



An Introduction to NRC and the Youth Outcome Network

March 7, 2006

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of National Research Center, Inc. (NRC), I am pleased to announce the release of NRC's Youth Outcome Network and companion Youth Outcome Toolkit.

The Youth Outcome Toolkit was first introduced in 2001 to grantees of The Colorado Trust's After School Initiative and has continued to be administered and refined ever since. The Toolkit offers customizable survey templates as well as capacity-building insight on how to conduct a thorough, and practical, evaluation of youth outcomes. The Toolkit is available at not cost to community-based organizations.

The Youth Outcome Network represents a collection of data from thousands of youth who had been served by youth-serving agencies and who completed a survey from the Youth Outcome Toolkit. These thousands of data points collected by NRC over the last several years represent youth perceptions about nine outcome domains: academic success, arts and culture, community involvement, core values, cultural responsiveness, healthy lifestyles, life skills, positive life choices and sense of self. The Youth Outcome Network offers youth-serving agencies comparative information to help interpret their own Youth Outcome Toolkit survey results, to improve programming, to evaluate the success of their programs, to communicate their successes with funders and other important stakeholders.

The Youth Outcome Network service is now available to collaboratives of youth-serving agencies (and larger, individual agencies who serve at least 100 youth). When a group becomes a member of the Youth Outcome Network, NRC will analyze that group's Youth Outcome Toolkit survey data and produce a straightforward, user-friendly report that includes the group's results alongside normative Youth Outcome Network comparisons. These analysis and reporting services are only offered to agencies that survey 100 or more youth (individually or combined) as this is the best way to render this valuable service in a cost-effective manner for our clients.

The NRC team offers a unique combination of scholarly expertise and practical experience to all of our work. We have worked extensively with non-profit organizations, foundations and government agencies helping them understand their efforts to improve outcomes for their clients. Our work with non-profit organizations has helped them learn and use evaluation methods to improve programming, demonstrate accountability to funders and garner new program funding. We have worked with foundations to help them evaluate the impacts of their initiatives. We are also known locally and nationally for our expertise in survey research methods, program evaluation and evaluation capacity building. The Toolkit offers free access to this expertise, while participation in the Network provides in-depth evaluation to community-based organizations, that might not otherwise be able to afford it.

Please feel free to call me, or Deanna Hall LaFlamme of NRC, if you would like more information on the Youth Outcome Toolkit and the corresponding Youth Outcome Network.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Kindest regards,



Thomas I. Miller, President

The Youth Outcome Network™

Community-based organizations that serve youth face mounting pressure to demonstrate their effectiveness. Pressure comes primarily from funders and parents. Until now, sustained program evaluation has meant reducing evaluation rigor in order to achieve lower costs. Creating and field-testing reliable survey instruments takes expertise and staff time that many agencies do not have. The touchstone of rigorous evaluation design—finding and maintaining a comparison group—is out of range for most youth-serving agencies. Furthermore, sustained evaluation often burdens program staff who, though hired and trained to provide specific services to youth, are conscripted into survey construction, data analysis and report writing on top of their main responsibilities.

National Research Center, Inc., is offering a low-cost service to assist youth-serving agencies in producing high quality, credible measurements of youth outcomes that measure program quality and impacts without greatly burdening staff. The service includes a field-tested survey for youth, adults, data analysis, report writing and comparison of results to a norm of youth outcomes from other youth-serving agencies.

Members of the Youth Outcome Network™ (YON) will receive a copy of the latest version of our youth evaluation tools contained in the Youth Outcome Toolkit (YOT) to prepare them for program evaluation.

The Youth Outcome Toolkit (YOT)

NRC developed the toolkit after years of evaluation work with youth-serving agencies and an extensive review of literature about youth program outcomes. The YOT was designed to easily measure youth outcomes. The YOT includes groups of questions about changes in youth behaviors, attitudes and knowledge that may have resulted from participation in their youth program from the perspectives of youth participants, their parents or guardians, teachers and program staff. Toolkit questions have been tested and found reliable among a wide range of youth—those living in rural and urban areas, white, African American and Latino youth, younger and older youth. For Spanish readers, the questions are available in Spanish.

The Youth Outcome Network (YON)

In the business and governmental sectors, companies regularly invest in databases that permit organizations to share and compare information about product or service quality. Quality ratings of different cars, hospitals, beverages, and even schools, are becoming part of the working capital of private and public sector industries. These databases permit better understanding of customer perspectives because we don't know what is tall or small without comparing.

Youth-serving agencies need information both on their own participants' outcomes as well as comparisons with other youth outcomes in order to more effectively demonstrate program effectiveness. Without comparison data, it is hard to interpret a finding such as "75% of youth feel safe coming to this program." The meaning becomes clearer once you know that the average percent of youth who feel safe coming to similar programs across the U.S. is only 60%. Results also

can be used to set performance standards (minimum thresholds for program success) that your staff may feel motivated to reach; for example, aiming for 90% of the youth feeling safe.

Youth programs that participate in The Youth Outcome Network (YON) contribute to a growing database of youth, parent, teacher and staff perspectives. The database contains hundreds of youth reports about program quality and the progress of youth in nine outcome areas:

- Academic Success
- Arts and Culture
- Community Involvement
- Cultural Responsiveness
- Healthy Lifestyles
- Life Skills
- Core Values
- Positive Life Choices
- Sense of Self

How it Works

Participating programs should first complete the simple logic model template that is part of the Youth Outcome Toolkit. Completion of the logic model will help direct selection of relevant question sets from the Toolkit. Once domains are selected, they are sent to NRC. NRC staff will customize the survey for your programs. The completed questionnaire, attractively designed, is emailed in PDF format so that program staff can print and copy as many surveys as necessary.

Data collection is the responsibility of the program, as described in the preceding pages. The completed questionnaires are express mailed to NRC in a self-addressed and metered envelope provided. (For those who prefer to conduct data collection or data submission on-line, NRC provides Web surveying or email transmission.) Within approximately four weeks¹ of data receipt, a full report will be returned to you with your results compared to the results from other youth-serving programs in the database who asked the same questions.

¹Our four-week turn around assumes 100 completed questionnaires. The time frame will be adjusted for greater numbers. Although processing time may increase, greater number of surveys increases the generalizability of data.

Sample Youth Outcome Network Report



Report of Results

Program ABC

a member of

The Youth Outcome Network

Youth Outcomes & Interpretation Guide

Provided by National Research Center, Inc. – February 2005

Program Background

Would be filled in from information the program provides (brief)

Survey Background and Methodology

Would be filled in from information the program provides via the Survey Administration Tracking Form (brief)

Youth Outcome Toolkit

National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) developed the *Youth Outcome Toolkit*ⁱ as a resource for programs serving youth. This Toolkit includes questions for youth participants to measure youth development outcomes and program quality. The outcomes selected for the Toolkit were based on a synthesis of a national search of instruments used to measure assets and positive youth development, a review of the positive youth development literature, logic models from the many community-based organizations serving youth, and surveys and focus groups with youth-serving programs.

Surveys created from the Toolkit include questions on academic success, arts and culture, community involvement, cultural competency, positive core values, life skills, positive life choices, sense of self, healthy lifestyles and program quality. Additional background information can be found in the Toolkit itself, available at: <http://www.n-r-c.com>

Using the Toolkit questions, NRC customized participant surveys for Program ABC.

Methodology

The youth participant surveys were administered on November 1-4, 2004. This is the third administration for Program ABC. Program staff administered the survey to youth and were available for questions. One-hundred twenty-five surveys were completed out of 182 eligible participants, representing 69% of Program ABC's participants. Youth respondents ranged in age from 9 years old to 13 years old. Students who did not complete the survey were either absent on the administration day or did not have a consent or assent form on file to participate in the evaluation.

Composite Ratings

Groups of questions (such as those for Program Quality) are reported with an aggregated average rating across the entire set of questions. This composite rating, or index, takes into account the average rating for each “required” questionⁱⁱ in the sectionⁱⁱⁱ. The index can be thought of as an overall rating of the program in a particular area. It is important to note that each question used in the index receives equal weighting in the index, so one uncommonly low or high score can influence this composite score.

Overall Norms

The results from all of the youth programs contributing data were aggregated to provide “Overall Norms.” Program ABC contributed 125 of the 1,928 surveys (6%) included within the Overall Norms. These overall data are presented in the final column of each table.

Although responses to the evaluative questions used in the Toolkit were made on a scale with three options “yes,” “kind of” and “not really,” the Overall Norms are based on the percent of participants answering “yes.” NRC used the percent “yes” to focus program staff and other stakeholders on the ideal for youth participant outcomes. Research shows that only the top-scale response option of program quality questions are linked to respondents’ loyalty to programs or services. Especially with a 3-point response scale, NRC staff felt it reasonable to focus on the top response. The use of percent “yes” also simplifies the comparisons. [NOTE: Data in this sample report are fabricated. In addition, normative results in actual reports may not be given as “Percent Yes.”]

When comparing composite scores across outcome domains it is important to note that not all programs asked the same question sets. To make for fairer comparison, the composite scores are based only on the “required” question sets within each domain. Thus, ratings for questions outside of the “required” sets are not included in the composite scores.

The overall normative data, used with a number of cautionary notes, offer important context to individual program to interpret the comparisons the norms provide:

Compare individual program demographics and program usage questions to the Overall Norms (Background and Demographic Questions sections of this report). It may be that differences in youth demographics and program use affect participant ratings.

Use caution when interpreting small differences. There is a certain amount of variation that occurs when a program does not have responses from all of the youth who participated in that program. The results, in most cases, should confirm staff’s intuition and knowledge gained from day-to-day program work. If results are wildly different than what were expected, staff may need to assure themselves that the data are correct before proceeding. Unless the differences between the program and the overall results exceed 5 percentage points, one may assume that the individual program’s results are not meaningfully different than the average across all programs where similar questions were asked. Even differences that reach the threshold of statistical significance may not

be large enough to merit immediate program change. Staff should be cautious but attentive when reading these results.

When program participant perspectives are compared to the perspectives of all youth in the database who answered the same questions, staff should not be surprised or overly concerned if ratings from their program are lower than the overall average. In a group of superb programs, still close to half or more will have ratings below that group's average. Staff may consider the absolute rating (e.g. 70% "yes, " as well as the overall average, say, 75%) and use both sets of data to craft the individual program's response to results.

Limitations of These Data

The program's participant survey was designed to address outcomes that your program wanted youth participants to achieve (as reflected in the program's goals and desired outcomes). It is important to note the potential limitations of the data derived from these surveys.

First, the survey asked youth to self-report, or rate, their behaviors. Weaknesses of self-reported data are that they tend to be more subjective or biased compared to other types of measurements. On the other hand, self-report data can be quite valuable. They provide valuable feedback from the youth themselves, help gauge the program's quality, and can be quite useful for directing program improvement.

Second, these youth participant survey data were collected using a "post-only" survey format, wherein respondents were asked to rate how much they have changed over time, as opposed to assigning a rating for themselves at program start and at program end ("pre-post" measurements). The post-only method of assessing change is more subject to bias, as respondents may not accurately recall their status at program start. On the other hand, it provides an assessment of the youth's perceptions of change.

Despite the potential weaknesses of the data, these survey results are an important tool in understanding how well the program is received by youth. They provide the participants' own perceptions of how the program may have changed their lives.

Your use of these results can be strengthened by comparing your individual program data to the Overall normative data. But the real strength of these data will grow as you continue to monitor the perspectives of the youth you serve and compare findings over time.

Survey Results

The following tables include the percent of respondents that selected each response option ("Percent") as well as the number of respondents ("N=") that answered each question ("Count"). Data are presented for the Program Quality Questions and then for each youth outcome domain selected by the program.

Program Quality Questions

There are 21 Toolkit questions that ask about Program Quality. The questions comprise the following four categories: 1) Safe and Trusting Environment, 2) Supporting and Caring Climate, 3) Youth as Partners and Resources and 4) Attractive and Meaningful Activities. Youth responded to a number of items per category, and composite scores were calculated for each Program Quality category^{iv}. The composite scores for Program ABC are presented along with the Overall Norms^v in the table below (Table 1). The ratings for individual questions are presented in the tables that follow (Tables 2 through 5).

TABLE 1. Average Score for Program Quality Domain				
	Program ABC		Overall Ratings	
	Average Score (Average % "yes")	Count	Average Score (Average % "yes")	Count
Safe and trusting environment	83%	N=125	83%	N=922
Supportive and caring environment	84%	N=125	82%	N=927
Youth as resources	65%	N=122	65%	N=918
Attractive and meaningful activities	74%	N=125	71%	N=927

TABLE 2. Program Quality - Safe and Trusting Environment							
	Program ABC					Overall Ratings	
	Yes	Kind of	Not Really	Total	Count	Yes	Count
There are rules I am expected to follow at Program ABC	91%	8%	1%	100%	N=123	90%	N=915
I feel safe at Program ABC	81%	15%	3%	100%	N=124	83%	N=915
Staff can be trusted	90%	10%	1%	100%	N=125	87%	N=911
I could go to a staff member at Program ABC for advice if I had a serious problem	70%	17%	13%	100%	N=122	73%	N=907
Staff treat all kids fairly	87%	12%	1%	100%	N=122	83%	N=917

TABLE 3. Program Quality - Supportive and Caring Climate							
	Program ABC					Overall Ratings	
	Yes	Kind of	Not Really	Total	Count	Yes	Count
Staff care about me	90%	8%	2%	100%	N=125	84%	N=923
Staff help me feel important	76%	19%	5%	100%	N=125	75%	N=909
Staff give me lots of support	80%	14%	6%	100%	N=124	79%	N=907
Staff spend time with me one-on-one	50%	25%	25%	100%	N=124	57%	N=565
I like the staff here	89%	10%	2%	100%	N=123	85%	N=918
Staff expect me to try hard and do my best	91%	7%	2%	100%	N=125	88%	N=922
Staff tell me when I do a good job	80%	15%	5%	100%	N=122	78%	N=906

TABLE 4. Program Quality - Youth as Partners and Resources							
	Program ABC					Overall Ratings	
	Yes	Kind of	Not Really	Total	Count	Yes	Count
Staff listen to what I have to say	80%	16%	4%	100%	N=121	78%	N=913
Staff ask me to plan, choose or lead activities	51%	23%	27%	100%	N=120	53%	N=907

TABLE 5. Program Quality - Attractive and Meaningful Activities							
	Program ABC					Overall Ratings	
	Yes	Kind of	Not Really	Total	Count	Yes	Count
There are interesting activities at Program ABC	85%	14%	1%	100%	N=125	79%	N=925
The activities are fun at Program ABC	79%	20%	1%	100%	N=125	77%	N=923
I learn about new things at Program ABC	70%	20%	11%	100%	N=123	67%	N=912
I like coming to Program ABC	85%	13%	2%	100%	N=125	84%	N=910
I feel like people are happy to see me here	64%	27%	9%	100%	N=124	60%	N=913
I tell my friends to come to Program ABC	58%	13%	29%	100%	N=125	60%	N=918

Youth Outcomes: Composite Ratings by Outcome Domain

The following table presents the average score for each outcome domain (question set)^{vi}. Overall Norms for fall 2004 appear in the two columns to the right.

TABLE 6. Average Score for Outcome Domains				
	Program ABC		Overall Ratings	
	Average Score (Average % "yes")	Count	Average Score (Average % "yes")	Count
Academic Success	55%	N=124	62%	N=923
Life Skills	62%	N=125	66%	N=742
Positive Core Values	71%	N=122	68%	N=532
Sense of Self	70%	N=123	73%	N=836
Total for Outcome Domains	64%	N=125	67%	N=928

Academic Success

TABLE 7. Academic Success							
	Program ABC					Overall Ratings	
	Yes	Kind of	Not Really	Total	Count	Yes	Count
Improve my grades in school	44%	27%	30%	100%	N=124	57%	N=915
Do better in school	52%	26%	23%	100%	N=124	65%	N=911
Try harder in school	60%	16%	24%	100%	N=124	67%	N=911
Spend more time doing my homework	48%	18%	34%	100%	N=124	58%	N=913
Participate more in class activities	61%	18%	21%	100%	N=123	65%	N=911
Become more interested in going to school	56%	18%	26%	100%	N=123	64%	N=906
Care more about my school	57%	22%	21%	100%	N=123	64%	N=908
Get along better with my classmates	58%	21%	21%	100%	N=124	63%	N=907
Get along better with my teachers	66%	17%	17%	100%	N=124	65%	N=909
Spend more time reading for fun (not for school)	50%	19%	31%	100%	N=124	51%	N=905

Arts and Culture

TABLE 8. Arts and Culture							
	Program ABC					Overall Ratings	
	Yes	Kind of	Not Really	Total	Count	Yes	Count
I spend more time in music, dance, theater, and/or visual arts	49%	15%	36%	100%	N=124	53%	N=342
I enjoy music, dance, theater, and/or visual arts	53%	11%	35%	100%	N=124	61%	N=341
I am better at music, dance, theater, and/or visual arts	50%	15%	35%	100%	N=123	55%	N=340
I practice my artistic skills on my own	65%	13%	22%	100%	N=124	64%	N=481
I am better able to express myself through art	63%	14%	23%	100%	N=125	67%	N=481
A am more able to see myself as an artists	60%	14%	26%	100%	N=125	64%	N=182
I feel more strongly that kids like me can be artists	70%	20%	10%	100%	N=125	62%	N=181
I understand better what it means to work as an artist	50%	50%	0%	100%	N=125	45%	N=181
I have a better idea about whether I could get a job in the arts.	60%	20%	20%	100%	N=125	55%	N=181

Life Skills

TABLE 9. Life Skills							
	Program ABC					Overall Ratings	
	Yes	Kind of	Not Really	Total	Count	Yes	Count
I get along better with other people my age	61%	24%	15%	100%	N=125	70%	N=741
I am better at making friends	59%	26%	15%	100%	N=125	66%	N=738
I am better at telling others about my ideas and feelings	61%	21%	18%	100%	N=125	59%	N=733
I am better at listening to other people	67%	22%	10%	100%	N=125	69%	N=737
I work better with others on a team	69%	19%	12%	100%	N=124	72%	N=736
I make better decisions	62%	26%	12%	100%	N=125	70%	N=736
I am better at planning ahead	60%	26%	14%	100%	N=124	63%	N=735
I am better at setting goals	65%	21%	14%	100%	N=124	67%	N=733
I am better at solving problems	60%	23%	18%	100%	N=124	63%	N=737
I am more of a leader	55%	26%	19%	100%	N=123	57%	N=730
I am better at taking care of problems without violence or fighting	64%	14%	21%	100%	N=121	64%	N=730

Core Values

TABLE 10. Core Values							
	Program ABC					Overall Ratings	
	Yes	Kind of	Not Really	Total	Count	Yes	Count
I care more about other people	70%	19%	11%	100%	N=122	67%	N=531
I care more about the feelings of other people	71%	19%	10%	100%	N=122	68%	N=530
I am better at standing up for what I believe	76%	14%	10%	100%	N=122	73%	N=529
I tell the truth more often even when it is hard	73%	16%	12%	100%	N=121	68%	N=529
I am better at taking responsibility for my actions	69%	17%	13%	100%	N=121	70%	N=456
I am more interested in community and world problems	63%	21%	16%	100%	N=121	60%	N=461
I am better at speaking up for people who have been treated unfairly	75%	15%	10%	100%	N=121	69%	N=461

Sense of Self

TABLE 11. Sense of Self							
	Program ABC					Overall Ratings	
	Yes	Kind of	Not Really	Total	Count	Yes	Count
Feel better about myself	67%	20%	14%	100%	N=123	74%	N=831
Feel I have more control over things that happen to me	67%	19%	14%	100%	N=123	71%	N=830
Feel that I can make more of a difference	67%	18%	15%	100%	N=122	73%	N=828
Learn I can do things I didn't think I could do before	75%	10%	16%	100%	N=122	75%	N=825
Feel better about my future	71%	12%	17%	100%	N=123	72%	N=829
Feel I am better at handling whatever comes my way	71%	14%	15%	100%	N=122	72%	N=829

Open-ended Questions

Responses to the three open-ended questions appear below. They are included verbatim (i.e., literally as the youth wrote them).

What do you like best about coming to Program ABC?

- "I like best is Crafts because I get to help other people"
- "I like meeting new friends and learning how to do new things."
- "doing arts and crafts if I was in it"
- "It is fun."
- "I like the best is learning now things."
- "seeing my friends and haveing fun."
- "I get to see my friends"
- "I like doing activities and learning what I didn't already know."
- "Acting"
- "I like acting"
- "It is fun and egecacional"
- "The leders"
- "pot luck"
- "the games"
- "Learning how to be a police officer and seeing my friends"
- "being with others my age"

If you could change one thing at Program ABC, what would it be?
--

- "I would change the time to 5:30 because we would have time to get more things done"
- "Nothing"
- "The way people treat other people"
- "I really dont want to change anything in Program ABC."
- "Having the leaders listen to some of the ideas my friends and I have."
- "more sulections"
- "I would change the wheather."
- "a lot more time."
- "It should be done at 4:00"
- "I would let the kids pick what we would do"
- "Some of the sports"
- "We could have more activities"
- "nothing"
- "Nuthing"
- "snacks"
- "dance"
- More time to play."
- "Letting everybody treat everybody the way your supposed to be and contorl yourself and be Polite with the leaders."
- "more games"
- "that you could do watever you want."

What activities would you like Program ABC to offer next year?

- "I would like a winter thing where each day we would do something different like ice skating and sleading."
- "Pottery, Ice skating, and cooking."
- "Exersizing"
- "Ice skating teatherball"
- "Cheer Leading and maybe ice skating"
- "cherleading and beautiful you"
- "Dog training, tootering, and learning how to take care of your younger sibling."
- "Cheerleading, Gymastics, and friends."
- "hiphop Dance."
- "Making coustums."
- "ice skating"
- "acade feild trips."
- "Marshal arts and more water activities"
- "something to do scientificly"
- "Pottery painting, and pottery making."
- "Modeling"
- "Journalisum, Photography"
- "rock climbing"
- "Horse riding"
- "Role playing games like Meta scape"
- "dog watching and grooming"

Background and Demographic Questions

TABLE 12. Frequency of Attendance

How often do you come to Program ABC?	Program ABC		Overall Characteristics	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Every day or almost everyday (4-5 times per week)	49%	N=60	49%	N=447
Two to three times a week	36%	N=44	31%	N=277
Once a week	11%	N=14	15%	N=132
A couple times a month	2%	N=2	3%	N=29
At least once a month	1%	N=1	1%	N=9
Less than once a month	1%	N=1	1%	N=10
Total	100%	N=122	100%	N=904

TABLE 13. Start of Attendance

When did you start coming to Program ABC?	Program ABC		Overall Characteristics	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
This fall	61%	N=73	47%	N=169
Over the summer	N/A	N/A	3%	N=12
Last spring	8%	N=10	6%	N=21
Last year or longer ago than that	31%	N=37	44%	N=159
Total	100%	N=120	100%	N=361

TABLE 14. Age of Respondent

How old are you?	Program ABC		Overall Characteristics	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
8 years or younger	0%	N=0	0%	N=3
9 years	1%	N=1	9%	N=86
10 years	42%	N=52	21%	N=189
11 years	46%	N=57	24%	N=220
12 years	10%	N=12	18%	N=165
13 years	1%	N=1	15%	N=140
14 years	0%	N=0	8%	N=77
15 years or older	0%	N=0	3%	N=31
Total	100%	N=123	100%	N=915

TABLE 15. Grade of Respondent

What grade are you in?	Program ABC		Overall Characteristics	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
4	0%	N=0	14%	N=127
5	66%	N=76	29%	N=251
6	34%	N=40	23%	N=205
7	0%	N=0	15%	N=133
8	0%	N=0	12%	N=107
9	0%	N=0	6%	N=54
Total	100%	N=116	100%	N=877

TABLE 16. Gender of Respondent

Are you a girl/female or boy/male?	Program ABC		Overall Characteristics	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Girl/Female	67%	N=78	56%	N=508
Boy/Male	33%	N=39	44%	N=394
Total	100%	N=117	100%	N=902

TABLE 17. Race/Ethnicity of Respondent				
Race	Program ABC		Overall Characteristics	
	Percent*	Count	Percent*	Count
African American/Black	0%	N=0	9%	N=61
Asian/Pacific Islander	1%	N=1	2%	N=16
Bi-racial/Multi-racial	2%	N=2	4%	N=28
Caucasian/White	71%	N=86	40%	N=274
Latino/Hispanic	4%	N=5	30%	N=207
Native American	8%	N=10	8%	N=57
Other	18%	N=22	10%	N=71
*Total may exceed 100% as respondents were allowed to select more than one response.				

In the following table, youth participants were asked to check all the youth-serving program activities in which they were involved. This question allowed program staff to use the same survey with multiple activity groups, yet enabled them to separate results for a variety of activities.

Activity	Program ABC	
	Percent*	Count
Cheerleading/Dance Team	18%	N=22
Crafts	15%	N=19
French	8%	N=10
Drama	11%	N=13
Rock Climbing	15%	N=18
Espanol!	11%	N=14
Jr. Attorney	12%	N=15
Jr. Police	15%	N=19
Horseback Riding	7%	N=8
Beautiful You!	11%	N=13
Acting 101	10%	N=12
Safe Sitter	6%	N=7

*Total may exceed 100% as respondents were allowed to select more than one response.

Language of instrument	Program ABC		Overall Characteristics	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
English	80%	N=100	96%	N=892
Spanish	20%	N=25	4%	N=36
Total	100%	N=125	100%	N=928

Next Steps

Program ABC staff may want to work with NRC, or a local evaluator, to understand the survey results further and to work at presenting program outcomes to stakeholders and future funders. Program ABC staff may also work on making programmatic improvements in areas where ratings fell short. Once data are collected over time, programs may compare results of one survey administration to another.

As the James Irvine Foundation explains, "If organizations know how to gather and use data to assess performance, their service to clients will improve."^{vii} It is vitally important for youth-youth-serving programs to share this perception of data with staff, board members, and other stakeholders. This value can become engrained in an organization when data are understood as something that is *of* and *for* their organization, rather than

something that is done *to* them.”² Data then serve as a learning tool, a manner of empowering programs to improve their positive impact on youth.

Once data are in hand, staff should move to capitalize on results to improve their programs and their evaluation. Detailed next steps might include:

- Debrief this Survey Analysis and Interpretation Guide with other staff, parents, board members and youth participants.
- Identify a limited number of action steps along with a timeline and plan to accomplish each step.
- Where appropriate, communicate to stakeholders both the findings and plans to improve the program based on the findings.
- Review the survey questions used to assure that they truly are relevant and useful.

Experience and Qualifications of our Firm

NRC has significant experience designing and conducting evaluations of governmental and non-profit agency work. We have provided evaluation assistance to myriad types of community-based organizations—those serving victims of sexual assault and domestic violence, after-school programs, dental aid, child care, African-American leaders, Latino parents, elderly, homeless and more. We have published outcome handbooks for older adults, youth-serving programs, community food security projects and obesity prevention programs as well as a general guide to help all community-based organizations measure their effectiveness.

NRC's experience extends beyond merely conducting evaluations. We have significant expertise working with organizations to help build evaluation capacity. Through our collaborations, staff learn enough about evaluation to understand what the measurements mean, to be conversant with professional program evaluators or, more ambitiously, to be able to create and run a continuous evaluation system in-house. NRC has developed trainings and classroom curricula that prepare staff to understand and, if it is the intent, to conduct credible program evaluation.

Our trainings cover such topics as general principles of program evaluation, logic model development, focus group facilitation, data synthesis and reporting and uses of results as well as data collection and survey research design. We have written texts and curricula designed to be understood easily by lay audiences and to be fun and interactive for program staff. Our individual technical assistance provides clients with the resources to craft data-collection instruments, administer surveys and to analyze and report results. We have developed toolkits of survey questions that make the data collection, synthesis and reporting process remarkably easy. We intend to make evaluation sustainable in community-based organizations.

Our extensive work with community-based organizations has led NRC to innovate a new model for evaluation capacity building. Called "insourcing," this model protects community-based organizations' limited resources—in staff time and more—and creates economies of scale by drawing together like organizations for whom inexpensive, moderately standardized outcome measurement can be performed. (Article is being reviewed for publication in *American Evaluation Journal* and is available upon request.)

Evaluation Content Areas

Although our evaluation work has taken us to many corners of service provision, NRC has developed a strong sub-specialty in evaluation in a number of content specific areas such as positive youth development, physical activity and education.

Positive Youth Development

NRC has partnered with a wide variety of youth-serving programs to evaluate the effectiveness of services provided. As part of this work, we have developed tools that measure outcomes in the areas of academic achievement, self-esteem, alcohol and drug use, teen pregnancy, physical activity, nutrition, conflict resolution, leadership and other life skills, to name a few. We conduct evaluation trainings with youth-serving organizations and have written a number of evaluation handbooks and toolkits to measure program quality and youth outcomes.

As part of our youth evaluation work, we have helped 32 after-school programs in Colorado track and evaluate their programs, developed trainings and evaluation tools to measure Search Institute's developmental assets for youth-serving programs funded by Mile High United Way and provided evaluation assistance to dozens of community-based organizations. Using our Youth Outcome Toolkit, we are currently assisting a number of Colorado youth-serving agencies to evaluate their programs. Current clients include Colorado Council on the Arts YouthReach Initiative grantees, I Have a Dream Foundation and the Medicine Horse Program.

Recreation, Physical Activity and Obesity Prevention

Our evaluation work has been used in numerous studies of recreation, physical activity and obesity prevention. NRC has worked with the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment to develop tools to help measure the results of programs related to physical activity and nutrition, including interventions aimed at getting physical education back into schools and training PE teachers in new methodologies to appeal to students. We are the evaluators of The Colorado Trust's Healthy People 2010 Obesity Prevention evaluation; a study measuring the sustained behavior change of participants from 16 community-based organizations working in the areas of physical activity, nutrition and diabetes prevention. In addition, NRC has conducted scores of surveys for local governments including measuring recreation facility and program performance. We have administered surveys and hosted focus groups with youth to determine the types of recreation and leisure services attractive to young community residents.

Education

NRC has conducted a number of evaluations related to education and academic performance. Beyond our work in after-school programming, we have worked with a number of school districts and community-based organizations seeking to improve academic performance, retention, graduation and college admission. We have worked on community consensus of school district effectiveness and interpretation of standardized test scores. We conducted a multi-year evaluation of the Arts Infusion Program of Denver Public Schools and for that observed classrooms, surveyed youth and conducted focus groups with staff.

Our Evaluation Philosophy

More than 20 years conducting research and evaluation for community-based organizations, local government and foundations has shaped our evaluation philosophy. We understand the environment in which educational programs operate. We are sensitive to the demands and pressures of program staff and we know the distractions that vie for the attention of young program participants. We also are aware that the best conceived evaluation plan must be changed if assumptions that led to its conception cannot sustain.

Our Principles

We thrive on diversity, operate in close partnership with our clients, provide strong leadership, work hard and produce high quality results and honest conclusions.

Measuring What Matters

We communicate real world perspectives necessary for making good decisions. We help organizations listen before taking action. We provide reasoned focus when pressures build just to try anything. We direct organizations toward what works and what helps and away from what is weak or untenable. We teach the value of our craft and the methods to practice it. We remain sensitive to the resources available to organizations and optimize those resources to provide the best work possible.

Cultural Competence

We prosper because of diversity of geography, history, race, language, personality and thought. We become more creative, empathic, wise and useful to our clients by absorbing and reflecting the full range of differences we may encounter in our work relationships. We work especially hard at including the voices of the underserved – the low-income, ethnic minority, frail or disabled resident or program participant. Often this requires translation of data collection instruments, the use of native speakers of languages other than English, participation in data collection and interpretation by members of the hard-to-reach communities.

Partnership

Simply being expert in content or research methods does not guarantee that an organization can produce a research or evaluation study that is useful to clients. We know that we need help from our clients. NRC staff understand that planning for the best deliverable begins with close collaboration with the client. At the outset of our work, NRC staff seeks to clarify the purposes of the project, identify the key contacts and stakeholders and learn the personal, political and geographic contingencies that will influence the work. Throughout each project, NRC staff check in with our client to test our direction, work on solving problems and plan for the final product. Collaboration with our client vastly improves our work and assures that clients get what they expect and is most helpful to their mission.

Honesty

There is almost an infinite number of ways to tell the story of research results. NRC staff have built a reputation for candor and simplicity. This does not mean that we ignore the pressures of the context in which our work is conducted. We are sensitive to the constraints of personality and politics, but we give our advice in a palatable and straightforward way so that it can be heard and acted upon by all parties. We believe that there is no bad news from research results, that our findings help to move our clients in a better direction or at a faster pace than they are now moving, so we feel no pressure to tell a client what the strongest pressure groups “want” to hear. Top references are not built on half-truths. Because NRC constructs strong partnerships with our clients, the truth is expected and easy to receive.

Leadership

The best leaders know when to lead and how to follow. NRC’s reputation for high quality research and evaluation brings with it the responsibility to identify the best ways to conceive and implement a research or evaluation project. Nevertheless, we are careful to listen before we lead. Our skilled and thoughtful staff do not rest on NRC’s reputation. We understand that there is a lot to learn

from the accomplishments of our clients and their stakeholders, so in each new venture, before we plot a path, we pay close attention to the body of knowledge already accumulated, the voice of staff closest to the issues and the nuances of the context in which we work. We lead best as part of the group, not apart from the group.

Productivity

NRC produces what it promises. We design a workplan and budget at the beginning of the project and we stick to what we design. When a change in scope or timeframe is required, we work with the client to select the best options and we come to agreement about the associated costs before we move ahead. When high quality research must be done at reasonable cost and on time, NRC excels.

Excellence

For NRC, it is not enough merely to produce the expected. We strive to add unique value to the research process or to the final product or both. By keeping track of milestones and by keeping in close communication with our clients, we assure that the activities needed to bring a project toward completion are clearly understood. We are easy to contact and encourage our clients to do so whenever they wish. No question is too small; no inquiry unimportant. We think of both the process and final product as our calling card for the next clients, so NRC staff intend to make our reports, presentations, trainings and curricula not only what the client expects, but something we can be proud of for years.

Empathy

Successful evaluation must be empathic. For large scale evaluations to be responsive, evaluators must understand the goals of each program, the evaluation interests and skills of program staff, and the context of the community environment in which each of the programs operates. Evaluators must be flexible enough to provide both what we believe an agency needs and what agency staff are convinced that they want. With this balanced approach, we can provide the assistance needed for agency staff to gather the best information about program outcomes while not overburdening them and diminishing their ability to deliver direct services.

Respect

For evaluation to be respectful, evaluators must create evaluation instruments and data collection methods that will be accepted, understood and even appreciated by the ethnic and geographic culture wherein programs operate. Respect also is conveyed by a genuine appreciation that programs spring from community contemplation, hard-raised money and dedicated local staff. These characteristics of community not-for-profits must, on the face of them, be considered valuable. Finally, to be respectful, an evaluation must provide unbiased process or outcome data. The data will help to sustain the program by telling a hard truth about the work, a truth that can only help the program to improve. Telling the truth is an important measure of respect.

Utility

Work is not done for its own sake. Excellent work is necessary but it is often insufficient. Excellent work must be both useful and put to use. NRC is mindful of how and when results are intended to

be acted upon and we work with our clients to maximize the likelihood that results lead to action when action is warranted.

Feasibility

Gold standard evaluations are pretty to look at and valuable in concept, but too often evaluators fail to create the exchange mechanism that permits the best design to be converted to practical operation. NRC staff are trained in the most rigorous evaluation designs, so we understand where compromise to parts of design inflicts least harm to conclusions about program effects. This requires a schooled balance between academic know how and real world constraints.

Making it Make Sense

The key to practical evaluation is excellence of method and simplicity of communication. Our principles' experiences range from teaching statistics and market research at the graduate level to using experiential learning techniques with staff from grassroots non-profits. We have presented results to board members, elected officials, task forces of local residents and teams of executives and managers. Not only have we taught management seminars and written in scholarly journals, but one of our principals with a Ph.D. in research and evaluation methods also was a journalist and acting director of communication for a local government.

Evaluation Clients & Projects

National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) conducts evaluations for foundation, not-for-profit, government and health care programs. Evaluation activities may include construction and use of surveys, observation or focus group scripts; data collection to measure or describe program activities and outcomes; data analysis; and reporting. For almost all evaluations, NRC collaborates with clients and interacts with the general public or customers, broadly defined. The people with whom we work, both clients and respondents, typically cover all age, ethnic, income and education groups and are people with widely varying values and life circumstances.

Multi-Site, Multi-Year Initiatives

After School Initiative, The Colorado Trust

We are working with The Colorado Trust to be the statewide evaluator of the After School Initiative, which is funding 35 sites across the state of Colorado to encourage after-school care with an emphasis on positive youth development. In addition to developing evaluation tools, conducting trainings and providing technical assistance, an annual administration of the Agency Survey allows us to track the progress of the sites in their efforts to create partnerships, become more culturally competent and become more sustainable.

Colorado Healthy People 2010 Obesity Prevention Initiative, The Colorado Trust

Focusing on a core set of risks identified in the federal governments Healthy People 2010 Initiative, this is a five year study of the success of 17 different programs funded by The Colorado Trust to reduce obesity, increase activity or improve nutrition among thousands of participants. The evaluation examines effects at program termination and again 12 months later. It explores the relationship between program and community characteristics and participant outcomes.

Colorado Healthy People 2010 Statewide Initiative, The Colorado Trust

At the request of regional coordinating agencies and with the sponsorship of The Colorado Trust, NRC provides training and technical assistance for evaluation activities for grantees providing programs to unintended injuries, improve access to health care, provide mental health and drug abuse preventative services or reduce obesity and type 2 diabetes. Trainings may cover the basics of conducting evaluation, measuring outcomes, developing logic model and more. Technical assistance may include literature searches and reviews, data analysis, result reporting and more.

Community Food Security Coalition Evaluation Assistance for Community Food Projects

NRC provides evaluation training and technical assistance nationwide to community food projects grant funded by the USDA. In addition, NRC is developing a customized curriculum and outcome toolkit for these projects.

Palliative Care Initiative, The Colorado Trust

We are working with The Colorado Trust to be the statewide evaluator of the Palliative Care Initiative, which is funding 8 sites across the state of Colorado to improve end-of-life care. Thus far we have developed an "evaluation toolkit" (instrumentation) for use by the sites, and conducted a training of the local evaluators employed at each site. In addition, we are providing technical assistance to the 8 local evaluators for the life of the initiative (3 years).

Results Integration, Evaluation and Training, Mile High United Way

We have been working with MHUW for the past 3 years to compile the outcome data provided by 100+ grantees. As part of this outcome assistance, we have conducted trainings on outcome assessment and provided technical assistance on evaluation tools. We recently developed a set of evaluation tools for all of MHUW's youth-serving agencies. Along with the tools, we will provide significant training and technical assistance to the 36 agencies.

City of Boulder Human Services Fund, Housing and Human Services Department

We provided technical assistance to 40 human services agencies for a four-year period. We helped them in the areas of defining objectives, measuring outcomes, outcome assessment, database development, etc. Clients included the Boulder Homeless Shelter, Community Food Share, Attention Inc., Emergency Family Assistance, Women's Source, the Counseling Center, Boulder County Sexual Assault Team, Sexual Assault Interagency Council, Boulder Valley Teen Parenting, Family Resource Schools, Teen Intervention, Boulder Community Action Program, Partners and Safehouse.

Staff Introductions

Thomas I Miller, Ph.D., is the president of National Research Center, Inc. He received a Ph.D. in research and evaluation methods from the Laboratory of Educational Research at the University of Colorado, Boulder. He has worked in state and local government and as a consultant to human service agencies since 1977. With Michelle Kobayashi, he wrote, *Citizen Surveys: How to do them, how to use them, what they mean*, published in 2000 by the International City and County Management Association, Washington, D.C. Tom founded National Research Center, Inc. in 1994. He has designed, overseen and written results of hundreds of research and evaluation projects and presented his findings to a wide variety of audiences, both academic and lay. He has written about survey research in journals and books devoted to public management, including *Public Administration Review*, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *Planning Commissioners Journal*, *Management Science and Policy Analysis*, *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*, *Handbook of Social Intervention*, and *Governing*. Tom also has been a journalist and acting director of communication for local government.

Michelle Miller Kobayashi, M.S.P.H. (unrelated to Tom), is vice president of NRC, Inc. Not only has she conducted numerous complex statistical weighting procedures for our survey research, Michelle has developed statistical models from our survey results to understand the risk factors predicting resident behaviors and attitudes and the need for community services. Her statistical expertise extends far beyond the standard descriptive and inferential statistics required by frequency distributions and cross-tabulations. She has built statistical models using logistic regression, performed risk analyses using adjusted odds ratios and validated survey instruments using factor analysis. To prove she speaks English, too, Michelle has made scores of presentations to public managers, elected officials and staff and she has designed and overseen a wide variety of surveys on topics that include citizen satisfaction with government services, public trust, growth and land use planning, urban renewal, transportation, open space and fair market rental rates. She co-authored *Citizen Surveys: How to do them, how to use them, what they mean* with Tom Miller and worked as chief project manager on a variety of health care outcome projects with Evaluation Systems International, Inc. Her work includes integration of research outcomes on cancer risk estimates for exposure to powerline electromagnetic fields, published in *Risk Analysis*.

Erin Caldwell, M.S.P.H., is a senior research associate at NRC. Erin has earned a master's degree in public health with an emphasis in research methods and statistics. Erin has designed and conducted scores of needs assessments, policy studies and program evaluations. She has published in *The American Journal of Public Health* on the health and quality of life of ethnic minorities living in Colorado's San Luis Valley. Other analytic work has included formulation of measures of acculturation for use in a rural bi ethnic population. Erin has overseen and performed a variety of research in local government and human services. Much of her emphasis has been on outcome monitoring and program evaluation. Erin has over 10 years experience as a senior researcher and research manager. As Senior Research Associate for the national submetering study, Erin focused on developing and implementing the apartment manager and resident surveys, supervising coding all survey responses, statistical analysis of data sets including multiple regression and benefit-cost analysis, and final report preparation.

Rachel Cooper, M.A., research associate, has a master's degree in Clinical Sociology from the University of Northern Colorado as well as a B.A. in Sociology from South Dakota State

University. Along with clinical work in the criminal justice field, she has extensive research experience with local governments and nonprofits. Rachel participated in management of the Louisville, CO Library Survey in 2003, as well as managed the Louisville Citizen Survey the following year. She also has participated in management of several NRC custom citizen surveys throughout the Front Range and across the nation including, but not limited to, the following projects: Longmont, CO Citizen Survey, Arvada, CO Citizen Survey, Broomfield, CO Citizen Survey and Rockville, MD Citizen Survey.

Wendy DuBow, Ph.D., research associate, earned her doctorate in English and American Literature from the University of North Carolina. She brings to NRC a depth of professional experience in writing, teaching, editing, communications and information technology. Her skills as a researcher are also multifaceted; Wendy has designed and conducted program evaluations as well as needs assessments, outcome assessments and literature reviews. She is familiar with Web-based research and has administered maintained and provided technical support for numerous Web-based projects. Wendy is adept at descriptive, inferential statistical and qualitative analysis.

Shannon Hayden, M.A., senior analyst, Shannon earned her undergraduate degree in Sociology from The Colorado College and a master's degree in Educational Psychology (emphasis on research and evaluation methodology) from the University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center. Shannon has been involved in dozens of citizen surveys at NRC, working as a project manager and on all aspects of the projects, including survey instrument development, overseeing data collection and analyzing and reporting the data. She helped develop The National Citizen Survey™ and oversaw the Beta Site testing of this project. Her background includes a number of years in marketing. Shannon also has designed Access databases for client use and to aid in data collection and analysis.

Deanna Hall LaFlamme, M.A., research associate, earned a Masters in Communication Studies with emphasis on interpersonal communication. At NRC, Deanna provides evaluation support to a number of non-profit organizations including I Have a Dream Foundation, the Medicine Horse Program, Lake County Montana Community Economic Development and grantees of The Colorado Trust's After School Initiative. She has conducted hundreds of telephone interviews for a various NRC projects including The Colorado Trust's Palliative Care Initiative, the Community Food Security Coalition evaluation program and the Colorado Strengths and Needs Assessment of Older Adults. Prior to NRC, Deanna gained experience as an instructor for the University of Maine teaching undergraduates interpersonal communication, small group communication, interviewing and public speaking.

Angela Kopetksy, B.S., is the office manager for National Research Center, Inc. She received her degree in Business Operations Management from Leeds School of Business. Angela previously worked as an administrative support technician for the U.S. Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications & Information Administration and as a finance supervisor for the University of Colorado Student Recreation Center. She is involved in every facet of company operations at NRC, including finances, HR, general office protocol and legal affairs.

Heather Locke, M.A., is the The National Citizen Survey™ Director. Heather earned a master's in Religious Studies from the University of Colorado at Boulder, with an emphasis in comparative religious traditions, and undergraduate degrees in Religion and French. Her experience is in teaching, research, management, and coordination.

Kerry A. Lupher, M.S.W., senior research associate, holds a Master of Social Work degree from University of Denver. Her undergraduate degree is in Communications with an emphasis in public relations. At NRC, Kerry has managed numerous large-scale evaluations for state and national not-for-profit agencies and foundations in the areas of positive youth development, older adults, community food security, healthy lifestyles and more. Kerry has led scores of focus groups and interactive evaluation trainings and provided one-on-one technical support to dozens of grassroots organizations striving to build their own capacity in program evaluation. Prior to NRC and in her free time, Kerry has served an array of philanthropic groups as researcher, victim advocate, social justice advocate, service provider, fundraiser and member of boards of directors.

Sabrina Arredondo Mattson, Ph.D., is a research associate who earned her undergraduate degree from California State University at Fresno and her Ph.D. in Sociology with an emphasis in Criminology from the University of Colorado, Boulder. Sabrina is an experienced project manager who is bi-lingual in English and Spanish. She has ample experience working with Justice Systems, cities, schools, and programs on a variety of evaluation projects, technical assistance needs and multicultural issues.

Paula M. Noble, M.A., research associate, has a master's degree in experimental psychology from the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs and a Bachelor of Science in psychology from Missouri State University. Paula's expertise includes a thorough understanding of research methods with experience overseeing data collection, entry, analysis and reports. Additionally, Paula has developed and designed specialized measurement tools and is proficient in a variety of statistical processes including cross-tabulation, t-tests, correlations, analysis of variance and regression.

Thomas Oyer, B.A., is a research assistant at National Research Center, Inc. Thomas has a Bachelor of Arts in Sociology from Westminster College where he developed a background in social research involving both quantitative and qualitative methods. He has experience in event coordinating and planning, as well as leadership and activism for the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender community. Thomas's other areas of interest include film studies and playing the piano. At NRC, Thomas lends his skills to both evaluation and citizen survey research including data collection, focus groups recruitment and report formatting.

Patrick Raichart, M.M., is an administrative assistant at National Research Center. When not keeping our office organized and running smoothly, he can be found playing trombone with local musical ensembles.

Lee Tyson, B.A., analyst, has a Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology and English from the University of Connecticut. Companies such as IBM and Bose have utilized her extensive technical skills, where she has provided customer troubleshooting support, Internet/Intranet design, and database expertise.

Kaisa Ullsvik, M.F.A., research assistant, has a Master of Fine Arts in Writing and Poetics from Naropa University. She earned her undergraduate degree in English from Luther College. Her experience and skills include teaching, writing consultation and editing. She assists with citizen survey research, data collection, formatting, report design and creating presentation materials.

Laurie Urban, B.A., research associate, has a bachelor's degree in Speech Communications with a focus in Public Relations from Miami University. She works on numerous evaluation projects at NRC, Inc. and assists with evaluation research, data collection, formatting and report design.

Sonya Wytinck, M.S., research associate, earned a master's degree in Agricultural Economics from the University of Alberta and is a SAS Certified Professional. She comes to NRC with an extensive amount of survey design, testing, implementation and analysis experience. Her professional background spans the gamut, including work with rural student transportation issues, tribal and non-tribal fisheries in the Great Lakes, recreational damage on the Kalamazoo River and water distribution in the Mae Taeng Irrigation Project (Thailand). Sonya extends these skills across yet another border (the US-Canadian) to join NRC after serving as an economist for Alberta Health and Wellness.

Damema Zoss, B.A., The National Citizen Survey™ Associate Director, earned her bachelor's degree in Political Science from the University of Vermont. Her experience and skills include marketing, management and customer service. Damema is involved in all aspects of The NCS™ from customizing surveys to data analysis and report creation. She also maintains the normative database for NRC.

List of Child and Youth-serving Evaluation Clients

- ◆ Adams 12 Five Star Schools in partnership with Goals, Inc.
- ◆ African American Leadership Institute
- ◆ Appalachian Sustainable Agriculture Project's Growing Mind's Project
- ◆ Archuleta County Education Center
- ◆ Art from Ashes
- ◆ Artes Por Todos
- ◆ ArtReach, Inc.
- ◆ Arts Street
- ◆ ArtWorx!
- ◆ Asian Pacific Development Center RELAY Program
- ◆ Aspen Santa Fe Ballet Company & School Folklorico Mexicano Program
- ◆ Attention Inc.
- ◆ Bent County DARE to be Fit Program
- ◆ Black Canyon Boys & Girls Club
- ◆ Boulder Valley School District Teen Parenting Program
- ◆ Boulder Youth Services Initiative
- ◆ Boys & Girls Club of Pueblo County
- ◆ Canon City Metro Parks & Recreation
- ◆ Casey Middle School Community Learning Center
- ◆ Child and Family Advocacy Center
- ◆ City of Boulder Youth Services Teen Intervention Program
- ◆ City of Cripple Creek Parks & Recreation
- ◆ City of Longmont Division of Youth Services
- ◆ Colorado I Have a Dream Foundation
- ◆ Colorado State University Cooperative Extension, El Paso County
- ◆ Community Harvest
- ◆ Cross Community Coalition
- ◆ Denver Public School Art Infusion Project
- ◆ Dolores County Broadcast Network
- ◆ Durango Latino Education Coalition
- ◆ Escuela Tlatelolco
- ◆ Estes Valley Recreation & Park District
- ◆ Family Resource Schools
- ◆ Florida Certified Organic Growers
- ◆ Full Circle of Lake County, Inc. Outdoor Leadership Project

- ◆ Girl Scouts Mile Hi Council
- ◆ Girl Scouts, Mountain Prairie and Chipeta Councils, Girl Scouts on the Move
- ◆ Horace Mann Neighborhood Center
- ◆ I Have a Dream Foundation of Boulder County
- ◆ Jammin' in Northeast Denver (J'NED)
- ◆ Janus Youth Program
- ◆ Jewish Community Center of Denver Russian After School Program
- ◆ Jewish Family Service New American School-Based Program
- ◆ Kellogg Child Development Center
- ◆ La Plata Family Centers Coalition
- ◆ Lake County School District
- ◆ Medicine Horse Program
- ◆ Mercy Housing South West
- ◆ Mesa County Department of Human Services Club MID
- ◆ Metro Black Church Initiative
- ◆ Migrant Arts
- ◆ Moffat County Healthy People
- ◆ Park County RE-2 School District
- ◆ Parkview Medical Center's School-Based Wellness Center Diabetes Prevention Program
- ◆ Partners of Boulder County
- ◆ Partners of Larimer County FIRM Program
- ◆ Pikes Peak YMCA
- ◆ Plateau School District RE-5
- ◆ Rainbow Bridge
- ◆ Recreational After-School Doorway (RAD) Program
- ◆ Rio Grande Community Farm
- ◆ Rocky Mountain Youth Corps Mentoring Healthy Lifestyles Program
- ◆ Saint Andrew Avelino Youth Guild
- ◆ South Plains Food Bank
- ◆ Taos Economic Development, Comida Para La Vida Project
- ◆ The Bridge Project, University of Denver
- ◆ The Fund for Colorado's Future, High Horizons Program
- ◆ The Salvation Army , Colorado Springs
- ◆ The Spot's Spoken Word
- ◆ Urban Peak Youth Center
- ◆ Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
- ◆ Valle del Sol Community Center
- ◆ Wray School District RD-2, Wray Can Program
- ◆ Youth in Motion

ⁱ Based on earlier work for The Colorado Trust, October 2002. *Toolkit for Evaluating Positive Youth Development*.

ⁱⁱ A core set of questions within each outcome domain was required for Toolkit surveys. Other questions were optional. The optional questions were not included in the composite scores to make for fairer comparisons when grantees compare to Overall Norms.

ⁱⁱⁱ The composite was calculated by averaging the percent of youth that responded "yes" to each item in a category. This results in a mean percent "yes."

^{iv} The composite was calculated by averaging the percent of youth that responded "yes" to each item in a category. This results in a mean percent "yes." This table included only the questions that are required by the Toolkit.

^v All data in this sample report are fabricated. In addition, normative results in actual reports may not be given as "Percent Yes."

^{vi} The composite was calculated by averaging the percent of youth that responded "yes" to each item in a category. This results in a mean percent "yes." This table included only the questions that are required by the Toolkit.

^{vii} Hernandez, G. and M.G. Visher, July 2001. *Creating a Culture of Inquiry*. The James Irvine Foundation.