

# Community Leadership Development for Youth and Adults

Community Leadership Development for Youth and Adults

## V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

### 1. Name of the Planned Program

Community Leadership Development for Youth and Adults

## V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

### 1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities	50%			
806	Youth Development	50%			
	<b>Total</b>	100%			

## V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

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

Year: 2008	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
<b>Plan</b>	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	4.0	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	1890 Extension	Hatch	Evans-Allen
0	0	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
290852	0	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
0	0	0	0

## V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

### 1. Brief description of the Activity

Form planning committee; assist with organizational development, fund development, and tailoring content to local community need. Provide facilitation, training, workshops, retreat, field trips and exchanges with other communities, conduct planning with education class for use of learning.

### 2. Brief description of the target audience

Targeted audience is all social groups in the community, including low-income and minority, youth (age 14-18), adults. No limitation on gender, ethnic or religious diversity, lifestyle choice, etc. Also targeted among adults will be those who are currently serving in a leadership role in an agency, organization, neighborhood, club, community, business or aspire to serve.

**V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)**

**1. Standard output measures**

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

	<b>Direct Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Direct Contacts Youth</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Youth</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan</b>	200	3000	150	1000
2008	2682	402	941	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**

	<b>Extension</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Plan</b>	0	0	
2008	0	0	0

**V(F). State Defined Outputs**

**Output Target**

**Output #1**

**Output Measure**

Number of program participants (gender and ethnicity).

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	200	396

**Output #2**

**Output Measure**

Number of programs held.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	25	37

**Output #3**

**Output Measure**

Number of volunteers who assisted.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	250	125

**V(G). State Defined Outcomes**

O No.	Outcome Name
1	Increased knowledge, understanding, and skills.
2	Increased density of leadership networks.
3	Increased engagement in leadership activities.
4	Increase in collective community action undertaken.
5	Sustained capacity for community leadership development: the number of programs which continue after at least 5 years.
6	% of participants reporting changes in changes in personal growth and self-efficacy; community commitment; shared future and purpose, community knowledge and civic engagement.

**Outcome #1**

**1. Outcome Measures**

*Not reporting on this Outcome for this Annual Report*

**2. Associated Institution Types**

**3a. Outcome Type:**

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Quantitative Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
-------------	----------------------------	---------------

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement**

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

<b>KA Code</b>	<b>Knowledge Area</b>
----------------	-----------------------

**V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)**

**External factors which affected outcomes**

Natural Disasters (drought, weather extremes, etc.)

Economy

Appropriations changes

Public Policy changes

Government Regulations

Competing Public priorities

Competing Programmatic Challenges

Populations changes (immigration, new cultural groupings, etc.)

## Brief Explanation

A number of concerns facing communities demand leadership related to community development. The contemporary arena in which community actions are pursued can seem overwhelmingly complex. For example, community organizations and political subdivisions such as cities, school districts, library boards and counties continually struggle to find qualified residents to serve as council, board and commission members.

The forces external to the community locality and structure that affect its status and its future are important to take into account in the process of formulating leadership programs. These forces include: the devolution of authority for action and service delivery to the community; the double bind created by trying to maintain quality with fewer resources; expectations for sharing power and responsibility; interdependence, diversity, collaboration, and communication; and displacement of the developmental paradigm with the globalization paradigm.

Less than the target of 72% was reached in follow-up EXCEL evaluation of 5 key areas because the data is from the benchmark study. Plans are to use these scores as the starting point for comparison of scores over time. CLD programs have participated in evaluation efforts on a voluntary basis producing a small number of cases in the benchmark data. In 2009, programs will be required to participate in an evaluation survey designed by Dr. Ken Pigg that is being used in a multi-state NRI funded project. An evaluation process is being centralized in the State CD Extension office for use with Regional staff. Administration will take place approximately 6 mos. to 1 yr. following the end of the educational program.

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

### 1. Evaluation Studies Planned

After Only (post program)

Retrospective (post program)

During (during program)

## Evaluation Results

Outcomes from EXCEL program: personal growth and self-efficacy community commitment, a shared future and purpose for the community, community knowledge, and civic engagement among participants. Increased knowledge of local, county and state resources, local history and decision-making process, local issues that affect the community, processes for getting things done in the community, and other factors related to the roles and responsibilities of community leaders, and changes in attitudes about the factors important in relationships between leaders and followers as well as individuals' assessments of their leadership capacity.

Percent of participants scoring greater than the mean on the following indices in follow up survey: 49% personal growth and self-efficacy, 53% community commitment, 53% shared future and purpose for the community, 63% community knowledge, and 54% civic engagement.

Plans are to use scores from benchmark data as the starting point for comparison of scores over time. In 2009, programs will be required to participate in an evaluation survey designed by Dr. Ken Pigg that is being used in a multi-state NRI funded project. An evaluation process is being centralized in the State CD Extension office for use with Regional staff. Administration will take place approximately 6 months to 1 year following the end of the educational program. An evaluation plan has been designed by a team of state and regional faculty that includes: a demographic questionnaire at the beginning of the program, a post/pre test (survey); individual session assessments, anticipated actions and actions taken assessment (NCR Recommendations), and creation of a process for focus groups for long-range evaluation efforts.

## Key Items of Evaluation

An NRI research project is investigating the relationship between individual level outcomes of participation in community leadership education programs with community level outcomes which are intended as a result of the intervention.

In phase 1, findings indicate the participation in community-based leadership development education programs produced significant learning when compared to those in control counties where no programs were available. There were significantly larger gains in learning and attitude changes in all six of the indices being used to measure individual-level effects or impacts. Yet to be determined is the community effect of these programs (phase 2). In early 2008 an online survey was conducted to determine the effects of participation in community-based leadership development education programs in 6 states and 24 localities. Each locality was selected based on their relative score on a "viability index" created by summing the ratios of per capita income and population growth for the locality and the state as a whole. A balance was achieved by selecting half from the upper quartile and half from the lower quartile so long as other criteria were met such as the operation of a leadership development program in the location in the past five years. In addition, a balanced group of 12 control localities was selected where no leadership development program had been held to further demonstrate the effects of such programs.

The research methodology used relied upon previously developed instrumentation that had proven reliable in several applications (Pigg, 2000). Participants were asked to rate themselves on their knowledge and skills prior to the educational program and after this experience was complete. For the control locations the same approach was used except the framework was shifted to reflect a time frame, "five years ago" vs. "today." From this data, the pre-program scores were subtracted from the post-program scores and "impact" scores were computed. In addition, the individual indicators were organized into six indices, based on previous study, for summarizing the impacts experienced. Reliability coefficients were computed for each of these indices and all produced high reliability coefficients (.8 or above), meaning these are very reliable indices.

In the treatment counties, a list of participants in leadership development programs was obtained from the respective sponsors of the programs and each person on the list was contacted by email or phone and invited to participate. Over 600 people responded to this online survey with an overall response rate of 62%; in some cases a lower number of respondents is reported due to missing data. In the control counties the number of respondents in the population was not known so the response rate could not be computed. The total number of respondents from these counties was over 150.