

Community Youth Development

Community Youth Development

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

1. Name of the Planned Program

Community Youth Development

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
805	Community Institutions, Health, and Social Services	30%		30%	
806	Youth Development	70%		70%	
Total		100%		100%	

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

1. Actual amount of professional FTE/SYs expended this Program

Year: 2008	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	12.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actual	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0

2. Actual dollars expended in this Program (includes Carryover Funds from previous years)

Extension		Research	
Smith-Lever 3b & 3c 102507	1890 Extension	Hatch	Evans-Allen
	0	0	0
1862 Matching 652107	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
	0	0	0
1862 All Other 805897	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
	0	0	0

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

1. Brief description of the Activity

(Note: In 2007, Community Youth Development programs changed its name to **The Youth Work Institute (YWI)**.) Institute staff are sought after for partnerships to strengthen the youth development field, advance policy and advocacy, conduct training and infuse new research and ideas into daily practice. Efforts in 2008 strengthened outreach to the youth development field through increased use of webinars, a digital outreach center, and online courses designed to advance the field. Also, a survey of workforce issues was done this year to learn more about the needs and concerns of YWI's target audiences. (See results in the Description of Target Audience.) The Institute was successful this year in piloting and beginning the evaluation and dissemination of six signature programs. These programs aim to be accepted and valued by practitioners, and are based on bodies of research and knowledge put forth by, for example, Community Networks for Youth Development in San Francisco, UMN's Howland Endowed Chair Terri Sullivan and others.

The Quality Matters program, which focuses on change strategies at the program and organizational level, was widely utilized this year, with successes in deepening the commitment to quality youth development programming among key Minnesota organizations. (For more information, visit www.extension.umn.edu/YouthWorkInstitute.)

2. Brief description of the target audience

The audience for Youth Work Institute programs is all persons working with and on behalf of youth. According to the 2008 organizational network studies, primary contacts for the YWI are Youth Program Organizations (18% of contacts), Minnesota's social service organizations (11.5%) and public schools (10.3%). A majority of these contacts (51%) work to provide substantive information to youth-serving organizations and their staffs.

Collaborative work with the national Next Generation Youth Work Coalition's Career Pathways Project prompted a survey of workforce issues in the fall of 2007 and the winter of 2008. Two findings of this audience analysis are important to the Youth Work Institute's agenda moving forward:

- Rewards: There is a substantial group of Minnesota youth workers that are well-educated, have been in youth work for a considerable period of time, continue to work directly with youth and intend to stay in the field. This group seeks rewards and recognition for the investments they are willing to make in professional development.

- Entry and Retention: New, younger youth workers need to see a tangible career pathway that encourages artful youth workers to stay in the field, and guides new youth workers in their understanding and core knowledge around the fundamentals of positive youth development work. A certificate program linked to credit-bearing college credits will create a sense of belonging and progression in youth work that ranges from direct service to middle management to system leaders.

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures

Target for the number of persons (contacts) reached through direct and indirect contact methods

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
Plan	2250	4250	0	0
2008	5705	13766	0	0

2. Number of Patent Applications Submitted (Standard Research Output)

Patent Applications Submitted

Year	Target
Plan:	0
2008:	0

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

	Extension	Research	Total
Plan	2	0	
2008	1	0	1

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target

Output #1

Output Measure

Youth Work Institute products and publications will be disseminated statewide

Not reporting on this Output in this Annual Report

Output #2

Output Measure

The number of educational events offered to professionals will increase. (Target expressed as the number of events, classes, workshops, etc. offered.)

Year	Target	Actual
2008	175	179

Output #3

Output Measure

The number of organizations participating in capacity building consultation and technical assistance will increase. (Target expressed as number of participating organizations.)

Year	Target	Actual
2008	75	86

Output #4

Output Measure

Individuals representing diverse organizations will participate in networks and collaboratives supported by Youth Work Institute Staff. (Target expressed as number of organizations involved.)

Year	Target	Actual
2008	115	182

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

O No.	Outcome Name
1	Participants at public educational offerings will report that they increased their knowledge of current research and effective program practices. (Target expressed as a percentage of participants.)
2	Youth Development organizations participating in consultation and technical assistance will report that their participation increased their ability to effectively serve youth. (Target expressed as percentage of those in agreement.)
3	Youth-serving organizations across the state will become aligned with research-based standards of youth quality.
4	Research based work with local youth and youth workers will result in supporting youth in addressing youth gang violence.

Outcome #1

1. Outcome Measures

Not reporting on this Outcome for this Annual Report

2. Associated Institution Types

3a. Outcome Type:

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
------	---------------------	--------

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

What has been done

Results

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
---------	----------------

V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes

Appropriations changes

Public Policy changes

Brief Explanation

Reviewers should note that the absence of Experiment Station dollars for research specialists in youth development does not correspond to a lack of research base for 4-H programs. Rather, other dollars and collaborations are utilized to assure that research base.

V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies and Data Collection)

1. Evaluation Studies Planned

After Only (post program)

Before-After (before and after program)

Case Study

Evaluation Results

Key Items of Evaluation