

# 2001 AGENCY EVALUATIONS

Conducted for

**CITY OF COLUMBIA, MISSOURI  
OFFICE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES**

April 6, 2001

Conducted by



409 Vandiver Drive  
Building 6, Suite 102  
Columbia, Missouri 65202  
Telephone: (573) 874-1333  
Fax: (573) 874-6904

Branch Office:  
30423 Canwood Street, Suite 224  
Agoura Hills, CA 91301  
Telephone: (818) 865-2777  
Fax: (818) 865-2776

[www.horizonresearch.com](http://www.horizonresearch.com)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Executive Summary .....	1
Background.....	1
Process .....	1
Agencies and Program Services Evaluated.....	2
Summary of Scores .....	3
Background.....	4
Process .....	5
Development of Evaluation Frameworks .....	5
Evaluation Process.....	9
Number of Agencies and Program Services Evaluated.....	9
Secondary Data Collection and Reporting .....	10
Relevant Community Benchmark Data .....	11
High school Drop Out and Graduation Rates.....	11
1998 Community Needs Assessment .....	11
Missouri 1999 Youth Risk Behavior Survey and 2000 Safe and Drug-free Schools and Communities Survey.....	13
Kid’s Count.....	18
Assessment of Major Goals and Objectives .....	19
Programs Involved in Mentoring Youth.....	19
Major Goals of the Other Youth Programs.....	23
Assessment of Relationship of Goals to Pertinent Community Issues.....	24
Relation to Boone County Health Report Card.....	24
Relation to Priorities in the 1998 Community Needs Assessment .....	25
Relation to Issues in the YBRS and the Feb. 2000 Survey of 9 <sup>th</sup> Graders.....	26
Relation to Kids Count Indicators .....	26
Individual Program Ratings and Scores from the Frameworks.....	27
Framework for Continuous Evaluation and Improvement .....	27
Framework for Gathering and Analyzing Outcomes Information .....	28
Big Brother/Big Sister – One-on-One Mentoring .....	31
Program Theory .....	31
Current Evaluation Plan.....	31
Recommended Outcome Objectives .....	32
Ideas for Further Consultation.....	33
SOAR (Successful Opportunities in Academics and Recreation).....	35

---

Program Theory .....	35
Current Evaluation Plan.....	35
Recommended Outcome Objectives .....	36
Ideas for Further Consultation.....	36
Family Counseling Center – Counseling for School-Age Populations .....	37
Program Theory .....	37
Current Evaluation Plan.....	37
Recommended Outcome Objectives .....	38
Ideas for Further Consultation.....	38
Project CRIB.....	40
Program Theory .....	40
Current Evaluation Plan.....	41
Recommended Outcome Objectives .....	41
Ideas for Further Consultation.....	42
Boone County Resource Mothers (BCRM).....	44
Program Theory .....	44
Current Evaluation Plan.....	44
Recommended Outcome Objectives .....	46
Teen Partners/Working Partners .....	48
Program Theory .....	48
Current Evaluation Plan.....	49
Recommended Outcome Objectives .....	51
Fun City.....	53
Program Theory .....	53
Current Evaluation Plan.....	53
Recommended Outcome Objectives .....	54
Ideas for Further Consultation.....	55
APPENDIX .....	57
Bibliography.....	57

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

### Background

For the past two years, the City of Columbia has contracted with Horizon Research Services to evaluate city-funded human services agencies. At the start of the first contract period, the Office of Community Services and the Boone County Community Services Advisory Commission had revised the evaluation process to focus more on program services and less on fiscal and management processes. Part of Horizon's role has been to help agencies move toward outcomes-based planning and performance evaluations.

In 1998, when Horizon Research Services first submitted a proposal for this evaluation project, a “Sample Evaluation Framework for Outcomes-based Evaluation” was developed. The idea for these frameworks or continuums came from a project Horizon Research Services was conducting for the education community and mainly from a book entitled The School Portfolio by Victoria L. Bernhardt (Eye on Education, Larchmont, NY) published in 1994.

For the 2001 evaluation process, the original framework was revised and renamed, “Framework for Gathering and Analyzing Outcomes Information.” In addition, to address the continuum of overall evaluation planning, a new framework was developed, the “Framework for Continuous Evaluation and Improvement.”

### Process

At the beginning of the evaluation process, the evaluator conducted a review to determine if the program had written measurable objectives and outcomes. The Social Services Proposals to the City of Columbia, Boone County, and Columbia Area United Way for the years 2001, 2000, and 1999 were the starting points for the review. The agencies involved with youth mentoring were sent a form devised by HRS called the “Mentoring Program Description.” On this form, mentoring groups were asked to describe their program and check goals common to youth mentoring programs. They were also asked to list the one main goal most important in their program.

For agencies not involved in youth mentoring, the mission statement, goals and objectives, and other written materials were evaluated.

Based upon information gathered and the results from the interview with agency personnel, the evaluator then placed each program or agency at a point on each of the evaluation frameworks and assigned a score.

To arrive at a determination about whether each agency is addressing identified community issues, the pertinent community issues were listed, then agencies addressing that issue identified.

The evaluator then made recommendations about choosing one primary goal and the wording of relevant outcome objectives.

The total score for each program was recorded in the Summary of Scores section in the Executive Summary of this report.

## Agencies and Program Services Evaluated

These seven programs were chosen by the Office of Community Services for evaluation in 2000-2001.

- Advent/Job Center - Working Partners: Youth employment mentoring program
- Big Brother/Big Sisters – One-on-One Mentoring: Mentoring program for youth between the ages of 6-16
- Big Brothers/Big Sisters – SOAR (Successful Opportunities in Academics and Recreation) Program: Group mentoring/activity program for youth waiting to be placed with a big brother or big sister
- Columbia Public Schools - Project CRIB: On-site child care and parent support services at Douglass High School
- Community Play Ground “Fun City Saturday Academy” – Saturday Youth Academy: Youth academic and activity program
- Family Counseling Center - School Age Counseling Services: Counseling services provided to students in the Columbia Public School District
- Mid-Missouri Coalition on Adolescent Concerns (MMAC) - Boone County Resource Mothers Program: Mentoring and parent support services to pregnant and parenting teens

## Summary of Scores

<b>PROGRAM NAME</b>	<b>SCORE ON THE FRAMEWORK FOR CONTINUOUS EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT (15 maximum)</b>	<b>SCORE ON THE FRAMEWORK FOR GATHERING AND ANALYZING OUTCOMES (15 maximum)</b>	<b>PROGRAM ADDRESSES IDENTIFIED COMMUNITY ISSUES</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
Advent/Job Center – Working Partners	10.0	9.5	YES	Consider primary goal of improving job skills for youth Strengthen outcome objectives
Big Brothers/Big Sisters – SOAR	7.5	6.5	YES	Consider primary goal of personal development Set outcomes based on the adult survey
Big Brothers/Big Sisters – One-on-One Mentoring	9.0	7.0	YES	Consider primary goal of personal development Strengthen outcome objectives
Columbia Public Schools – Project CRIB	6.0	6.0	YES	Retain primary goal of drop out prevention. Strengthen outcome objectives
Community Play Ground – Fun City Saturday Youth Academy	6.5	6.5	YES	Consider primary goal of academic enrichment Revise outcome objectives
Family Counseling Center – School Age Counseling	10.0	8.0	YES	Consider primary goal of reducing drug and alcohol use Develop outcome objectives based on current tracking system
MMAC – Boone County Resource Mothers Program	9.0	7.5	YES	Consider primary goal of prevention of pregnancy Strengthen outcome objectives

## BACKGROUND

---

For the past two years, the City of Columbia has contracted with Horizon Research Services to evaluate city-funded human services agencies. At the start of the first contract period, the Office of Community Services and the Boone County Community Services Advisory Commission had revised the evaluation process to focus more on program services and less on fiscal and management processes. Part of Horizon's role has been to help agencies move toward outcomes-based planning and performance evaluations.

As part of the process of continuous improvement in their planning, allocation, and evaluation procedures, the Office of Community Services and the Boone County Community Services Advisory Commission took further steps to revise the evaluation process. The new process was developed through discussions with Councilman Rex Campbell, the Office of Community Services, the Boone County Community Services Advisory Commission, and Horizon Research Services.

For each year's evaluation, the Office of Community Services plans to choose programs that are generally related to a service delivery system focusing on a specific population being served or a similar set of services being provided (e.g. mentoring services for youth). This will allow the Commission to compare outcomes for similar services each year.

This revised process further increases the emphasis on evaluation of program services and will help the City to judge to what extent agencies are producing measurable positive outcomes for the participants of their programs.

## PROCESS

---

### Development of Evaluation Frameworks

In 1998, when Horizon Research Services first submitted a proposal for this evaluation project, a “Sample Evaluation Framework for Outcomes-based Evaluation” was developed. The idea for these frameworks or continuums came from a project Horizon Research Services was conducting for the education community and mainly from a book entitled The School Portfolio by Victoria L. Bernhardt (Eye on Education, Larchmont, NY) published in 1994.

Called “Continuous Improvement Continuums” in the business world, Bernhardt adapted this planning and assessment tool to the world of school improvement. Based on the principles of quality management, the continuums lay out the directions and expectations for growth and continuous improvement. HRS adapted these to the evaluation of agency programs to outline the processes that are crucial to developing effective outcomes-based evaluation systems. The continuums provide a unique and effective framework for describing current processes and for envisioning the best possible scenario. Besides providing a constant guideline for change for the agency or program, the frameworks can also be used to track progress toward the ideal.

For the 2001 evaluation process, the original framework was revised and renamed “Framework for Gathering and Analyzing Outcomes Information.” This framework outlines a continuum for gathering and analyzing the outcomes information. In order to address the overall plan for evaluation, a new framework was developed, called the “Framework for Continuous Evaluation and Improvement.” Copies of these two frameworks follow this section.

Bernhardt outlines reasons these continuums or frameworks have been successful and useful.

- they focus on what is important in outcomes for clients
- they are simple to use - the goal is to spend time reflecting on progress, implementing the “big picture” and discussing next steps, rather than on conducting cumbersome assessments
- they are indicative of what needs to happen - they make clear the steps that need to be achieved to move forward
- they are set up for self-assessment
- they are challenging but achievable
- they are a working contract, as opposed to a form driven exercise
- they encourage ongoing conversations about the things that are important rather than demanding activities that require conforming to rules and paperwork
- they are comprehensive in scope

These frameworks will give members of the Columbia/Boone County Community Services Commission, as well as Boards and staff of agencies, a chance to reflect on the process and reach a common vision. As the vision and description of the ideal outcomes-based evaluation system is refined, each group can more clearly communicate where they are going and what acceptable and unacceptable evaluation processes look like.

It is suggested that each group create their own frameworks. This can be done by creating new criteria, or adopting or adapting existing criteria. The main goal in developing these frameworks is to extend the idea of continuous quality improvement. Describing the vision and stating the ideal outcomes wished for the people served will help move everyone along the road to an excellent evaluation system.

The frameworks extend from 1 to 5 horizontally, with the rows representing a continuum of expectations related to the approach to the evaluation, implementation of the approach, and the outcomes that result from the implementation.

A rating of “1” is given if the descriptions in the left-most column most accurately describe a program or agency. A rating of “5” is given if the descriptions in the right-most column most accurately describe an agency. This column represents the agency or program that is one step removed from being perfect or “world class quality.” The elements between one and five describe how that continuum is hypothesized to evolve in a continuously improving agency. The “5” in each continuum is the target. Vertically, the “approach-implementation-outcome” statements are hypotheses. In other words, the implementation statements describe how the approach might look when implemented, and the outcomes are the “pay-off” for implementing the approach. If the hypotheses are accurate, the outcomes will not be realized until the approach is actually implemented.

## FRAMEWORK FOR CONTINUOUS EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT

	ONE	TWO	THREE	FOUR	FIVE
APPROACH	Neither goal nor strategies exist for the evaluation and continuous improvement of the agency or elements of the agency's programs.	The approach to continuous improvement and evaluation is problem solving. If there are no problems, or if solutions can be made quickly, there is no need for improvement or analyses. Changes in parts of the system are not coordinated with all other parts.	Some elements of the organization are evaluated for effectiveness. Some elements are improved on the basis of the evaluation findings.	All elements of the agency's operations are evaluated for improvement and to ensure congruence of the elements with respect to the continuum of improvement for all clients.	All aspects of the agency are rigorously evaluated and improved on a continuous basis. Clients, and the maintenance of a comprehensive improvement continuum for clients become the focus of all aspects of the evaluation and improvement process.
IMPLEMENTATION	With no overall plans for evaluation and continuous improvement, strategies are changed by individual program managers and administrators only when something sparks the need to improve. Reactive decisions and activities are a daily mode of operation.	Isolated changes are made in some areas of the organization in response to problem incidents. Changes are not preceded by comprehensive analyses, such as an understanding of the root causes of problems. The effectiveness of the elements of the agency or changes made to the elements, is not known.	Elements of the organization are improved on the basis of comprehensive analyses of root causes of problems, client perceptions, and operational effectiveness of processes.	Continuous improvement analysis of client outcomes and program strategies are rigorously reinforced within each program and across all levels to develop a comprehensive improvement continuum for all clients and to prevent negative client outcomes.	Comprehensive continuous improvement becomes the way of doing business at the agency. Staff continuously improve the appropriateness and effectiveness of program strategies based on client feedback and outcomes. All aspects of the organization are improved to support staff efforts.
OUTCOMES	Individuals struggle with system failure. Finger pointing and blaming others for failure occurs. The effectiveness of strategies is unknown. Mistakes are repeated.	Problems are solved only temporarily and few positive changes result. Additionally, unintended and undesirable consequences often appear in other parts of the system. Many aspects of the agency or program are incongruent, keeping the agency from reaching its vision.	Evidence of effective improvement strategies is observable. Positive changes are made and maintained due to comprehensive analyses and evaluation.	Those delivering service become astute at assessing and in predicting the impact of their strategies on individual clients. Sustainable improvements in clients are evident in all programs, due to continuous improvement.	The agency becomes a congruent and effective learning organization. Only methodology and strategies that produce quality client outcomes are used. A true continuum of improvement results for all clients.

Created by Carol M. Schultz, Ph.D., Horizon Research Services, Columbia, MO

Adapted from Victoria L. Bernhardt, The School Portfolio, Eye on Education, Larchmont, NY

## FRAMEWORK FOR GATHERING AND ANALYZING OUTCOMES INFORMATION

	ONE	TWO	THREE	FOUR	FIVE
APPROACH	Data or information about client needs are not gathered in any systematic way; there is no way to determine what needs to change at the agency based on data.	There is no systematic process, but some client information is collected and used to problem solve and to establish essential client outcomes.	Agency collects data on client outcomes and conducts client needs assessments. The information is used to drive the strategic quality plan for the agency.	There is systematic reliance on hard data (including data for sub-groups) as a basis for decision making at the client level as well as the agency level. Changes are based on the study of data to meet the needs of clients and staff.	Information is gathered in all areas of client interaction with the agency. Staff engage clients in gathering information on their own outcomes. Accessible to all levels, data are comprehensive in scope, and an accurate reflection of agency quality.
IMPLEMENTATION	No information is gathered with which to make changes. Client dissatisfaction is seen as an irritation, not a need for improvement.	Some data is tracked, such as client recidivism. Individuals are asked for feedback about their experience with the agency.	Agency collects information on clients and former clients, analyzes and uses it in conjunction with future trends for planning. Identified areas for improvement are tracked over time.	Data are used to improve the effectiveness of service delivery. Client indicators are graphed and utilized for diagnostics. Client evaluations and indicators are analyzed by all staff.	Innovative processes meeting the needs of clients are implemented to the delight of staff, clients, and funding agencies. Root causes are known through analyses. Problems are prevented through the use of data.
OUTCOMES	Only anecdotal and hypothetical information is available about clients behavior and satisfaction. Problems are solved individually with short-term results.	Little data is available. Change is limited to some areas of the agency operation and dependent upon individuals and their efforts.	Information collected about clients' needs and outcomes is shared with staff and is used to plan for change. Information helps staff understand pressing issues, how to analyze information for root causes and how to track for improvement.	An information system is in place. Positive trends begin to appear in individual client as well as community outcomes. There is evidence that these results are caused by understanding and effectively using data collected.	Clients are delighted with the agency's processes and proud of their own capabilities to assess their own progress. There are good to excellent results for all clients. No client falls through the cracks. Staff use data to predict and prevent potential problems.

Created by Carol M. Schultz, Ph.D., Horizon Research Services, Columbia, MO

Adapted from Victoria L. Bernhardt, The School Portfolio, Eye on Education, Larchmont, NY

## Evaluation Process

At the beginning of the evaluation process, the evaluator conducted a review to determine if the program had written measurable objectives and outcomes. The Social Services Proposals to the City of Columbia, Boone County, and Columbia Area United Way for the years 2001, 2000, and 1999 were the starting points for the review. The agencies were asked to send supporting documents to HRS such as instruments used in internal program evaluation and review processes, instruments from client feedback mechanisms, and instruments from outcomes-based evaluation processes already in use. These documents, reports from all of these measures, as well as reports from external reviewing agencies were reviewed.

The agencies involved with youth mentoring were sent a form devised by HRS called the “Mentoring Program Description.” On this form, mentoring groups were asked to describe their program and check goals common to youth mentoring programs. They were also asked to list the one main goal most important in their program.

For agencies not involved in youth mentoring, the mission statement, goals and objectives, and other written materials were evaluated.

The HRS evaluators used their expertise to determine if the program’s objectives and outcomes were measurable and appropriate for the programs offered. If the agency had not developed a set of measurable objectives and outcomes for their specific program service, the evaluator discussed this with the appropriate agency personnel during a site visit to the agency. The HRS evaluator consulted with the appropriate agency staff to develop measurable objectives and outcomes for the specific program. The evaluator used a combination of available program records and data and secondary data to determine the measurable outcomes for the program.

Whenever possible, information from evaluations conducted by external monitoring organizations was utilized in order to reduce redundancy in evaluation practices. For example, if a program is subject to outcomes-based performance evaluations by state or national monitoring and/or accrediting organizations, the HRS evaluator determined the scope and quality of these evaluations and suggested that these findings be reported as outcome measures in their social services proposals.

Internal agency outcomes-based performance evaluations such as customer satisfaction surveys were reviewed whenever possible and available.

Based upon information gathered, the evaluator then placed each program or agency at a point of each of the evaluation frameworks and assigned a score. The total score for each program was recorded on the Summary of Scores Sheet.

To arrive at the score on how well each agency is addressing identified community issues, the pertinent community issues were listed, and agencies addressing that issue identified. In addition, programs that mentored youth were asked to complete the “Mentor Program Description” which gave them the opportunity to identify their main program goals.

## Number of Agencies and Program Services Evaluated

The agency program evaluation process was conducted for seven (7) program services with six (6) agencies involved in the evaluation process. These seven (7) programs were chosen by the Office of Community Services for evaluation in 2000-2001.

- Advent/Job Center - Working Partners: Youth employment mentoring program

- Big Brother/Big Sisters – One-on-One Mentoring: Mentoring program for youth between the ages of 6-16
- Big Brothers/Big Sisters – SOAR (Successful Opportunities in Academics and Recreation) Program: Group mentoring/activity program for youth waiting to be placed with a big brother or big sister
- Columbia Public Schools - Project CRIB: On-site child care and parent support services at Douglass High School
- Community Play Ground “Fun City Saturday Academy” – Saturday Youth Academy: Youth academic and activity program
- Family Counseling Center - School Age Counseling Services: Counseling services provided to students in the Columbia Public School District
- Mid-Missouri Coalition on Adolescent Concerns (MMAC) - Boone County Resource Mothers Program: Mentoring and parent support services to pregnant and parenting teens

## **Secondary Data Collection and Reporting**

In addition to the specific program information gathered during the outcomes-based evaluation process, relevant, secondary, community-wide data relating to this issue/program area was also included in the process. This allowed the services being evaluated to be compared to broader community needs and relevant “community benchmarks.”

Also included were interviews with the various “Community Support Teams” of the Community Partnership and the Health Report Card Project to gather their input and any available data that relates to the issue/program area being evaluated.

## RELEVANT COMMUNITY BENCHMARK DATA

---

A number of state and national sources were found to provide relevant community benchmark data.

### High school Drop Out and Graduation Rates

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) reported annual drop-out and graduation rates for Boone County schools and the state. These rates are listed in the table below.

	Annual Drop-out Rate	Graduation Rate
Location	1999-2000	1999-2000
Boone County R-IV (Hallsville)	4.9%	85.5%
Centralia	4.0%	85.9%
Columbia	6.1%	74.0%
Harrisburg R-VIII	3.8%	83.3%
Southern Boone County	3.0%	90.9%
Sturgeon R-V	4.1%	87.0%
Missouri	5.0%	79.3%

### 1998 Community Needs Assessment

#### *General issues*

For the City of Columbia, these problems were rated as most serious in the 1998 Community Needs Assessment

- 1) crowded classrooms
- 2) children not getting enough attention, discipline, and guidance from their parents
- 3) illegal drug use
- 4) unhealthy behaviors such as smoking, drinking, and lack of exercise
- 5) kids dropping out of school
- 6) teenage pregnancy
- 7) crime
- 8) alcoholism

### *Mental health issues*

In addition to the general listing of problems, findings related to mental health of children seemed pertinent. Nine percent (8.8%) of Boone County households with children under age 18 reported that one or more children in their household experienced a moderate or major behavioral or emotional problem in the past 6 months. This was projected to 1,214 households in the county that might need this help. For various subgroups, the percentage reporting that one or more children in their household experienced a moderate or major behavioral or emotional problem in the past 6 months was greater than the percentage in the general population.

	Boone County households with children under age 18 who reported that one or more children in their household experiences a moderate or major behavioral or emotional problem in the past 6 months.	Among households with a child behavioral or emotional problem, percent who sought help.	Among households that sought help for a child behavioral or emotional problem, percent who got help.
Boone County 1998	8.8%	87.6%	78.4%
Persons with household income below \$10,000	16.3%	88.9%	77.8%
African Americans	19.0%	70.6%	72.2%
Persons who receive public assistance	24.4%	88.6%	88.7%

Ratings of getting affordable counseling or medical care for mental health problems as a city problem.	Percent who rated as major or moderate problem	Mean rating	Ranking among listed problems
Residents in or near Columbia 1998	48.6%	1.45	18
Persons with household income below \$10,000	57.1%	1.77	4
African Americans	75.2%	2.06	10
Persons who receive public assistance	58.3%	1.82	17

## Missouri 1999 Youth Risk Behavior Survey and 2000 Safe and Drug-free Schools and Communities Survey

The Youth Risk Behavior Survey is administered by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to monitor specific behaviors among high school students. These behaviors contribute to the leading causes of morbidity and mortality. The survey is administered in the spring of odd-numbered years. In 1999, 1,652 students in 23 public high schools participated. The YRBS was developed by the Division of Adolescent and School Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The publication can be obtained from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

In February 2000, the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education administered the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Survey to 1,035 9<sup>th</sup> graders in the Columbia Public Schools. The results were published in the Columbia Daily Tribune on March 25, 2001. The complete survey can be found on the Tribune Web site, [www.columbiatribune.com/Surveys/032501survey.html](http://www.columbiatribune.com/Surveys/032501survey.html).

Results from these 2 surveys are reported together for ease in comparison.

### *Suicide*

<b>Suicide</b>	<b>Survey of Columbia 9<sup>th</sup> graders Feb. 2000</b>			
	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
During the past 12 months, did you ever seriously consider attempting suicide?	20.5%		79.5%	
During the past 12 months, did you make a plan about how you would attempt suicide?	14.7%		85.3%	
<b>Suicide attempts</b>	<b>Survey of Columbia 9<sup>th</sup> graders Feb. 2000</b>			
	0 times	1 time	2 or 3 times	4 or more times
During the past 12 months, how many times did you actually attempt suicide?	90.5%	4.9%	2.8%	1.8%
	<b>Survey of Columbia 9<sup>th</sup> graders Feb. 2000</b>			
	<b>Did not attempt in last 12 months</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>
If you attempted suicide during the past 12 months, did any attempt result in an injury, poisoning, or overdose that had to be treated by a doctor or nurse?	81.5%	3.0%		15.5%

Nearly ten percent (9.5%) of the Columbia 9<sup>th</sup> grade students surveyed in February 2000 reported they had actually attempted suicide one or more times. This represents 97 individuals.

## Smoking

Smoking	Missouri high school students in 1999			Feb. 2000
	Male	Female	Total	Survey of Columbia 9 <sup>th</sup> graders
Percentage of Missouri high school students in 1999...				
...who smoked cigarettes on one or more of the 30 days preceding the survey.	36%	30%	33%	25%
...who smoked cigarettes on 20 or more of the 30 days preceding the survey.	18%	15%	16%	9%
...who smoked two or more cigarettes per day on the days they smoked during the 30 days preceding the survey.	27%	22%	24%	

Survey of Columbia 9 <sup>th</sup> graders Feb. 2000		
Onset of smoking	Age when you smoked your first whole cigarette for the first time	Age when you first started smoking cigarettes regularly (at least one a day for 30 days)
Never	51.7%	81.7%
8 years old or younger	5.6%	1.7%
9 or 10 years old	5.7%	2.4%
11 or 12 years old	15.2%	5.0%
13 or 14 years old	18.9%	8.3%
15 or 16 years old	2.9%	0.9%
17 years old or older	0.0%	0.0%

## Alcohol use

Alcohol Use	Missouri high school students in 1999			Feb. 2000
	Male	Female	Total	Survey of Columbia 9 <sup>th</sup> graders
Percentage of Missouri high school students in 1999...				
...who had at least one drink of alcohol on one or more of the 30 days preceding the survey.			50%	42%
...who had five or more drinks of alcohol in a row, that is, within a couple of hours, on one or more of the 30 days preceding the survey.	36%	29%	32%	27%

Alcohol Use	Missouri high school students in 1999			
	9 <sup>th</sup> grade	10 <sup>th</sup> grade	11 <sup>th</sup> grade	12 <sup>th</sup> grade
Percentage of Missouri high school students in 1999...				
...who had five or more drinks of alcohol in a row, that is, within a couple of hours, on one or more of the 30 days preceding the survey, by grade.	24%	28%	41%	39%

Survey of Columbia 9 <sup>th</sup> graders Feb. 2000	
First Drinks of Alcohol	Age when you had your first drink of alcohol other than a few sips
Never	34.4%
8 years old or younger	11.6%
9 or 10 years old	6.8%
11 or 12 years old	16.3%
13 or 14 years old	26.1%
15 or 16 years old	4.8%
17 years old or older	0.0%

## Substance abuse

Substance Abuse	Missouri high school students in 1999			Feb. 2000
	Male	Female	Total	Survey of Columbia 9 <sup>th</sup> graders
Percentage of Missouri high school students in 1999...				
...who used marijuana one or more times during the 30 days preceding the survey.	28%	23%	26%	20%
...who had sniffed or inhaled intoxicating substances one or more times during their life.	15%	11%	13%	16%

Substance Abuse	Missouri high school students in 1999			
	Cigarettes	Alcohol	Marijuana	Cocaine
Percentage of Missouri high school students in 1999...				
...had tried cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, and cocaine for the first time before age 13.	25%	34%	14%	NA

Substance Abuse	Survey of Columbia 9 <sup>th</sup> graders Feb. 2000	
	Age when you tried marijuana for the first time	Age when you tried any form of cocaine, including powder, crack, or freebase, for the first time
Never	61.8%	94.5%
8 years old or younger	2.2%	0.9%
9 or 10 years old	1.8%	0.6%
11 or 12 years old	9.0%	1.1%
13 or 14 years old	23.0%	2.5%
15 or 16 years old	2.1%	0.4%
17 years old or older	0.1%	0.0%

## *Sexual activity*

Sexual Activity	Missouri high school students in 1999		
	Male	Female	Total
Percentage of Missouri high school students in 1999...			
...who ever had sexual intercourse, by gender.	57%	56%	57%
...who had sexual intercourse with one or more people during the past three months, by gender.	40%	43%	42%
...(of those who had sexual intercourse with one or more people during the three months preceding the survey) ... who used a condom during last sexual intercourse.			60%
...who had sexual intercourse for the first time before age 13, by gender.	14%	5%	10%

Sexual Activity	Missouri high school students in 1999			
	9 <sup>th</sup> grade	10 <sup>th</sup> grade	11 <sup>th</sup> grade	12 <sup>th</sup> grade
Percentage of Missouri high school students in 1999...				
...who ever had sexual intercourse, by grade.	46%	53%	64%	68%
...who had sexual intercourse with one or more people during the past three months, by grade.	31%	36%	52%	52%
...(of those who had sexual intercourse with one or more people during the three months preceding the survey) ... who used a condom during last sexual intercourse.	69%	68%	53%	54%

## Kid's Count

Kids Count in Missouri (KCM) is a partnership of Citizens for Missouri's Children, the Children's Trust Fund, and the University of Missouri's Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis. KCM is supported by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, America's largest philanthropic source for disadvantaged children. Each year KCM tracks a group of outcome measures that describe the overall well-being of children. Each measure is rated according to whether the measure got better or worse between the base and current year. The outcome measures relevant to the group of agencies evaluated for Boone County are reported.

Measure	Current Year Rate	*Trend	1999 State Rate	**County Rank 1999
Births to teenagers ages 15-19 per 1,000 females in 1999	27.5	Worse	55.5	9
Low birthweight infants	8.6%	Worse	7.6%	99
Births to mothers with under 12 years education in 1999	14.4%	Worse	19.3%	21
Probable cause child abuse/neglect per 1,000 under 18 in 1999	33.2	Worse	24.4	46
Annual high school dropouts	5.9%	Better	4.8%	98

\*Trend=The change between the base year and 1999

\*\*County rank 1999=The county's rank compared to the other 114 Missouri counties for that measure.

The Kids Count in Missouri 2000 report also lists some key facts for Boone County.

Measure	Base Year		Current Year	
Child population	28,344	(1995)	29,615	(1999)
Minority children	15.8%	(1995)	16.3%	(1999)
Limited English Students	244	(1998)	239	(1999)
Children in poverty	17.2%	(1993)	13.0%	(1995)
Children in single parent families	16.0%	(1980)	20.9%	(1990)
Children receiving subsidized child care	1,038	(1995)	1,881	(1999)
Children receiving public mental health services for serious emotional disorders	528	(1995)	239	(1999)
Juvenile law violations per 1,000 youth age 10-17	128.6	(1995)	99.3	(1998)

## ASSESSMENT OF MAJOR GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

---

### **Programs Involved in Mentoring Youth**

All the mentoring agencies participate in Mentor Mid-Missouri (MMM), the group recognized by the Columbia/Boone County Community Partnership as the mentoring consortium.

### ***Results from the Mentor Program Description Form***

A “Mentor Program Description” created by HRS was sent to each program involved in youth mentoring. In developing the “Mentor Program Description” a list of goals common to mentoring programs was gleaned from Sipe and Roder (1999). Sipe and Roder (1999), in their national report on school age mentoring programs, outlined five major classifications for goals found in youth mentoring programs. These classifications are

- personal development (to have a positive impact on the youth’s personal development);
- academic development;
- expose youth to new positive experiences;
- reduce undesirable or delinquent behavior, and
- improve job skills.

### ***Major goals identified***

As expected, most of the reviewed programs had several goals in each area. The HRS evaluator reviewed the mission statement for each program for congruity with the stated one most important goal for the program on the “Mentor Program Description” and the goals checked as major goals. For goals checked as major goals, the program could indicate whether they had outcome measures related to the major goal. Instruments and processes related to these major goals with outcome measures were discussed with the program staff at the site visit.

In several cases, a recommendation was made to the program to focus on one primary goal, as this would distinguish the program among the mentoring programs as having a unique goal. One clear, primary goal could then be measured with outcome objectives and outcome measures set. Also considered was whether the youth targeted by the program matched the stated goal and the activities (e.g., if the program targets youth who are having academic problems, do they have goals related to dropout prevention or academic performance). Another consideration was whether the mentors engage in activities related to the stated goals of the program.

The “Mentor Program Description” asked each program to check major and minor goals related to these five classifications of goals found in youth mentoring programs. A summary of the results and recommended primary goal follows.

<b>PROGRAM NAME</b>	<b>TOTAL MAJOR GOALS CHECKED</b>	<b>TOTAL MAJOR GOALS WITH OUTCOME MEASURES</b>	<b>GOAL CONSIDERED TO BE THE MOST IMPORTANT</b>	<b>SUGGESTED PRIMARY GOAL FOR THIS PROGRAM</b>	<b>REASONS FOR SUGGESTING THIS AS A PRIMARY GOAL</b>
Advent/Job Center – Working Partners	12	9	Improve job skills.	Improve job skills	Uniqueness of the services offered. Outcome measures available
Big Brothers/Big Sisters - One-on-One Mentoring	17	14	Building self-esteem, self-worth, and social skills.	Personal development: To have a positive impact on the youth’s personal development	Availability of national studies for comparison. Most goals relate to the personal development area.
Big Brothers/Big Sisters – SOAR	30	23	Building self-esteem and self-worth; relationship building with their mentor.	Personal development: To have a positive impact on the youth’s personal development	Most goals relate to the personal development area. Consistency with the core program.
Community Play Ground – Fun City Saturday Youth Academy	22	19	Academic enrichment.	Academic enrichment	Staff and parents identify this as the primary goal.
MMAC – Boone County Resource Mothers Program	12	11	Improving the health of mother and baby by reducing stress.	Reduce teen pregnancy.	Unique primary goal for this program.

The SOAR Program was the most ambitious program, citing 30 major goals spread among all the areas except job skills.

The Personal Development area had the most goals for which no outcome measures were reported. “Help youth develop positive values” was the most common goal of this type. Others were “Improve attitude” and “Improve youth’s attitude toward school.”

Fun City Youth Academy, Big Brothers/Big Sisters One-on-One mentoring and SOAR checked several goals in the area of Academic Achievement. “Prevent youth from dropping out of school” was the most common goal checked for which programs reported outcomes measures.

*Types of youth mentored and program location*

<b>PROGRAM NAME</b>	<b>TYPE OF MENTORING</b>	<b>AGES MENTORED</b>	<b>GENDER MENTORED</b>	<b>PROGRAM LOCATION</b>
Advent/Job Center - Working Partners	1 to 1	15 to 21	both male and female	community
Big Brothers/Big Sisters – SOAR (Successful Opportunities in Academics and Recreation)	group	6 to 14	both male and female	community
Big Brothers/Big Sisters - One-on-One Mentoring	1 to 1	6 to 14	both male and female	community
Community Play Ground - Fun City Saturday Youth Academy	both	8 to 14	both male and female	place based
Mid-Missouri Coalition on Adolescent Concerns (MMAC) - Boone County Resource Mothers Program	1 to 1	15 to 21	female	community

Program location: place based (mentoring must take place at a specific site, i.e. school or recreation facility); community based (mentoring can take place anywhere in the community)

*Mentor Screening Criteria*

<b>PROGRAM NAME</b>	<b>AGE REQUIREMENT FOR MENTORS</b>	<b>MENTOR SCREENING CRITERIA</b>
Advent/Job Center - Working Partners	16+	Written application Personal interview Reference checks Criminal records check CAN check
Big Brothers/Big Sisters – SOAR	16+	Written application Personal interview Reference checks Criminal records check Drivers check
Big Brothers/Big Sisters - One-on-One Mentoring	16+	Written application Personal interview Reference checks Criminal records check Drivers check
Community Play Ground “Fun City – Saturday Youth Academy	22+	Personal interview Reference checks Criminal records check Orientation/Training (3 hrs session)
MMAC – Boone County Resource Mothers Program	22+	Written application Personal interview Reference checks Criminal records check CAN check

## Major Goals of the Other Youth Programs

For agencies not involved in youth mentoring, the mission statement, goals and objectives, and other written materials were evaluated.

<b>PROGRAM NAME</b>	<b>TOTAL MAJOR GOALS LISTED</b>	<b>TOTAL MAJOR GOALS WITH OUTCOME MEASURES</b>	<b>GOAL CONSIDERED TO BE THE MOST IMPORTANT</b>	<b>SUGGESTED PRIMARY GOAL FOR THIS PROGRAM</b>	<b>REASONS FOR SUGGESTING THIS AS A PRIMARY GOAL</b>
Columbia Public Schools – Project CRIB	4	1	Retention and graduation of DHS student parents	Drop out prevention	Outcome measures available for this primary goal.
Family Counseling Center – School Age Counseling	1	1	Empower school age youth to make positive changes in their life by providing professional therapy and treatment.	Reduce substance abuse (alcohol and other drugs) among school age youth.	Unique primary goal for this program.

## ASSESSMENT OF RELATIONSHIP OF GOALS TO PERTINENT COMMUNITY ISSUES

---

In deciding if program objectives addressed pertinent community issues, the agency or program mission, the major goals and objectives listed, and the activities offered were subjectively assessed.

### Relation to Boone County Health Report Card

Several of the Boone County Health Report Card issues are positively affected by the programs reviewed this year. Each program is marked where it has goals that relate to a Health Report Card issue. M=Major Goal; I=Indirect Goal

	Advent/Job Center – Working Partners	Big Brothers/Big Sisters – SOAR	Big Brothers/Big Sisters – One-on-One Mentoring	Columbia Public Schools – Project CRIB	Community Play Ground – Fun City Saturday Youth Academy	Family Counseling Center – School Age Counseling	MMAC – Boone County Resource Mothers Program
Child abuse and neglect							M
Child Care				M			
High school dropouts	M	M	M	M	M		I
Mental health issues						M	
Parent education	I				M		M
Promotion of healthy behaviors	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Substance abuse and prevention	I	I	I		I	M	
Teen pregnancy	I	I	I	M	I		M

## Relation to Priorities in the 1998 Community Needs Assessment

A number of the issues identified in the 1998 Community Needs Assessment are positively affected by the programs reviewed this year. Each program is marked where it has goals that relate to a CNA issue. M=Major Goal; I=Indirect Goal

	Advent/Job Center – Working Partners	Big Brothers/Big Sisters – SOAR	Big Brothers/Big Sisters – One-on-One Mentoring	Columbia Public Schools – Project CRIB	Community Play Ground – Fun City Saturday Youth Academy	Family Counseling Center – School Age Counseling	MMAC – Boone County Resource Mothers Program
1. Crowded classrooms							
2. Children not getting enough attention		M	M				
3. Illegal drug use						M	
4. Unhealthy behaviors	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
5. Kids dropping out of school	M	M	M	M	M		I
6. Teenage pregnancy	I	I	I	M	I		M
7. Crime		I	I		I	I	
8. Alcoholism						M	

## Relation to Issues in the YBRS and the Feb. 2000 Survey of 9<sup>th</sup> Graders

Some of the major issues raised in the YBRS and the February 2000 survey of 9<sup>th</sup> graders in Columbia are affected by the programs reviewed this year. Each program is marked where it has goals that relate to a YRBS issue. M=Major Goal; I=Indirect Goal

	Advent/Job Center – Working Partners	Big Brothers/Big Sisters – SOAR	Big Brothers/Big Sisters – One-on-One Mentoring	Columbia Public Schools – Project CRIB	Community Play Ground – Fun City Saturday Youth Academy	Family Counseling Center – School Age Counseling	MMAC – Boone County Resource Mothers Program
Alcohol use		I	I	I	I	M	I
Sexual activity		I	I	M	I		M
Smoking		I	I	I	I		I
Substance abuse		I	I	I	I	M	I
Suicide						I	

## Relation to Kids Count Indicators

Some of the indicators measured in the Kids Count report are addressed by the programs reviewed this year. Each program is marked where it has goals that relate to a Kids Count issue. M=Major Goal; I=Indirect Goal

	Advent/Job Center – Working Partners	Big Brothers/Big Sisters – SOAR	Big Brothers/Big Sisters – One-on-One Mentoring	Columbia Public Schools – Project CRIB	Community Play Ground – Fun City Saturday Youth Academy	Family Counseling Center – School Age Counseling	MMAC – Boone County Resource Mothers Program
Births to mothers with < 12 years education	I			I			I
Low birth weight infants							M
Probable cause child abuse and neglect				I			M
High school dropouts				M			
Births to teenagers ages 15-19	I	I	I	I	I		I

# INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM RATINGS AND SCORES FROM THE FRAMEWORKS

---

## Framework for Continuous Evaluation and Improvement

### *Approach to continuous evaluation and improvement*

		Fun City 2.0 CRIB 2.0	BCRM 3.0 BB/BS 3.0 SOAR 3.0	FCC 3.5 TnPart 3.5						
0	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5
Neither goal nor strategies exist for the evaluation and continuous improvement of the agency or elements of the agency's programs		The approach to continuous improvement and evaluation is problem solving. If there are no problems, or if solutions can be made quickly, there is no need for improvement or analyses. Changes in parts of the system are not coordinated with all other parts		Some elements of the organization are evaluated for effectiveness. Some elements are improved on the basis of the evaluation findings		All elements of the agency's operations are evaluated for improvement and to ensure congruence of the elements with respect to the continuum of improvement for all clients.		All aspects of the agency are rigorously evaluated and improved on a continuous basis. Clients, and the maintenance of a comprehensive improvement continuum for clients become the focus of all aspects of the evaluation and improvement process		

***Implementation of continuous evaluation and improvement***

		Fun City 2.0 CRIB 2.0 SOAR 2.0	BCRM 3.0 BB/BS 3.0	FCC 3.5 TnPart 3.5						
0	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5
With no overall plans for evaluation and continuous improvement, strategies are changed by individual program managers and administrators only when something sparks the need to improve. Reactive decisions and activities are a daily mode of operation.		Isolated changes are made in some areas of the organization in response to problem incidents. Changes are not preceded by comprehensive analyses, such as an understanding of the root causes of problems. The effectiveness of the elements of the agency or changes made to the elements, is not known.		Elements of the organization are improved on the basis of comprehensive analyses of root causes of problems, client perceptions, and operational effectiveness of processes.		Continuous improvement analysis of client outcomes and program strategies are rigorously reinforced within each program and across all levels to develop a comprehensive improvement continuum for all clients and to prevent negative client outcomes		Comprehensive continuous improvement becomes the way of doing business at the agency. Staff continuously improve the appropriateness and effectiveness of program strategies based on client feedback and outcomes. All aspects of the organization are improved to support staff efforts.		

***Outcomes of continuous evaluation and improvement***

		CRIB 2.0	Fun City 2.5 SOAR 2.5 TnPart 3.0	BCRM 3.0 BB/BS 3.0 FCC 3.0						
0	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5
Individuals struggle with system failure. Finger pointing and blaming others for failure occurs. The effectiveness of strategies is unknown. Mistakes are repeated.		Problems are solved only temporarily and few positive changes result. Additionally, unintended and undesirable consequences often appear in other parts of the system. Many aspects of the agency or program are incongruent, keeping the agency from reaching its vision.		Evidence of effective improvement strategies is observable. Positive changes are made and maintained due to comprehensive analyses and evaluation.		Those delivering service become astute at assessing and in predicting the impact of their strategies on individual clients. Sustainable improvements in clients are evident in all programs, due to continuous improvement.		The agency becomes a congruent and effective learning organization. Only methodology and strategies that produce quality client outcomes are used. A true continuum of improvement results for all clients.		

**Framework for Gathering and Analyzing Outcomes Information**

***Approach to gathering and analyzing outcomes information***

--	--	--	--	--

		BB/BS 2.0 CRIB 2.0 Fun City 2.0 SOAR 2.0	BCRM 2.5	FCC 3.0	TnPart 3.5				
0	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5 4 4.5 5		
Data or information about client needs are not gathered in any systematic way; there is no way to determine what needs to change at the agency based on data.		There is no systematic process, but some client information is collected and used to problem solve and to establish essential client outcomes.		Agency collects data on client outcomes and conducts client needs assessments. The information is used to drive the strategic quality plan for the agency.		There is systematic reliance on hard data (including data for sub-groups) as a basis for decision making at the client level as well as the agency level. Changes are based on the study of data to meet the needs of clients and staff.		Information is gathered in all areas of client interaction with the agency. Staff engage clients in gathering in-formation on their own outcomes. Accessible to all levels, data is comprehensive in scope, and an accurate reflection of agency quality.	

***Implementation of gathering and analyzing outcomes information***

		BCRM 2.0 BB/BS 2.0 CRIB 2.0 FCC 2.0 Fun City 2.0 SOAR 2.0	TnPart 3.0						
0	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3 3.5 4 4.5 5			
No information is gathered with which to make changes. Client dissatisfaction is seen as an irritation, not a need for improvement.		Some data is tracked, such as client recidivism. Individuals are asked for feed-back about their experience with the agency.		Agency collects information on clients and former clients, analyzes and uses it in conjunction with future trends for planning. Identified areas for improvement are tracked over time.		Data are used to improve the effectiveness of service delivery. Client indicators are graphed and utilized for diagnostics. Client evaluations and indicators are analyzed by all staff.		Innovative processes meeting the needs of clients are implemented to the delight of staff, clients, and funding agencies. Root causes are known through analyses. Problems are pre-vented through the use of data	

***Outcomes of gathering and analyzing outcomes information***

		CRIB 2.0	BCRM 3.0 BB/BS 3.0 FCC 3.0 Fun City 2.5 SOAR 2.5 TnPart 3.0			
0	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3 3.5 4 4.5 5

Only anecdotal and hypothetical information is available about clients behavior and satisfaction. Problems are solved individually with short-term results.

Little data is available. Change is limited to some areas of the agency operation and dependent upon individuals and their efforts.

Information collected about clients' needs and outcomes is shared with staff and is used to plan for change. Information helps staff understand pressing issues, how to analyze information for root causes and how to track for improvement.

An information system is in place. Positive trends begin to appear in individual client as well as community outcomes. There is evidence that these results are caused by understanding and effectively using data collected.

Clients are delighted with the agency's processes and proud of their own capabilities to assess their own progress. There are good to excellent results for all clients. No client falls through the cracks. Staff use data to predict and prevent potential problems.

## **BIG BROTHER/BIG SISTER – ONE-ON-ONE MENTORING**

---

### **Program Theory**

Mission: To be recognized in Boone County as the premier mentoring organization serving children from single-parent homes by providing positive role models in a child's life.

For an agency like BB/BS, choosing appropriate program outcomes and indicators is a challenging task. Direct outcomes may be difficult to attribute to the actual service because of so many intervening variables. Each mentee is different, living in a different situation; each volunteer is different; and each family dynamic may add additional variables.

“Outcomes are usually benefits or changes in participants’ knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, behavior, condition, or status. Most often, an outcome represents a change for the better, although the outcome for some programs is that participants get worse more slowly than they would have otherwise.” (Plantz, et.al 1999) In many cases there is not one outcome, but a series of outcomes, with one outcome contributing to another.

To begin to develop outcome measures one must examine the assumptions and theories upon which the program operates. A good place to begin the process of identifying the program theory is to look at what services are being provided. These are the active treatment elements that program staff and Board believe are responsible for any outcomes the programs may produce. Why do we expect BB/BS to produce good outcomes for clients in the One-on-One mentoring program? Is there any reason to believe that involving youth with adult mentors will make any difference in their lives?

It is useful to develop a series of “if-then” statements to develop the logic or theory of how the program brings about benefits for participants. For example, some of these statements for BB/BS may be,

“If youth are provided with an adult mentor, the relationship will add to the youth’s self-esteem.”

“If youth have higher self-esteem then they will cooperate with parents and siblings at home.”

“If youth have higher-self esteem they will perform their assigned tasks at school, at home, and in community based program settings.”

### **Current Evaluation Plan**

The National office of BB/BS has developed a prototype evaluation process called “Program-Based Outcome Evaluation” (POE). The national office has provided software so that entries can be made and reports generated. BB/BS staff have attended some training sessions sponsored by the national organization, and have entered their first sets of data.

The POE system provides separate survey instruments for the youth, the volunteer, the parent, and the teacher. The BB/BS Case Manager assigned to each match completes a similar survey. Each of these ask the same questions so perceptions from each group can be compared. The holistic picture gained can be used to determine outcomes for each mentee and for the overall program.

## *Process*

**Upon application to the program:** Regularly administered intake forms and screening instruments are used for the youth, parents, and volunteers.

**January:** POE Survey instruments are administered to all current participants, parents of all youth participants, and the Big Brother/Big Sister volunteers.

**March:** POE Teacher survey instrument is administered to the teacher.

**June:** POE Survey instruments are administered to all current participants, parents of all youth participants, and the Big Brother/Big Sister volunteers.

## **Recommended Outcome Objectives**

The main emphasis in the BB/BS One-on-One mentoring program is on providing positive role models for youth from single parent households. BB/BS does emphasize some academic development goals, however, tutoring is not a structured part of the program. A youth's attitude toward school is rated by the parents, teachers, volunteer, and Case Manager in a question asking for a rating on the statement, "is positive about going to school and about what can be learned in school."

HRS recommends that BB/BS emphasize the outcomes from activities related to personal development goals because of the number of major goals in this area and the availability of national studies for comparison.

On pages 12 and 13 of the FY2001 Social Services Proposal, Objective 1 in the 2000 Objectives states, "Increase by 25% the number of youth who will be matched with a caring concerned mentor." The outcome listed for Objective 1 does not really relate to Objective 1 (Outcome: A majority of mentees served will demonstrate an increase in one of the following asset areas: self confidence, social competence, including school performance, and caring through the establishment of a consistent one-to-one relationship with a caring adult.).

To fit the outcome statement, Outcome Objective 1 could be stated:

**Recommended Overall Objective 1:** Mentees served will demonstrate an increase in the following asset areas: self confidence; social competence, including school performance; and caring as measured by their self-report and as reported by their parent/guardian, the volunteer, the teacher, and the case manager.

**Recommended Outcome Objective:** 75% of the mentees will rate themselves as "much better" in four of the five categories on the Youth Questionnaire.

**Recommended Outcome Objective:** 75% of the mentees will be rated as "much better" by their parent/guardian in 10 of the 18 categories in the areas of self confidence; social competence, including school performance; and caring on the Parent/Guardian Report on the Match.

**Recommended Outcome Objective:** 75% of the mentees will be rated as "much better" by their volunteer in 10 of the 18 categories in the areas of self confidence; social competence, including school performance; and caring on the Volunteer Report on the Match.

**Recommended Outcome Objective:** 75% of the mentees will be rated as "much better" by their teacher in 10 of the 18 categories in the areas of self confidence; social

competence, including school performance; and caring categories on the Teacher Report on the Match.

**Recommended Outcome Objective:** 75% of the mentees will be rated as “much better” by their case manager in 10 of the 18 categories in the areas of self confidence; social competence, including school performance; and caring on the Case Manager Report on the Match.

The statement in Objective 1, “Increase by 25% the number of youth who will be matched with a caring concerned mentor” could become Objective 2a, while the current Objective 2 could become Objective 2b. So we would have....

**Recommended Overall Objective 2a:** Increase by 25% the number of youth who will be matched with a caring concerned mentor.

**Recommended Outcome Objective:** 25% increase in total matches from a baseline of XX matches January 1, 2000, to XXX matches January 1, 2001.

**Recommended Overall Objective 2b:** Increase the number of adults who are mentoring children by 25% (15% in African American mentors) through a comprehensive recruitment and training program that includes other social service providers, ...”

**Recommended Outcome Objective:** 25% increase in the number of active mentors from a baseline of XX active mentors January 1, 2000 to XXX matches January 1, 2001.

**Recommended Outcome Objective:** 15% increase in the number of active African American mentors from a baseline of XX active mentors January 1, 2000, to XXX matches January 1, 2001.

## Ideas for Further Consultation

The three year plan for BB/BS includes goals about numbers and structure, volunteer leadership development, financial development, and professional staff. The Board and staff could consider developing a goal to fully implement an outcomes-based evaluation system.

The current youth survey does not cover some of the areas checked as the main goals for BB/BS. Some outcome measures could be developed for these areas. Two of these areas are “help youth develop positive values” and “help youth improve youth’s school attitude.” These two areas could be more fully defined in behavioral terms.

Some examples of more specific behavioral measures of self esteem and socialization are the following.

Outcome components

- the child complies with rules, limits, and routines
- the child volunteers for age appropriate tasks at home, school, and in the community

Measures

- number and percent of children who participate in routine activities
- number and percent of children who follow established rules/limits
- number and percent of children who perform their assigned tasks at school , at home, and in community based program settings

- number and percent of children who are considerate of others and engage in helping behaviors
- cooperate with peers and who volunteer to help peers with classroom or program tasks

## SOAR (SUCCESSFUL OPPORTUNITIES IN ACADEMICS AND RECREATION)

---

### Program Theory

Mission: To be recognized in Boone County as the premier mentoring organization serving children from single-parent homes by providing positive role models in a child's life.

For the BB/BS SOAR Program, choosing appropriate program outcomes and indicators is an even more challenging task than for the One-on-One Mentoring Program. Direct outcomes may be difficult to attribute to the actual service because the service is provided in a group setting. Each mentee is different, each volunteer is different; and each family dynamic may add additional variables.

To begin the process of identifying the program theory, staff and Board must ask themselves these questions. Why do we expect BB/BS to produce good outcomes for clients in the SOAR program? Is there any reason to believe that involving youth in these programs will make any difference in the lives of the clients served?

It is useful to develop a series of "if-then" statements to develop the logic or theory of how the program brings about benefits for participants. For example, some of these statements for the BB/BS SOAR Program could be,

"If intensive mentoring produces positive outcomes for youth, then less intensive mentoring can also produce positive outcomes for youth."

"If youth participate in positive group activities sponsored by SOAR, then they may exhibit less antisocial behavior, commit fewer violent crimes, and use and sell fewer drugs."

"If SOAR participants receive more positive peer group support, then they will associate less frequently with delinquent peers, feel less peer pressure, and feel pressured less often by peers to behave in antisocial ways."

The national BB/BS organization is in the process of conducting research to determine outcomes for youth mentored in various types of group settings. At the end of the research they hope to have a better idea about the types of programs that produce the most positive outcomes for youth mentored in group settings.

### Current Evaluation Plan

To assist in their program evaluation and outcome measures, BB/BS currently asks the SOAR volunteers and the participant's parent to rate the child's progress in six areas. These six areas are school grades, self esteem, relations at home, school attendance, relations with friends, and new interests and experiences. The adult rates the child on a four point scale where 1=much improved, 2=improved, 3=no improvement, and 4=worse.

The questionnaire also has questions that are used as measures of parent and volunteer satisfaction and asks for suggestions for improvement. Currently BB/BS does not ask the SOAR youth participants to complete these rating forms.

## Recommended Outcome Objectives

**Recommended Outcome Objective:** 75% of the SOAR participants will be rated as “improved” or “much improved” by their parent/guardian in one category on the program survey (categories are school grades, self esteem, relations at home, school attendance, relations with friends, and new interests and experiences).

**Recommended Outcome Objective:** 75% of the SOAR participants will be rated as “improved” or “much improved” by their SOAR volunteer in one category on the program survey (categories are school grades, self esteem, relations at home, school attendance, relations with friends, and new interests and experiences).

## Ideas for Further Consultation

Youth in the SOAR program could be asked to rate their own progress on the same six areas as are on the survey for parents.

School Resource Officers keep files on children they contact so these officers could be sent an evaluation form like the one sent to parents. SOAR participants could be compared to non-participants on school performance and attendance, grades, promotions, percentage of scheduled days youths attended, and records of disciplinary actions.

In addition, SOAR participants could be compared to non-participants on the following measures.

Do SOAR participants participate in significantly more social and educational activities, exhibit less antisocial behavior, commit fewer violent crimes, and use and sell fewer drugs?

Are SOAR participants more likely to report attending a drug or alcohol prevention program?

Did SOAR participants receive more positive peer group support, associate less frequently with delinquent peers, feel less peer pressure, and feel pressured less often by peers to behave in antisocial ways?

Are SOAR participants significantly less likely to have used gateway and serious drugs, sold drugs, or committed violent crimes?

# FAMILY COUNSELING CENTER – COUNSELING FOR SCHOOL AGE POPULATIONS

---

## Program Theory

Mission Statement: To improve the quality of life for individuals, families, and communities by helping people to make positive changes in their lives and empowering them to make healthy and effective choices. We strive to do this by providing professional therapy, treatment, community support, and educational services in a physically and psychologically safe environment which enhances self-esteem. We are committed to the principle that all persons who need treatment should receive high quality services, regardless of ability to pay.

For a program like Family Counseling Center’s Counseling for School Age Populations Program, choosing appropriate program outcomes and indicators is a challenging task. Direct outcomes may be difficult to attribute to the actual service because of so many intervening variables. Each young person is different, living in a different situation; each school setting is unique; and each family dynamic may add additional variables.

“Outcomes are usually benefits or changes in participants’ knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, behavior, condition, or status. Most often, an outcome represents a change for the better, although the outcome for some programs is that participants get worse more slowly than they would have otherwise.” (Plantz, et.al 1999) In many cases there is not one outcome, but a series of outcomes, with one outcome contributing to another.

To begin to develop outcome measures one must examine the assumptions and theories upon which the program operates. A good place to begin the process of identifying the program theory is to look at what services are being provided. These are the active treatment elements that program staff and Board believe are responsible for any outcomes the programs may produce. Why do we expect FCC’s School Age Counseling Program to produce good outcomes for youth who receive counseling? Is there any reason to believe that providing counseling will make any difference in the lives of the school age clients served?

One theory that seems to be operating in the FCC School Age Counseling Program is that youth can benefit from traditional counseling services. It is useful to develop a series of “if-then” statements to develop the logic or theory of how the program brings about benefits for participants. For example some of these statements for the FCC’s School Age Counseling Program could be,

“If individuals are disruptive or having a problem in school, then it may indicate a problem with drugs, alcohol, problems at home, or psychological problems.”

“If youth are having these problems, then they can improve by understanding their behavior.”

“If individuals understand their behavior, then they can consciously improve their interpersonal skills for the benefit of themselves and other students and teachers.”

## Current Evaluation Plan

As part of their CARF certification effort, FCC developed an outcomes-based evaluation process. Currently, FCC utilizes the CTRAC system that reports on the counselor’s assessment of the

progress each client has made. For example, Goal V: Successful Treatment Process for Drug and Alcohol Clients has the outcome measure, “75% of clients will be classified as having received some benefit from treatment at the time of discharge.” At the time of discharge, the counselor assigns a code indicating “some progress, major progress, or successful completion” on issues identified in the treatment plan. The results are compiled each quarter for review by the quality assurance team. The quality assurance team, which consists of program and administrative personnel, meets monthly to discuss treatment issues, revise policies, and review survey results and other statistical indicators.

As part of the new outcomes-based evaluation system, all adult out-patient clients will complete an instrument (BASIS-32) which measures aspects of their mental health status and day-to-day functioning at admission, and at a selected point during treatment. This has not yet been fully implemented. The process will be adapted for the school age population.

FCC also monitors client satisfaction with services with a consumer satisfaction survey given to clients at selected times during treatment and at discharge.

## Recommended Outcome Objectives

The FCC School Age Counseling Program is the only program reviewed this year that specifically targets youth with drug and alcohol problems. It is recommended that the Board and staff at FCC consider strengthening this component of the program and make drug and alcohol prevention a primary goal.

The objectives listed in the FY2001 Social Services Proposal are process objectives listing goals for the numbers of clients to be seen. FCC has not yet transferred the outcomes evaluation system to their report to the Columbia/Boone County Community Services Commission.

The first recommendation is that for the annual proposal and report to the Columbia/Boone County Community Services Commission, the school age clients be reported separately from the adult clients using the CTRAC/FCC Discharge form.

The following objectives could then be listed:

**Recommended Outcome Objective 1:** 75% of school age population clients will be classified as having received some benefit from treatment or be transferred to another program at the time of discharge.

**Recommended Outcome Objective 2:** 40% of school age population clients will be classified as having made major progress or successfully completed their treatment at the time of discharge.

**Recommended Outcome Objective 3:** 50% of school age population clients will be rated by their teacher and/or school resource officer as “much better” in 8 of the 12 categories on the \*Referral Source Report (\*new form to be developed).

## Ideas for Further Consultation

Depending on how confidentiality issues could be worked out, FCC could give the school counselor, school resource officer, or teacher a rating form to report on clients referred from these sources. This could be part of the “Referral Source Report” mentioned above.

FCC uses the Achenbach, (1991) child behavior checklist in their McCambridge House program. An adaptation of this could be used with their teen counseling clients.

Some resources for program outcomes for children: Contribution and Citizenship Outcomes  
<http://ag.arizona.edu/fcr/fs/nowg/contrib.html>

Measures

[http://ag.arizona.edu/fcr/fs/nowg/contrib\\_measures.html](http://ag.arizona.edu/fcr/fs/nowg/contrib_measures.html)

# PROJECT CRIB

---

## Program Theory

Statement of Purpose: While the main goal of Project CRIB is to increase the graduation and retention rate of adolescent mothers, the trickle-down effects of an exemplary infant/toddler program are far-reaching. By teaching appropriate infant and toddler development, Project CRIB can help the next generation of at-risk students get off to a much better start.

Project CRIB primarily provides a day care center for teen parents finishing school. Teen parents must attend classes in parenting and child development, work with the Parents As Teachers educator both at home and at school, participate in peer support groups, participate in a Child Development Practicum, and join in a contract of expectations with Project CRIB which delineates their responsibilities as a parent in the program, and specifies the services and benefits which they will receive.

Project CRIB has chosen the specific objective of increasing the graduation and retention rate of participants in their program. This objective does lend itself to measurement. Some of the outcomes may be difficult to attribute to the actual service because of so many intervening variables. While the project helps control the teen's school environment, each teen parent is different and each family dynamic may add additional variables.

“Outcomes are usually benefits or changes in participants’ knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, behavior, condition, or status. Most often, an outcome represents a change for the better, although the outcome for some programs is that participants get worse more slowly than they would have otherwise.” (Plantz, et.al 1999) In many cases there is not one outcome, but a series of outcomes, with one outcome contributing to another.

To begin to develop outcome measures one must examine the assumptions and theories upon which the program operates. A good place to begin the process of identifying the program theory is to look at what services are being provided. These are the active treatment elements that program staff and Board believe are responsible for any outcomes the programs may produce. Why do we expect Project CRIB to produce good outcomes for participants in the program? Is there any reason to believe that providing an exemplary infant/toddler program will make any difference in the lives of the teen parents served?

It is useful to develop a series of “if-then” statements to develop the logic or theory of how the program brings about benefits for participants. For example, some of these statements for Project CRIB could be,

“If teen parents have affordable infant/toddler care, then they will stay in high school until they graduate.”

“If teen parents know about infant nutrition, development, and safety guidelines, then they will provide proper health care, nutrition, and social interaction to their babies.”

“Educated adolescent mothers will provide better care and better opportunities for their children.”

## **Current Evaluation Plan**

Currently, students with children enrolled in Project CRIB must participate in several activities. Several of these activities involve evaluations that could be used to develop outcome measures.

Parenting Class: Students are graded and scored on projects they complete

Child Development Class: Students are graded and scored on projects they complete

Child Development Practicum: Students must work in the Project CRIB child care center in the role of a child care provider. They are evaluated along a satisfactory to unsatisfactory scale.

Project CRIB utilizes a Family Questionnaire to gauge the satisfaction the teen parent feels with the Project CRIB child care program. Results are used to improve the program and as a gauge of parent satisfaction with the child care services.

## **Recommended Outcome Objectives**

In the FY2001 Social Services Proposal, three objectives are listed. These three objectives have been the same for the three years the proposal was available for review. It is recommended that Project CRIB retain the primary goal of preventing drop outs.

While the graduation/retention rate is listed as an outcome, it is hard to determine which year is being reported in the evaluation report on the proposal. It is recommended that the report be put in a table so it can be easily seen and the new outcome objectives compared to the previous outcomes. Information reported on the 2001 proposal was placed on a table.

Senior Class of 1999	Senior Class of 1998	Senior Class of 1997
85% graduation/retention rate for Project CRIB participants	83% graduation/retention rate for Project CRIB participants	81% graduation/retention rate for Project CRIB participants
13 parents graduated		6 parents graduated
At the beginning of the 1998-99 school year, 28 students (14% of Douglass enrollment) had children or were pregnant. February 1999 13.2% of students at Douglass H.S. were adolescent parents	January 1998 11.5% of students at Douglass H.S. were adolescent parents	
Douglass High School graduated 39 students, 18% of whom had used Project CRIB during some part of their high school career.		

March 2000: 13.2% of students were adolescent parents.

Using the reported levels in the table as baseline information, the following outcome objectives are recommended.

**Recommended Outcome Objective 1:** 80% of the students who enroll in Project CRIB in September 2001 will stay in school and complete the year for high school credit.

**Recommended Outcome Objective 2:** 70% of the students who enroll in Project CRIB in September 2001 (not eligible for graduation) will re-enroll in school in September 2002.

**Recommended Outcome Objective 3:** 70% of Project CRIB parents in the parenting class each semester will receive a grade of B or better.

## Ideas for Further Consultation

### *Suggested schedule for additional processes:*

Objective 1: Completion rate calculated at the end of each school year.

Objective 2: Re-enrollment rate calculated at the beginning of each new school year.

Objective 3: Enhancement of parenting skills. Average grade at the end of each semester.

### *Follow-up*

The director of Project CRIB states there is no formal follow-up conducted of participants, however, former students do drop by to visit her. A more formalized tracking form could be used to capture the stories of these students who contact the program after graduation and keep track of their successes.

Name

Recorded by

Date

Did you graduate or obtain your GED? Yes Date No

Are you currently pursuing post-secondary education? Yes No If yes, type and name of school.

Do you currently have a job? Yes No If yes;

What is your job?

How do you like your job?

How long have you had this job?

Please tell me one thing that happened while you were associated with Project CRIB that helped you that you still remember? (something that made a difference in your life?)

What is one thing that would have been helpful to you that you did not receive while you were associated with Project CRIB?

## **BOONE COUNTY RESOURCE MOTHERS (BCRM)**

---

Advent has taken over management of BCRM, folding it into their Teen Parents program. This will allow for an orderly flow of mentoring from pregnancy, to parenthood, into job readiness training.

### **Program Theory**

The Center on Adolescent Sexuality, Pregnancy, and Parenting (CASPP) has met the challenging task of setting appropriate program outcomes and indicators for the BCRM program to track. However, direct outcomes may be still be difficult to attribute to the actual service because of so many intervening variables. Follow-up with this transient group is very difficult, each client is different, living in a different situation; each volunteer is different; and each family dynamic may add additional variables. Outcomes can only be reported for those teen parents who maintain contact with the BCRM Program.

“Outcomes are usually benefits or changes in participants’ knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, behavior, condition, or status. Most often, an outcome represents a change for the better, although the outcome for some programs is that participants get worse more slowly than they would have otherwise.” (Plantz, et.al 1999) In many cases there is not one outcome, but a series of outcomes, with one outcome contributing to another.

To begin to develop outcome measures one must examine the assumptions and theories upon which the program operates. A good place to begin the process of identifying the program theory is to look at what services are being provided. These are the active treatment elements that program staff and Board believe are responsible for any outcomes the programs may produce. Why do we expect BCRM Program to produce good outcomes for teen mothers and their children? Is there any reason to believe that providing mentoring will make any difference in the lives of the teens and children served?

It is useful to develop a series of “if-then” statements to develop the logic or theory of how the program brings about benefits for participants. For example, some of these statements for BCRM could be,

“If teen parents are provided with a mentor experienced in mothering, then the teen will feel supported in the parenting role.”

“If the teen parent feels supported in the parenting role, then they may experience less stress in that role.”

“If teen parents feel less stress in their parenting role, then they may be less likely to neglect or abuse their child.”

### **Current Evaluation Plan**

BCRM has been conducting periodic evaluations using protocols set up by the Center on Adolescent Sexuality, Pregnancy, and Prevention (CASPP) based at the University of Missouri. Their evaluation report dated December 18, 2000 was provided. Several items reported in the CASPP report could be used as outcome measures for BCRM.

These items from the narrative in the CASPP report were put into a table to better determine some future outcomes.

## Selected Items from the CASSP (December 18, 2000) Evaluation Report to Boone County Resource Mothers

(Time 1=assessment when entering the project)

(Time 2=Within two months of the birth of the baby)

(Time 3=Within two months of the baby's first birthday)

	Time 1 n=30	Time 2 n=25	Time 3 n=12
<b>School Status</b>			
In middle or junior high school	10.0%	12.5%	
In high school or GED classes	28.0%	41.7%	45.5%
In vocational classes	7.1%		
In a 4 year college	7.1%	8.3%	18.0%
Not in school	46.4%	37.5%	36.5%
Of those not in school			
Reported dropouts	40.9%		30.0%
Graduated	27.3%		25.0%
Earned GED	4.5%		30.0%
<b>Number of Pregnancies</b>			
2 pregnancies	20.0%	16.0%	36.0%
3 pregnancies		8.0%	9.0%
<b>Employment and Services Status</b>			
Unemployed	69.0%	77.3%	58.3%
On TANF	3.3%	24.0%	33.3%
On Food Stamps	26.7%	75.0%	75.0%
On Medicaid	73.3%		58.3%
On WIC	53.3%	64.0%	50.0%
<b>Contraceptive Use</b>			
Oral contraceptive	53.3%	25.0%	
Depovera shot	16.7%	50.0%	
Condom	60.0%		25.0%
Withdrawal	33.0%		16.7%
No birth control	6.7%	24.0%	25.0%
<b>Child Abuse and Neglect</b>			
Hotlined for abuse	6.7%	12.5%	0.0%

	Time 1 n=30	Time 2 n=25	Time 3 n=12
<b>Health Status of the Baby</b>			
Less than 4 weeks premature		75.0%	
Weigh 100 oz. or more at birth		52.0%	
Full immunizations for 1 year old			100.0%
Hospital visits in the year			
No hospital visits in the year			33.0%
Only 1 hospital visit in the year			33.0%
Breast feeding			
Breastfed their baby for at least 1 month			66.0%
Did not breastfeed at all			22.0%

As the BCRM program transitions to the Advent program, the “Outcomes Inventories - Teen Parents Program” process will probably be used to develop and measure outcome objectives for the BCRM program. The Advent Teen Parents program uses the “Teen Mother Information Form” (TMIF) in an initial (TMIF-1) and a follow-up (TMIF-2) version. Many items on the TMIF relate to items reported in the CASPP report, so these can be used as ongoing measures for outcomes for the BCRM program.

## Recommended Outcome Objectives

In the FY 2001 Social Services Proposal, there are three objectives listed for BCRM. Objective 1 for 2000 relates to the number of matches of mentors and mentees. While the goals listed of matching certain numbers of youth with mentors are an important part of the program, they are process objectives, not outcomes. Likewise, Objective 3 is a process objective stating, “Develop and implement a curriculum that will expose all adolescents and mentors in the program to information on the following issues: developing and enhancing life skills, substance use and its impact on the fetus, child, and mother, domestic and relationship violence, and drop-out prevention.”

The outcomes listed in Objective 2 provide a stronger statement about the impact the program is having on the youth in the community (Objective 2 is “Significantly reduce parenting stress and child abuse potential and increase the knowledge of good health practices among mentored adolescent mothers as measured by evaluation instruments provided by the CASPP at the University of Missouri, and increase participation in school or workforce readiness programs of adolescents in the program”).

Since the BCRM program will be folded into the Teen Parents program at Advent, it is recommended that the goal statement for this program be refined. BCRM states their main goals as “to improve the health of the young mother and her baby, to reduce the stress associated with adolescent parenting through a mentoring relationships, referrals and educational programs, and to promote self-sufficiency through encouragement of continued education and/or job training.” In their objectives, the aspect of preventing child abuse potential is mentioned. The Teen Parents program seems to have an emphasis on “improved knowledge of positive parenting practices” and “reducing the rate of repeat pregnancies.” Both have an emphasis on encouraging the youth to continue their education (this is not always strictly dropout prevention). The BCRM program checked “reduce pregnancy” and “reduce sexual irresponsibility” as major goals and they track repeat pregnancies in their outcome measures.

One recommendation is that the Boards and Advisory Boards for the Teen Parents/BCRM program decide on a specific, more narrowly defined goal that perhaps relates to reducing teen pregnancy since this is a major issue in the community. This distinctive goal would distinguish the Teen Parents/BCRM from the other youth mentoring programs and lend itself to measurable outcome objectives.

Currently BCRM does not have a stated goal of reducing repeat pregnancies. There is, however, an outcome objective relating to this in the evaluation grid prepared for the Advent Teen Parents program. (“There will be no more than 5 repeat pregnancies among 70 teens in Teen Parents.”)

To strengthen the proposal and to focus on the current main goal of BCRM (that of reducing parenting stress, reducing child abuse potential, and increasing the knowledge of good health practices among adolescent mothers) the following are the recommended priority outcome objectives.

**Recommended Outcome Objective 1:** The number of mentored youth who are hot-lined for child neglect or abuse will remain below 5% when measured at Time 2 and Time 3 (see definition of times on the chart above).

**Recommended Outcome Objective 2:** 75% of mentored youth will deliver babies that weigh 100 oz. or more at birth.

**Recommended Outcome Objective 3:** 75% of mentored youth will show an increase of 5 points on the Attitude Toward Parenting scale.

In reporting the level of success on future Social Services funding applications, the numbers of youth as well as the percentage could be reported so that the Columbia/Boone County Community Services Commission could see the impact on youth in real numbers as well as the percentages for the program.

## TEEN PARTNERS/WORKING PARTNERS

---

### Program Theory

For a program like Teen Partners/Working Partners, choosing appropriate program outcomes and indicators is a challenging task. Direct outcomes may be difficult to attribute to the actual service because of so many intervening variables. Each client is different, living in a different situation; each volunteer is different; and each family dynamic may add additional variables.

“Outcomes are usually benefits or changes in participants’ knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, behavior, condition, or status. Most often, an outcome represents a change for the better, although the outcome for some programs is that participants get worse more slowly than they would have otherwise.” (Plantz, et.al 1999) In many cases there is not one outcome, but a series of outcomes, with one outcome contributing to another.

To begin to develop outcome measures one must examine the assumptions and theories upon which the program operates. A good place to begin the process of identifying the program theory is to look at what services are being provided. These are the active treatment elements that program staff and Board believe are responsible for any outcomes the programs may produce. Why do we expect Teen Partners/Working Partners to produce good outcomes for participants in the Job Readiness Training or the mentored youth program? Is there any reason to believe that providing job readiness training or mentoring will make any difference in the lives of the youth participants served?

While many job readiness and training programs build on the assets of the individuals involved, there is an underlying deficit theory at work. Some of the assumptions (spoken or unspoken) may be that youth

- do not get jobs primarily because they lack the proper attitudes
- lack habits for the world of work
- lack motivation
- come from families that fail to inculcate values of work and orderliness

There are many other theories that could also be true such as, youth

- lack faith in the reality of future job prospects
- have ready access to illegal activities that produce higher financial rewards for less work
- perceive a scarcity of entry-level jobs with reasonable long-term prospects

At the program level, the program theory is implemented in a series of steps that also make many assumptions. For example the assumption may be that

- training for attractive occupations is (or can be) provided in accessible locations
- information about its availability will reach the target audience
- when youth hear about the program, they will sign up for it

- they will attend regularly
- where necessary, stipends (and perhaps child care) will be available to youth while they are in training
- trainers will offer quality training and they will help youth learn marketable skills
- youth will learn the lessons being taught about work habits and work skills
- youth will internalize the values and absorb the knowledge
- having attained the knowledge and skills, the youth will seek jobs
- jobs with adequate pay will be available in the areas in which training was provided
- employers will hire the youth to fill the jobs
- the youth will perform well
- employers will be supportive
- youth will remain on the job and they will become regular workers with good earnings (Weiss, 1999)

When we examine the theories and assumptions at work, we can see that the desired outcome for youth could break down at any step.

## Current Evaluation Plan

Advent has instituted an agency wide, comprehensive program evaluation system to determine the effectiveness of services and the efficiency of results. As stated in the 2001 Social Services Proposal, “The program evaluation system is composed of 8 basic elements: statement of purpose, team outcomes, identified processes (activities of each team), primary objectives, measures (how achievement of objectives will be determined), expectancies (criteria against which performance is compared), weights (relative importance of objective), and client descriptors. A quarterly performance report is generated and distributed. This report details the performance of each process team. The system is reviewed annually and modified to reflect changes.”

Advent Enterprises Teen Partners/Working Partners program is advancing very well toward outcomes-based evaluation. The staff for the TP/WP Program have outlined their evaluation plan quite nicely on a grid entitled “YOP Project January 1, 2001-December 31, 2002, Goals, Verification Needed.”

A few modifications on this grid, in the outcomes related to Teen Partners/Working Partners program will make it flow a bit better from the HRS evaluators’ point of view.

The first outcome “Increase # of youth with mentoring relationships” is currently matched with the performance target “70 of 120 who complete JRT will enter mentored employment.” It should be matched with “70 teen parents will receive 6 months of mentoring.”

A new outcome was written, “Increase # of youth who enter and maintain employment.” This is matched with the performance target “70 of 120 who complete JRT will enter mentored employment.”

This new outcome was placed in a logical sequence with the other employment outcome objectives. (The recommended additions are labeled \*\*NEW\*\*)

**Suggested Revisions**  
**YOP PROJECT Jan. 1, 2001-December 31, 2002**  
**GOALS, VERIFICATION NEEDED**

OUTCOME	PERF. TARGET	VERIFICATION NEEDED	TIME FRAME	WHO PROVIDES
Increase # of youth with mentoring relationships	**NEW**70 teen parents will receive 6 months of mentoring	Statement from mentor with whom youth is matched	When matched	TP Assoc. Coordinators, Tpart. Assoc. Coord & RM Coord
		Contact sheets/compiled hours from contact sheets	Monthly	TP Assoc. Coordinators, Tpart. Assoc. Coord & RM Coord
		MMP year-end report	Dec. 31, 2001, 2002	TW Assoc Coordinators/Coordinator
Maintain/increase # in cont. ed. Programs	100 of 120 (83%) in TW will have completed or be pursuing ed.	Letter from school, other program, copy of GED certificate, HS diploma	When appropriate/at intake when completed, etc.	TP, TPart. Assoc. Coord & RM Coord will get from school/youth
	35 of 70 (50%) in TP will have completed or be pursuing ed	Letter from school, other program, copy of GED certificate, HS diploma	When appropriate/at intake when completed, etc.	TP, TPart. Assoc. Coord & RM Coord will get from school/youth
Increase # that have completed JRT	120 of 200 (60%) intakes will complete JRT	Attendance records	At end of each JRT	TW Assoc. Coord
		Copies of JRT certificates	At end of each JRT	TW Assoc. Coord
		MMP year-end report	Dec. 31, 2001, 2002	TW Assoc Coordinators/Coordinator

Continued:

OUTCOME	PERF. TARGET	VERIFICATION NEEDED	TIME FRAME	WHO PROVIDES
**NEW** Increase # who are achieving their primary employability development goal	75% of mentees will achieve their primary employability development goal			
Increase # who have improved job readiness and retention skills	120 of those who complete JRT will show improvement in knowledge	Comparison of pre- and post-test JRT scores	Give copies of JRT tests to Coordinator at end of each JRT	TW Assoc Coordinators/Coordinator
**NEW** Increase # of youth who enter and maintain employment	70 of 120 who complete JRT will enter mentored employment	Copies of employment time sheets	Weekly, bi-weekly or monthly as appropriate	Client and employers
	35 of 70 in mentored employment will retain position for at least 90 days	Copies of time sheets	Weekly, bi-weekly, monthly as appropriate	TW Assoc. Coord will request from employer
		MMP year-end report	Dec. 31, 2001, 2002	Coordinator
**NEW** Maintain 100% customer satisfaction with services rendered	**NEW** 100% of TP and TW will mark "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to question 6 on the CMMP Satisfaction Survey.			
Increase # of teen parents who have improved knowledge of positive parenting and practices and community resources	50 of 70 in TP will demonstrate pos. parenting practices and knowledge of community resources	Comparison of pre- and post-test scores on parenting information inventory	Pre-test given at intake. Post-test given 3 months later. Five copies to Coordinator as completed	TP Assoc. Coordinators/Coordinator RM Coord
Reduce the rate of repeat pregnancies	There will be no more than 5 repeat pregnancies among 70 teens in TP	Report from youth and mentors	Annually/whenever they occur	TP Assoc. Coordinators

## Recommended Outcome Objectives

In the FY 2001 Social Services Proposal, there are three objectives listed for TP/WP. It is recommended that TP/WP narrow their primary goal to improving job skills. To strengthen the proposal and to focus on this main goal, it is suggested that stronger and higher priority objectives be listed. This will distinguish TP/WP from the other youth mentoring programs with a distinctive goal. Since the BCRM program will be folded into the Teen Parents program, specific objectives related to teen parenting could be dropped from this program.

While the process goals listed, those mentioning matching certain numbers of youth with mentors, are an important part of the program, the distinct outcomes related to youth employment provides a

stronger statement about the impact the program is having on the youth in the community. The priority outcome objectives recommended are listed.

**Recommended Outcome Objective 1:** 60% of youth who complete the intake procedure will complete Job Readiness Training

**Recommended Outcome Objective 2:** 58% of youth who complete JRT will enter mentored employment.

**Recommended Outcome Objective 3:** 50% of youth who enter mentored employment will retain the position for at least 90 days.

In reporting the level of success on future Social Services funding applications, the numbers of youth as well as the percentage could be reported so that the Columbia/Boone County Community Services Commission could see the impact in real numbers as well as the percentages for the program.

## FUN CITY

---

### Program Theory

For a program like Fun City, choosing appropriate program outcomes and indicators is a challenging task. Direct outcomes may be difficult to attribute to the actual service because of so many intervening variables. Each youth participant is different, living in a different situation; each volunteer is different; and each family dynamic may add additional variables.

“Outcomes are usually benefits or changes in participants’ knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, behavior, condition, or status. Most often, an outcome represents a change for the better, although the outcome for some programs is that participants get worse more slowly than they would have otherwise.” (Plantz, et.al 1999) In many cases there is not one outcome, but a series of outcomes, with one outcome contributing to another.

To begin to develop outcome measures one must examine the assumptions and theories upon which the program operates. A good place to begin the process of identifying the program theory is to look at what services are being provided. These are the active treatment elements that program staff and Board believe are responsible for any outcomes the programs may produce. Why do we expect Fun City to produce good outcomes for participants in the Saturday Youth Academy programs? Is there any reason to believe that providing the Saturday Youth Academy will make any difference in the lives of the youth served?

It is useful to develop a series of “if-then” statements to develop the logic or theory of how the program brings about benefits for participants. In 2000, a class from MU devoted some time to working with the Fun City Board. As part of their project they completed a survey of the Board where Board members were asked to rank a list of goals in order of importance to Fun City. One of the top goals identified was to have more parental involvement with the program. Taking this goal as an example, some of these statements for Fun City may be,

“If family support is an important element in buffering negative pressure from peers and promoting positive functioning, then providing programs for parental involvement as an adjunct to the youth activities will encourage the parent to support the youth’s participation in Fun City activities.”

“If the parent supports the youth’s participation in Fun City activities, then the parent will make adaptations and accommodations necessary to make sure the youth can attend the activities.”

“If a youth attends more activities, then the likelihood for positive outcomes for the youth is increased.”

Thinking about the theory or assumptions underlying each component of the program can assist in developing outcomes for each component. In the suggested outcome objectives, some of these underlying assumptions have been postulated.

### Current Evaluation Plan

Since the last evaluation, the Fun City Board of Directors has done considerable developmental work. They have refined their mission statement so it is a clear concise statement. The current wording is:

It is the mission of Fun City Youth Academy, Inc. to create and maintain innovative programs that provide academic, socialization, and motivational support for youth ages 6-16 and their families.

When marking their major goals on the “Mentor Program Description” Fun City Youth Academy seemed to have a strong emphasis on academic development.

A parent survey conducted in 2000 ranked academic tutoring as the most important service that Fun City offers their family. Parents listed academic tutoring, cultural enrichment, and day care (all tied at 5 mentions each) as the services Fun City successfully accomplishes. Also the Parent Survey done at the Fun City Open House/Parent Teacher conferences, a Mind Mapping process, stressed academic and socialization goals. For these reasons HRS recommends that Fun City Saturday Academy adopt academic achievement as their primary goal.

## **Recommended Outcome Objectives**

The current wording of program objective for 2001 on page 17, section 4.3 of the FY2001 Social Services Proposal is: “Saturday Academy, in addition to Summer Academy, will continue to provide year round support for Fun City families, increasing academic achievement and socialization skills by 10%. Surveys will be administered before and after each semester to determine effectiveness of instruction methods. Students will be provided with tutoring and review of school attendance and parents, as an expectation with Parent Network will report academic performance.”

HRS recommends that this goal statement be separated into several statements, each with a specific outcome objective and outcome measure.

### *Academic achievement*

**Recommended major academic development goal:** Create and maintain innovative programs that promote academic achievement for youth ages 6 through 16.

Assumption or theory about academic programs driving this goal: Educational achievement is a major factor in becoming a productive member of society.

Specific activities that address this goal: Homework help (tutoring through “A Way With Words” Literacy Project), enrichment activities in specific subjects

**Recommended Overall Objective:** Improve youth’s grades

**Recommended Outcome Objective:** 75% of participants who are below a B average will raise their grade average by one point.

**Recommended Outcome Objective:** 90% of the students with at least a B average will maintain or increase that average throughout the school year.

Method: Participants will be requested to bring in their school report card each time it is issued. The grades on the last report card from the previous school year will be recorded as a baseline average for each participant. The grade point will be calculated for each participant each semester to give them on-going feedback at the end of each semester. At the end of the school year, the overall grade point will be calculated and the percentage of those participants who raised or maintained their grade calculated.

**Recommended Overall Objective:** Improve youth’s achievement at school in a particular subject

**Recommended Outcome Objective:** 75% of participants who are below a B average in a specific subject will raise their grade in that subject by one letter.

Method: Participants will be requested to bring in their school report card each time it is issued. The grades on the last report card from the previous school year will be recorded as a baseline grade for each subject for which the participant receives tutoring. The grade will be recorded each semester so that on-going feedback can be given to the participants. At the end of the school year, the grade will be recorded and the percentage of those participants who raised their grade calculated.

### *Communication and social skills*

The current wording of program objective for 2001 on page 17, section 4.3 of the FY2001 Social Services Proposal is: "Saturday Academy will continue to provide opportunities for individuals to improve self-esteem and community involvement, enhancing current instruction with mentors to address teen pregnancy and leadership development. Pre/Post surveys will indicate participants have increased knowledge of these issues by 10%."

**Recommended major socialization goal:** Create and maintain innovative programs that help youth develop communication and social skills.

Assumption or theory about personal development driving this goal: Participation in a wide range of small and large group activities will assist youth in gaining a sense of their own identity, and improve their social and communication skills so they can function successfully in the community.

Specific activities that address this goal: Rites of Passages classes, Cultural Enrichment classes, Leadership Development classes, group projects

**Recommended Overall Objective:** Improve youth's social skills

**Recommended Outcome Objective:** 80% of the participants in Saturday Academy will raise their score on the SETCLAE Student Profile by 10%.

Method: Administer SETCLAE Student Profile in September at the beginning of the program and again in June at the end of the program.

**Recommended Overall Objective: Improve youth's communication skills**

**Recommended Outcome Objectives:** 80% of the participants in Saturday Academy will raise their score on the Leadership Development profile by 10%.

Method: Administer Leadership Development Profile in September at the beginning of the program and again in June at the end of the program.

## **Ideas for Further Consultation**

### *Refinement of goal statements*

In 2000, a class from MU devoted some time to working with the Fun City Board. As part of their project they completed a survey of the Board where Board members were asked to rank a list of goals in order of importance to Fun City.

HRS suggests that the Board be provided with the list of program goals on the "Mentoring Program Description" sent to mentoring programs as part of this evaluation. This outline will be helpful in focusing on specific goals and objectives. Processes suggested in the 2000 Student Report could be

followed to gain consensus on the major goals. Focusing on two or three major goals for which outcome measures have been developed will further refine the mission of Fun City.

### ***Other goals that could be addressed***

Major motivational support goal: Increase the involvement of parents and families of Fun City participants.

Assumption or theory about family involvement driving this goal: The family provides a basic support system for a child. Having parents attending Fun City activities with their children will demonstrate support and provide motivation for the children.

Specific activities that address this goal: Fun City Parent Network

Objective: Parents will demonstrate involvement in their child's academic success by attending parent activities sponsored by Fun City.

Outcome Measure: To be developed

Method: To be developed

Objective: Parents will demonstrate involvement in their child's education by volunteering at the child's school.

Outcome Measure: To be developed

Method: To be developed

### ***Possible outcomes***

Mentored youth have positive outcomes on school performance and attendance, grades, and promotions, as measured by the percentage of scheduled days youths attended school and records of disciplinary actions.

Mentored youth and families participate in more services and pro-social activities during the program than youths and families not in the program.

Mentored youth participate in higher numbers of positive activities, such as sports, school clubs, religious groups, and community-organized programs, during the program period.

Mentored youth have fewer risk factors and/or more protective factors than youths in the general population after the program ended.

Mentored youth less likely to exhibit problem behaviors at school in the year following the end of the program than the year before their participation.

## APPENDIX

---

### Bibliography

Plantz, M. C., Greenway, M. T., and Hendricks, M. (1999). "Outcome Measurement: Showing Results in the Nonprofit Sector." United Way of America, Online Resource Library. <http://www.unitedway.org/outcomes/ndpaper.html>

Sipe, C. L. and Roder, A. E. (1999). "Mentoring School-age Children: A Classification of Programs." Public/Private Ventures, Winter 1999. (<http://www.ppv.org/indexfiles/mentor-index.html>)

Weiss, C. (1999). "New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives, Volume 1: Nothing as Practical as Good Theory: Exploring theory-Based Evaluation of Comprehensive Community Initiatives for Children and Families." The Aspen Institute. <http://www.aspenroundtable.org/vol11/weiss.htm>

Children

Youth

Parent/Family

Community

## Evaluating the National Outcomes

# Children

## Program Outcomes for Children

### **CONTRIBUTION AND CITIZENSHIP OUTCOMES**

#### **Introduction**

In the NCEO model adopted by the Children's Workgroup (Ysseldyke & Thurlow, 1993), the outcome domain for Contribution and Citizenship addresses: 1) compliance with rules, limits, and routines, and 2) acceptance of responsibility for age-appropriate tasks at home and school. While many researchers consider contribution and citizenship a subset of social skills development in children, the NCEO model treats this conceptual area as a separate outcome domain. When we examine the social behaviors mentioned as important to peers and teachers in the short-term, and those associated with later delinquency, it is apparent that addressing contribution and citizenship separately is valuable.

#### [NCEO Contribution and Citizenship Model](#)

Peer relationships are very important to children, and when they are asked to rate classmates according to whether they like, dislike, or ignore them (a research procedure called a sociometric study), the qualities they like in peers include skills and behaviors associated with contribution and citizenship (Cartledge & Milburn, 1995). Specifically, in sociometric studies children describe peers they like in terms of their altruism, participation in play activities, kindness, and helpfulness (Dygdon, Conger, Conger, Wallanda, & Keane, 1980; Hartup, 1970). Teachers cite a separate but related set of social skills which tend to facilitate their task of teaching academics. The skills rated as more important by teachers concern order, cooperative behavior, accepting consequences, following rules and directions, avoiding conflict, and basic self-help behavior (Milburn, 1974). Focusing on these behaviors has been criticized by some as overvaluing quiet, controlled, docile and conforming behaviors (Winnett & Winkler, 1972). However, there can be little doubt that respect for rules and social norms is necessary if children are to function well both in peer groups and in organized situations such as classrooms.

In the long term, similar skills are necessary if children are to avoid delinquency as they grow into adolescence. Socialization (the learning and

adoption of socially accepted values and behavior) has received less attention as an outcome in studies of long-term effects of early childhood interventions than have cognitive and school-related outcomes (Barnett, 1995). Nevertheless, researchers seeking factors which might be addressed in early childhood to prevent chronic delinquency suggest that the strongest predictor of delinquency is a history of antisocial behavior or conduct disorder in childhood (Yoshikawa, 1995). Low socioeconomic status, low cognitive ability, having parents who were convicted of crimes, and poor parenting are other early risk factors for delinquency. Patterson's "coercion model" describes how unskilled parents can inadvertently reinforce a child's antisocial behaviors (such as noncompliance with rules and social norms, aggression, or tantrums) by using a combination of inconsistent, harsh and ineffective discipline techniques. The parent gives in to the negative behavior at times, but disciplines harshly or explosively at other times. The child learns to counter these punitive acts by the parent with more aggressive behavior or tantrums, leading to escalating "coercive interchanges" (Baum & Forehand, 1981; Patterson, 1986).

### **Outcome Components**

The NCEO model (Ysseldyke & Thurlow, 1993), as adapted for use in community-based programs, specifies two primary outcomes in this domain:

- The child complies with rules, limits, and routines
- The child volunteers for age-appropriate tasks at home, school, and in the community

### **Suggested Indicators**

The following are some appropriate indicators of positive program outcomes for children in the area of contribution and citizenship, based on the NCEO model (Ysseldyke & Thurlow, 1993), as adapted for community-based programs by the Children's Outcome Work Group. The appropriateness of any given indicator on the list for evaluating your program depends on the age of the children you serve, and the goals and activities of your particular program:

- Number and percent of children who participate in routine activities
- Number and percent of children who follow established rules/limits
- Number and percent of children who perform their assigned tasks at school, at home, and in community-based program settings
- Number and percent of children who are considerate of others and engage in helping behaviors
- Number and percent of children who cooperate with peers and who volunteer to help peers with classroom or program tasks

### **Summary**

Respect for rules and social norms is necessary if children are to be able

to function well both in peer groups and in organized situations such as classrooms. Similar skills are necessary in the long term if children are to avoid delinquency and make positive contributions as they grow older. In addition to looking at other kinds of social development outcomes (see Children's Program Outcomes, Personal and Social Adjustment), State Strengthening project managers can look for indicators of achieving the outcomes of compliance with age-appropriate rules, limits and routines, volunteering, and acceptance of responsibility for age-appropriate tasks at home, at school, and in community-based settings.

## References

- Barnett, W. S. (1995). Long-term effects of early childhood programs on cognitive and school outcomes. The Future of Children, 5 (3). Los Altos, CA: The David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Center for the Future of Children, 25-50.
- Baum, C. J., & Forehand, R. (1981). Long term follow-up assessment of parent training by use of multiple outcome measures. Behavior Therapy, 12, 643-52.
- Cartledge, G., & Milburn, J. F. (Eds.) (1995). Teaching social skills to children and youth: Innovative approaches (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dygdon, J., Conger, A. J., Conger, J. D., Wallanda, J. L., & Keane, S. P. (1980). Behavioral correlates of social competence and dysfunction in early childhood. Paper presented the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Hartup, W. W. (1970). Peer interaction and social organization. In P. H. Mussen(Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology: Vol. 2. New York: Wiley.
- Milburn, J F. (1974). Special education and regular class teacher attitudes regarding social behaviors of children: Steps toward the development of a social skills curriculum. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Ohio State University. Columbus.
- Patterson, G. R. (1986). Performance models for antisocial boys. American Psychologist, 41, 432-444.
- Winnett, R. A., & Winkler, R. C. (1972). Current behavior modification in the classroom: Be still, be quiet, be docile. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 5, 499-504.
- Yoshikawa, H. (1995). Long-term effects of early childhood programs on social outcomes and delinquency. The Future of Children, 5 (3). Los Altos, CA: The David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Center for the Future of Children, 51-75.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Thurlow, M. (1993, October). Developing a model of educational outcomes (NCEO Report No. 1). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, College of Education, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M. L., & Erickson, R. N. (1993). Educational outcomes and indicators for early childhood (Age 6). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, College of Education, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Ysseldyke, J. E. (1993). Educational outcomes and indicators for early childhood (Age 3). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, College of Education, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Ysseldyke, J. E. (1994). Educational outcomes and indicators for grade 4. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, College of Education, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Ysseldyke, J. E. (1994). Educational outcomes and indicators for grade 8. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, College of Education, National Center on Educational Outcomes.



[Measures](#)



[Bibliography](#)

[| Program Outcomes for Children |](#)

[| NOWG Home |](#)