National Fire Academy

R0378 – Demonstrating Your Community Risk Reduction Program's Worth
Version: 3rd Edition, 2nd Printing, October 2022
Quarter:
ACE Credit: In the upper division baccalaureate degree category, three semester hours in risk management, public administration, or public safety.
IACET Continuing Education Units: 4.3

Length of Course: 6 Days (38 hr., 45 min. contact hours, Sunday – Friday)
Prerequisite: Yes
Curriculum: Fire Prevention: Public Education
Training Specialist: Mike Weller
Instructor:
Instructor email/phone:
Classroom: J-
Meeting Time: 8 AM – 5 PM

Table of Contents

Course Description	Course Resources
Primary and Secondary Audience	Evaluation Procedures
Course Scope	Course Outline
Course Objectives	Policies
Course Delivery Method	Grading Rubrics

Course Description (Catalog)

R0378 – "Demonstrating Your Community Risk Reduction Program's Worth." This six-day course provides students with the tools and skills to be able to evaluate their organization's fire and injury prevention programs. The course provides a systematic way to improve and account for evaluation actions by involving procedures that are useful, feasible, ethical and accurate.

Course framework guides fire prevention professionals in their use of prevention program evaluation. It is a practical, nonprescriptive tool, designed to summarize and organize essential elements of prevention program evaluation. The emphasis is on the practical,

ongoing evaluation strategies that involve all prevention stakeholders, not just evaluation experts. The main themes of the course include: misconceptions regarding the purposes and methods of prevention evaluation, the essential elements of prevention program evaluation, the steps for conducting effective prevention program evaluation and review standards for effective program evaluation.

Student Qualifications (Primary and Secondary Audience)

Target audiences for this course typically include: fire marshals, fire and building inspectors, public fire/life safety educators, youth firesetter intervention specialists, code inspectors and officials, and other community or allied professionals in the fire and injury prevention field. Local or state statisticians who manage data for fire prevention programs/outcomes are also admissible candidates.

Course Scope (Goal)

Course Objectives (Course Learning Outcomes – TLOs)

After successfully completing this course, you will be able to accomplish the following:

* Articulate why evaluation is an essential component of community risk reduction.
* Evaluate how the stages of evaluation and methods of data analysis are used to examine the effectiveness of a risk-reduction program.
* Engage stakeholders, describe a community risk-reduction program and focus a design for its evaluation.
* Demonstrate the ability to gather credible evidence that supports evaluation of a community risk-reduction program.
* Evaluate data objectively and report the results of program evaluation in a logical format.
* Propose best practices for enhancing the planning and evaluation of a community risk-reduction program.

Course Delivery Method

The National Fire Academy (NFA) offers specialized training courses and advanced management programs of national impact in an academic classroom environment on campus at the National Emergency Training Center (NETC) in Emmitsburg, Maryland. This classroom course is designed for the national level fire service officer from State and local fire service organizations. During this six-day delivery, students will reside in dormitories provided on campus with classes conducted in classrooms designed for critical student/instructor interaction. All course materials are designed for interactive classroom environments, in either paper notebook or electronic formats.

Course Schedule

The purpose of the course schedule is to give you, at a glance, the required preparation, activities, and evaluation components of your course.

DAY 1	DAY 2
Introduction, Welcome and Administrative Unit 1: Evaluation — An Essential Component of Community Risk Reduction	Unit 2: Evaluation 101 (cont'd)
Lunch Break	*Lunch Break*
Unit 2: Evaluation 101	Unit 2: Evaluation 101 (cont'd) Students Perform Examination 1
Review/Study Unit 2	Read the case study "Emergency Services Demands in Berlin, USA" found in the appendix of Unit 2 Read at least half of Unit 3

DAY 3	DAY 4
Unit 3: Engage Stakeholders, Describe Program, Focus the Evaluation Design	Unit 3: Engage Stakeholders, Describe Program, Focus the Evaluation Design (cont'd)
Lunch Break	*Lunch Break*
Unit 3: Engage Stakeholders, Describe Program, Focus the Evaluation Design (cont'd)	Unit 4: Gather Credible Evidence Students begin working on the first three components of Examination 2
Finish reading Unit 3 Read half of Unit 4	Students complete the first three components of Examination 2 Finish Reading Unit 4 Read Unit 5

DAY 5	DAY 6
Unit 4: Gather Credible Evidence (cont'd)	Students submit Examination 2 for grading Unit 5: Analyze Evidence, Reach Conclusions, Use Results (cont'd)
Lunch Break	*Lunch Break*
Unit 5: Analyze Evidence, Reach Conclusions, Use Results Students continue working on Examination 2	Unit 6: Applying Lessons Learned Graduation
Students finish Examination 2	

Course Resources (Instructional Materials)

In order to be fully prepared, obtain a copy of the required textbooks and other instructional materials prior to the first day of class.

Required Readings

The student must complete required readings during the course to be able to thoughtfully participate in discussions and activities.

None.

Suggested Reading/Resources

Suggested readings and resources are not evaluated, but may enhance the student's understanding, serve as additional sources for citation and promote discussion of course material.

None.

Required Resources (Course Textbook)

Student Manual.

Supplemental Resources (Supplemental Course Textbook)

None.

Grading Methodology (Evaluation Procedures)

Grading Structure and Rubrics With Individual Student Score Cards

Precourse Assignment	100 points
Examination 1 — Four Stages of Evaluation and Two Types of Data Analysis	100 points
Examination 2 — Evaluating a Community Risk-Reduction Program — Home Community	100 points
TOTAL	300 points

A minimum final grade of at least 70 percent is required to pass this course.

Numerical Score	Letter Grade
100-90	A
89-80	B
79-70	C
69 or below	F

Required Reading Assignments

Student completion of reading assignments will be done via evaluation of their class participation and will not be a separately graded activity.

Suggested Readings

Suggested readings are not evaluated, but may enhance the student's understanding and promote discussion of course material.

Course Outline

Introduction

Objectives

None.

Unit 1: Evaluation — An Essential Component of Community Risk Reduction (Day 1)

Objectives

Terminal Objective

The students will be able to:

1.1   Articulate why evaluation is an essential component of community risk reduction.

<u>Enabling Objectives</u>

The students will be able to:

1.1   Explain the process of strategic community risk reduction.

1.2   Define program evaluation.

1.3   Describe the purpose and benefits of evaluating risk-reduction programs.

1.4   Identify potential barriers to evaluating risk-reduction programs.

1.5   Explain how to overcome challenges associated with evaluating risk-reduction programs.

1.6   Explain why evaluation is a program planning and management tool.

Unit 2: Evaluation 101 (Day 1)

Objectives

<u>Terminal Objective</u>

The students will be able to:

2.1   Evaluate how the stages of evaluation and methods of data analysis are used to examine the effectiveness of a risk-reduction program.

<u>Enabling Objectives</u>

The students will be able to:

2.1   Explain the life cycle of a community risk-reduction program.

2.2   Identify and explain four stages of program evaluation.

2.3   Identify and explain two methods of data analysis.

2.4   Analyze previous evaluation strategies used in their home communities.

2.5   Identify at least two changes they will make on how evaluation is performed in their home communities.

Unit 3: Engage Stakeholders, Describe Program, Focus the Evaluation Design (Day 2)

Objectives

<u>**Terminal Objective**</u>

The students will be able to:

3.1   Engage stakeholders, describe a community risk-reduction program and focus a design for its evaluation.

<u>**Enabling Objectives**</u>

The students will be able to:

3.1   Evaluate stakeholders that should be involved in the community risk-reduction program planning and evaluation process.

3.2   Propose and describe a community risk-reduction program.

3.3   Develop a logic model.

3.4   Develop a draft community risk-reduction evaluation plan.

3.5   Focus an evaluation design for the proposed community risk-reduction program.

Unit 4: Gather Credible Evidence (Day 4)

Objectives

<u>**Terminal Objective**</u>

The students will be able to:

4.1   Demonstrate the ability to gather credible evidence that supports evaluation of a community risk-reduction program.

<u>**Enabling Objectives**</u>

The students will be able to:

4.1   Analyze the five aspects of gathering evidence.

4.2   Propose sources/methods for gathering evidence to support community risk-reduction program evaluation.

4.3   Explore the five types of data sampling.

4.4   Recommend a sampling strategy for a community risk-reduction program.

4.5   Demonstrate how to determine sample size.

Unit 5: Analyze Evidence, Reach Conclusions, Use Results (Day 5)

Objectives

Terminal Objective

The students will be able to:

5.1   Evaluate data objectively and report the results of program evaluation in a logical format.

Enabling Objectives

The students will be able to:

5.1   Demonstrate how to analyze data quantitatively and qualitatively.

5.2   Explain how to interpret the results of data analysis.

5.3   Describe strategies for preparing an evaluation report.

5.4   Explain methods for disseminating results of a program evaluation.

5.5   Explain how to ensure use of program evaluation results.

Unit 6: Applying Lessons Learned (Day 6)

Objectives

Terminal Objective

The students will be able to:

6.1   Propose best practices for enhancing the planning and evaluation of a community risk-reduction program.

Enabling Objectives

The students will be able to:

6.1   Define changes in how they will analyze data as a result of attending the "Demonstrating Your Community Risk Reduction Program's Worth" (DYCRRPW) course.

6.2   Describe community risk-reduction planning and evaluation best practices they plan to apply upon returning to their home community.

6.3   Collaborate with peers to develop common goals for advancing community risk-reduction program planning and evaluation.

Policies

Class Attendance and Cancellation Policy

<u>Attendance</u>

- You are required to attend all sessions of the course. If you do not, you may not receive a certificate, and your stipend may be denied.

- If you need to depart campus early and miss any portion of the course and/or graduation, you must make the request in writing to the NFA training specialist. The training specialist, in collaboration with the superintendent, may waive the attendance requirement in order to accommodate you with extraordinary circumstances as long as you complete all course requirements. If you receive approval for departing early, you must forward the approval to the Admissions Office so your stipend reimbursement is not limited.

<u>Student Substitutions</u>

Substitutions for NFA courses are made from waiting lists; your fire department can't send someone in your place.

<u>Cancellations or No-Shows</u>

NFA's mission for delivery of courses is impaired significantly by cancellations and no-shows. It is very difficult and costly to recruit students at the last minute. Currently there is a two-year ban on student attendance for students who are no-shows or cancel within 30 days of the course start date without a valid reason. If you receive such a restriction, your supervisor needs to send a letter to our Admissions Office explaining the cancellation/no-show.

<u>Course Failure</u>

If you fail an on-campus course, you will not be issued a stipend for that course. You can reapply for the failed course or any other NFA course and go through the random selection process. You don't have to successfully complete the failed course before attending another NFA course.

Student Code of Conduct Policy

Students, instructors and staff are expected to treat each other with respect at all times. Inappropriate behavior will not be tolerated and may result in removal from campus and denial of stipends.

Writing Expectations

Student writing will conform to the generally accepted academic standards for college papers. Papers will reflect the original work of the student and give appropriate credit through citations for ideas belonging to other authors, publications or organizations. Student written work should be free of grammatical and syntax errors, free of profanity or obscene language or ideas, and reflect critical thinking related to the course subject matter.

Citation and Reference Style

Attention Please: Students will follow the APA, Sixth Edition as the sole citation and reference style used in written work submitted as part of coursework to NFA. Assignments completed in a narrative essay, composition format, abstract, and discussion posts must follow the citation style cited in the APA, Sixth Edition.

Late Assignments

Students are expected to submit classroom assignments by the posted due date (11:59 p.m. EDT/EST) and to complete the course according to the published class schedule. As adults, students, and working professionals, you must manage competing demands on your time. Discussion board postings submitted within 3 days after the submission deadline will receive up to a 20% deduction. Those that do not submit their discussion board postings within this timeline will receive a "0" grade for the week. Final assignment papers will not be accepted after the deadline. Any paper submitted after the deadline will receive a "0" grade for that assignment.

Netiquette

Online learning promotes the advancement of knowledge through positive and constructive debate – both inside and outside the classroom. Forums on the Internet, however, can occasionally degenerate into needless insults and "flaming." Such activity and the loss of good manners are not acceptable in a professional learning setting – basic academic rules of good behavior and proper "Netiquette" must persist. Remember that you are in a place for the rewards and excitement of learning which does not include descent to personal attacks or student attempts to stifle the forum of others.

- Technology Limitations. While you should feel free to explore the full-range of creative composition in your formal papers, keep e-mail layouts simple. The NFA Online classroom may not fully support MIME or HTML encoded messages, which means that bold face, italics, underlining, and a variety of color-coding or other visual effects will not translate in your e-mail messages.

- Humor Note. Despite the best of intentions, jokes and <u>especially</u> satire can easily get lost or taken seriously. If you feel the need for humor, you may wish to add "emoticons" to help alert your readers: ;-), :), ☺ .

Disclaimer Statement

Course content may vary from the outline to meet the needs of this particular group.

Grading

Please review the following rubrics that explain how grades will be awarded.

Students who do not complete the entire course will be awarded an Incomplete (I) grade. In accordance with National Fire Academy academic policies, an Incomplete (I) grade must be removed by the end of the next semester following the course, or it automatically becomes a Failing (F) grade.

If you fail an on-campus course, you will not be issued a stipend for that course. You can reapply for the failed course or any other NFA course and go through the random selection process. You don't have to successfully complete the failed course before attending another NFA course.

http://www.usfa.fema.gov/training/nfa/admissions/student_policies.html

Academic Honesty

Students are expected to exhibit exemplary ethical behavior and conduct as part of the NFA community and society as a whole. Acts of academic dishonesty including cheating, plagiarism, deliberate falsification, and other unethical behaviors will not be tolerated.

Students are expected to report academic misconduct when they witness a violation. All cases of academic misconduct shall be reported by the instructor to the Training Specialist.

If a student is found to have engaged in misconduct and the allegations are upheld, the penalties may include, but are not limited to one or a combination of the following:

- expulsion,
- withholding of stipend or forfeiture of stipend paid,
- exclusion from future classes for a specified period; depending on the severity it could range from 1-10 years, and/or
- forfeiture of certificate for course(s) enrolled in at NETC.

Refer to NFA-specific Standard Operating Procedure 700.1 – *Academic Code of Conduct and Ethics* for more information.

Grading Rubrics

STUDENT SCORING DIMENSIONS GUIDE
PRE-COURSE ASSIGNMENT

Student Name:

Existing Program — Assessment Criteria	Points
Submitted an assignment for review	_____/10
Identified the program and summarized its purpose	_____/10
Described program operations and target groups	_____/10
Summarized program outreach, impacts and long-term results	_____/10
Described challenges associated with program development and operations	_____/10

New Program — Assessment Criteria	Points
Submitted an assignment for review	_____/10
Identified and summarized risk issue that needs to be addressed	_____/10
Proposed initial ideas about a program to address the issue	_____/10
Identified potential stakeholders to recruit	_____/10
Described challenges associated with program development and operations	_____/10

Total Score for Pre-Course Assignment: (100 points possible)   _____

GRADING RUBRIC

EXAMINATION 1

For each stage of evaluation (formative, process, impact, and outcome), and the section on qualitative and quantitative evaluation, the following rubric scale will be used for grading. The total points available for this examination are 100. Instructors will evaluate student response for each of the four evaluation stages. The section on qualitative and quantitative evaluation is combined. Each assessment area is worth a potential of 4 points that will be multiplied by 5 to equal up to 100. (see below).

<u>**Points**</u>   <u>**Evaluation Methodology**</u>

4   Excellent assessment of the stage of evaluation (or type of data analysis) as related to the Evaluation 101 unit

         Provided the requested number of examples of how the respective stage of evaluation or data analysis was applied

         Provided excellent written articulation of concepts learned in the Evaluation 101 unit

_____

3   Identified fewer than the number of requested examples of the stage of evaluation (or type of data analysis) being discussed

         Assessment overall was very good but lacked some articulation or details

         Good, but could have provided a more thorough explanation of how the stage of evaluation was applied

_____

2   Parts of the assignment may be missing or incomplete

         Attention to detail and articulation generally missing

         Examples may be miss-matched or weak

1   Assignment basically incomplete or missing all together

         Justification weak or missing

         Questionable writing and analysis throughout

Formative Stage		Process Stage		Impact Stage		Outcome Stage
Points:__ x 5 =___		Points: __ x 5 =___		Points: __ x 5 =___		Points: __ x 5 =___
Qualitative and Quantitative Data Analysis						**Total Score for Examination One**
Points: __ x 5 =___						Points: _____

GRADING RUBRIC

EXAMINATION 2

The total points available for this examination are 100. Instructors will use the rubric scale to evaluate student response for each of the five assessment areas. The student response to each specific assessment area is worth a potential of 4 points that will be multiplied by 5 to equal up to 100.

Assessment Area	Total Point Value (X5)	Poor (1 point)	Fair (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Excellent (4 points)
Provide a rationale of why your department is doing or wants to do this program. This should be a paragraph or two in length and use indicators (evidence) that support your case.	20	Provided a weak rationale that lacked indicators of why the department is doing or wants to do the program.	Provided a rationale of why the department is doing or wants to do the program but the response lacked indicators (evidence) that supports the rationale.	Satisfactorily explained the rationale of why the department is doing or wants to do the program. The response incorporated indicators (evidence) that supported the rationale. The response was fewer than two paragraphs.	Provided an *exceptional* rationale of why the department is doing or wants to do the program. The response incorporated indicators (evidence) that supported the rationale. The response was at least two paragraphs.
Describe, in general, what the program looks like or will look like (goals, key objectives and activities). This should be at least four (likely more) paragraphs.	20	Insufficiently described the program. Failed to articulate goals, key objectives and activities.	Vaguely described the program and did not fully articulate goals, key objectives and activities.	Satisfactorily described the program but did not fully articulate goals, key objectives and activities. The description was fewer than four paragraphs.	Provided an *excellent* general description of what the program looks like or will look like (goals, key objectives and activities). The description was at least four paragraphs.
Identify five stakeholders (people and/or groups) that should or should have been involved in planning your evaluation process. Justify why you have identified these people or groups	20	Did not identify any specific stakeholders or justify why any person or group should be or have been involved.	Identified only one or two stakeholders (people and/ or groups) that should or should have been involved in planning your evaluation process. Did justify why you have identified these people or groups.	Identified fewer than five stakeholders (people and/or groups) that should or should have been involved in planning your evaluation process. Did not fully justify why you have identified these people or groups.	Identified *five* stakeholders (people and/or groups) that should or should have been involved in planning your evaluation process. Justified why you have identified these people or groups.
Explain how the lifecycle of the program would/will be evaluated. The response should include examples of evidence needed, where/how it would be obtained, the amount needed and how it would be validated.	20	Provided an unsatisfactory explanation of how the lifecycle of the program would/will be evaluated. The response lacked examples of evidence needed, where/how it would be obtained, the amount needed and how it would be validated.	Provided a fair explanation of how the lifecycle of the program would/will be evaluated. The response lacked sufficient examples of evidence needed, where/how it would be obtained, the amount needed and how it would be validated.	Provided a satisfactory explanation of how the lifecycle of the program would/will be evaluated. The response lacked sufficient examples of evidence needed, where/how it would be obtained, the amount needed and how it would be validated. Not all of the stages of the program's lifecycle were discussed.	Provided an *exemplary* explanation of how the lifecycle of the program would/will be evaluated. The response included examples of evidence needed, where/how it would be obtained, the amount needed and how it would be validated. All three stages of the program's lifecycle were discussed.

		Provided an unsatisfactory explanation of how a combination of quantitative and qualitative data would be used to evaluate the effectiveness of your community risk-reduction program. The response was vague and lacked examples of the two types of data.	Provided a fair explanation of how a combination of quantitative and qualitative data would be used to evaluate the effectiveness of your community risk-reduction program. The response lacked examples of the two types of data. Not all of the stages of the program's lifecycle were discussed.	Provided a satisfactory explanation of how a combination of quantitative and qualitative data would be used to evaluate the effectiveness of your community risk-reduction program. Only one type of data was summarized and/or examples were not provided. Not all of the stages of the program's lifecycle were discussed.	Provided an *exemplary* explanation of how a combination of quantitative and qualitative data would be used to evaluate the effectiveness of your community risk-reduction program. Both types of data were summarized and examples were provided. All three stages of the program's lifecycle were discussed.
Summarize how you will use a combination of quantitative and qualitative data (evidence) to evaluate the effectiveness of your community risk-reduction program. The response should include examples for each type of data.	20				
Total Points	100				

Student's Total Score: _____