risk, due to relocation or loss of competitiveness, without the ARC-funded project.
Leveraged Private Investment (LPI)	The dollar amount of private-sector financial commitments, outside of project costs that result from an ARC project, measured during the project period and up to three years after the project end date. Note: for infrastructure projects, businesses must provide letters stating their intention to make a specific level of investment if the project is funded; for non-infrastructure projects, grant applicants should estimate the dollar value of investments that will be made by the company or companies that will benefit from the project.
Organizations Improved	The number of organizations with a measurable improvement as a result of an ARC project, including hospitals, schools, churches, non-profits, non-governmental organizations, and government agencies (use when number of businesses or households does not apply). The grant applicant and ARC project manager must agree on what constitutes "measurable improvement" and a method for measuring the degree of improvement must be provided. For each project, this number is always a subset of, or the same as, the "organizations served" output measure.

Metric Name	Definition
Participants Improved	The number of participants with a measurable improvement as a result of an ARC project (use when patients, students, or worker/trainee measures do not apply, as with a leadership program or planning process). If outcomes are not achieved or cannot be measured within three years after the project is completed, the number of participants that complete or attend all or a required number of components of the project activity may be substituted. For example, the number of participants that attend at least four out of the five community workshops offered. The grant applicant and ARC project manager must agree on what constitutes "measurable improvement" and a method for measuring the degree of improvement must be provided. For each project, this number is always a subset of, or the same as, the "participants served" output measure.
Patients Improved	The number of unique patients expected to benefit from an ARC health project. Because it is usually assumed that all patients served by a health project receive some benefit from it, the numbers for "patients served" and "patients improved" are usually the same. However, if the grant applicant can perform clinical measurement of health outcomes, the outcome number may be lower than the output number. For example, if 30 obese patients participate in an exercise program and 25 are expected to lower their BMI by a certain percentage, the output could be recorded as 30 patients served and the outcome as 25 patients improved.
Programs Implemented	The number of new programs, or the number of ongoing activities related to a defined goal, which are implemented as a result of an ARC project. If possible, use with other measures that indicate the results of the project, such as students, workers, participants, etc.
Revenues Increased: Export Sales	The increase in revenue in export sales realized by a business as a result of an ARC project, within three years of the project end date.
Revenues Increased: Non-Export Sales	The increase in revenue in domestic (non-export) sales realized by a business as a result of an ARC project, within three years of the project end date.
Students Improved	The number of students who obtain a job in the field for which they were specifically trained; the number that receive a diploma, certificate or other career credential; or the number of students who successfully complete a course or unit of study and/or graduate to the next grade or level necessary to continue their education. When outcomes occur after the project period, the number of students improved may be counted up to three years beyond the project end date. For programs where final outcomes are achieved after three or more years, the number of students improved may be counted by an alternative benchmark, such as the number of students completing a skill, grade, or level, or continued enrollment for the project period. For each project, this number is always a subset of, or the same as, the "students served" output measure.

Metric Name	Definition
Telecom Sites	The number of new telecom services installed as a result of an ARC project. This diverse measure includes, but is not limited to, new telemedicine sites, new wi-fi hotspots, a new wireless router or computer lab at a high school, new fiber run to an industrial site, a new antenna used to provide broadband service, etc.
Workers/Trainees Improved	The number of workers/trainees with improved skills that enable them to obtain employment or to enhance their current employment. For example, the number of workers or trainees obtaining a new job; getting higher pay or a better position; or receiving a certification, measured during the project period when possible. When outcomes occur after the project period, the number of workers or trainees improved may be counted up to three years beyond the project end date. For programs where outcomes are achieved after three or more years, the number of students improved may be counted by an alternative benchmark, such as completion of a skill, level/course, or continued enrollment for the project period. For each project, this number is always a subset of, or the same as, the "workers/trainees served" output measure.

This page intentionally left blank.





www.chamberlindunn.com

mc@chamberlindunn.com

nd@chamberlindunn.com

