# ANNUAL REPORT

Tony Grampsas Youth Services Program SFY 2019 - 2020 Prepared by The Butler Institute for Families







# Acknowledgments

Butler would like to thank the Tony Grampsas Youth Services participating programs, staff, youth, parents, and stakeholders. We also would like to thank Erin Enders, Melanie Young, and Sarah Roman for their editing and design assistance.

# **Recommended Citation**

Longworth-Reed, L., Molieri, A., Holcombe, M., Roach, K., & Silverstein, M. (2020). *Tony Grampsas Youth Services (TGYS) final outcome evaluation report*. Butler Institute for Families, University of Denver.

For more information regarding this evaluation, contact Laricia Longworth-Reed, Laricia.Longworth-Reed@du.edu or (303) 871-4099.

Please visit the Butler Institute for Families website at socialwork.du.edu/butler

# **Table of Contents**

Acknowledgments	2
Recommended Citation	2
Table of Contents	3
Executive Summary	5
Evaluation Highlights	5
Introduction	8
Methods	9
Data Collection	10
Implementation Capacity Survey	10
Child/Youth Outcomes Survey	12
Survey Versions	13
Retrospective Surveys	14
Multiple Data Collection Options	14
Outcome Survey Cleaning	15
COVID-19 Responsiveness	15
Data Analysis	16
Findings	16
Respondent Characteristics	16
Children/Youth	16
Providers	18
Child/Youth and Provider Comparison	19
Implementation	21
Implementation Capacity	21

3

Intent to Stay	24
Outcome	25
Youth (age 11 and older)	26
Substance Use	29
Children (age 10 and under)/Parent Report	30
Limitations	31
Discussion and Recommendations	33
Implementation Recommendations	33
Program Staffing	33
Competency Drivers	33
Intent to Stay	33
Implementation and COVID-19	34
Impact Recommendations	34
Change Over Time	34
Substance Use	34
Conclusion	35
References	36

## **Executive Summary**

Tony Grampsas Youth Services (TGYS) is a state-administered program within the Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) that funds local prevention, intervention, and education programs for children, youth, and their families in Colorado. The portfolio of grantees for SFY 2019-2020 included 125 programs and 94 grantee organizations across the state of Colorado with the goal of preventing youth crime and violence, youth marijuana use, and child abuse and neglect.

The Butler Institute for Families at the University of Denver (Butler) conducted an evaluation across the TGYS portfolio of programs to assess program implementation and child/youth outcomes as a result of TGYS programming during SFY 2019-2020 (July 1-June 30).

The evaluation consisted of two components: (1) an implementation capacity survey administered to direct service providers and administrators within programs in the TGYS portfolio and (2) a child/youth outcome survey administered to youth ages 11 through 25 and the parents/guardians of children age 10 and younger. Participants included 1,042 staff, volunteers, and administrators who took the implementation survey, and 4,396 youth or parents/guardians of children who took the outcome survey.

## **Evaluation Highlights**

- Overall, implementation capacity scores were relatively high across the TGYS portfolio. The lowest scores related to coaching and supervision and performance assessment.
- Across the TGYS portfolio, youth and parent/guardian respondents reported a statistically significant improvement in all six measured child/youth outcomes (protective factors, positive youth development, school engagement, substance use, safety and stability, and violence prevention).
   Safety and stability, did not change significantly for youth respondents, but increased significantly according to parent responses.
- There was a statistically significant decrease in substance use after programming, with the exception of heroin, where there was no change in use.

#### Impact of COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic emerged during this reporting period, and it is important to understand the significant impact of the pandemic on TGYS grantees and their ability to provide services and participate in the evaluation. As Governor Jared Polis issued a state of emergency order for Colorado in March 2020, TGYS grantees worked urgently to continue providing services to youth and families within the guidelines of the governor's orders and in the face of sudden and lengthy school closures.

The Butler evaluation team maintained contact with TGYS staff and grantees during this critical time. The consensus among TGYS staff and Butler was to support grantees' ability to provide services above all and offer a flexible and collaborative approach to the evaluation requirements. As part of the evaluation, the Butler team had established multiple pathways to communicate with grantees including a dedicated email address, assigned points of contact, and a monthly newsletter. These communication pathways coupled with the relationships evaluators had built with grantees ensured the accessible and responsive support grantees needed to implement evaluation under these unprecedented conditions.

To better gauge the pandemic's impact on grantees while not overburdening them with additional surveys, an open-ended text question was added to the implementation survey that asked, "Briefly tell us of any changes your program has made as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic." Butler received 851 responses and conducted a thematic analysis to identify patterns and themes. Overall, organizations moved to online services whenever possible and experienced significant programmatic changes including service reductions and loss of participants. Many staff began to work remotely. Some programs reported they were forced to close completely or lost funding, affecting their ability to continue offering services during the spring and beyond. Grantees reported participants' access to reliable high-speed internet connections and devices was a significant challenge to participating in services, highlighting the digital divide and fundamental inequities in technology access. In addition, participants' ability to meet basic needs such as securing food and ensuring an income took priority over program participation. One grantee reported:

"All of our programming has been moved to an online format, so we have had to learn how to adapt our practices and curriculum to a new setting. We have also had many students who are unable to attend because they do not have internet, are working more to make ends meet for

6

families, or are too focused on schoolwork that they have no time or resources for after-school extra curriculars."

In response, many grantees stated they were able to pivot toward the emergent needs of their communities and participants beyond their service focus or mission to offer food distribution and financial assistance.

Overall, services continued across the grantee portfolio even in the face of significant disruption and distress among the communities served. As described later in this report, grantees' ability to participate in the evaluation varied during this time and there was approximately a 50% reduction in responses to the Outcome Evaluation Survey compared to last year. Given the circumstances, this points to the resilience and commitment of grantees to their missions and communities.

## Introduction

Colorado's Tony Grampsas Youth Services (TGYS) program is a state-authorized program that funds local prevention, intervention, and education programs for children, youth, and their families. The purpose of the program is to prevent youth crime and violence, youth marijuana use, and child abuse and neglect. Specific funding categories during this grant cycle included:

- Before- and After-School
- Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention
- Education
- Marijuana Prevention
- Mentoring
- Restorative Justice
- Student Dropout Prevention
- Youth Crime and Violence Prevention

TGYS contracted with the Butler Institute for Families at the University of Denver for the SFY 2019–2020 grant year to conduct an evaluation across TGYS's distinct and varied funding categories. The evaluation collected and analyzed data from grantees of various sizes with differing levels of evaluation and staffing capacity. Data were used to inform TGYS's program priorities and local grantees' program delivery. The TGYS evaluation had the following key goals:

- Assessment of the extent to which grantees use implementation science practices to ensure strong program implementation
- Assessment of child/youth outcomes after participation in programming
- Analysis and reporting of data to facilitate an understanding of relative outcomes across TGYS grantees
- Reporting of program-specific data to encourage grantees' understanding and use of data

The COVID-19 pandemic began during this reporting period and had a significant impact on grantees' service provision and their ability to participate in the evaluation. As a result, the findings reported here also reflect the challenges faced by grantees during this unprecedented time. A more in-depth discussion of the COVID-19 pandemic can be found in the Findings section of this report.

# Methods

Butler's evaluation for TGYS focused on two areas: 1) an implementation evaluation that looks at the extent to which TGYS programs are effectively implementing funded programs and 2) an outcome evaluation that focuses on collecting, analyzing, and reporting child/youth outcomes across TGYS program categories.

The implementation and outcome evaluation was designed with a one-year projection to examine shortterm participant outcomes. This evaluation looks at TGYS programming from July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020 and focuses on participant-level outcomes and program implementation drivers and competencies.

Table 1 provides a summary of the evaluation questions that were explored, the targeted method, and samples used in the evaluation design.

Evaluation Question	Methodology	Sample		
1. To what extent are grantees effectively implementing funded programs?	Implementation Survey Design	Service delivery and program management staff from each TGYS program		
2. To what extent does child/youth well-being improve as a result of TGYS programming?	Retrospective Impact Survey Design	Children/youth receiving services from TGYS programs or their parents/guardians (depending on child's age)		
3. What recommendations do findings from Question 1 and Question 2 suggest for TGYS program structure and administration?	Data Review	Results from Question 1 and Question 2		

Table 1. Summary of Evaluation Questions, Methodologies, and Samples

# **Data Collection**

## Implementation Capacity Survey

To assess the extent to which TGYS grantees effectively implemented funded programs, Butler adapted a program implementation survey tool<sup>1</sup> to collect data from each program's staff and administrators on key program implementation drivers and related factors that impact program implementation fidelity (Bertram et al., 2015). In addition to items assessing core implementation drivers, the survey also included questions related to each respondent's intent to continue working with the program. These questions were included to help programs understand facilitators of and barriers to staff retention that may help them recruit staff and minimize turnover. A qualitative question was also added to the survey to help the evaluators and TGYS respond to programs during the pandemic and understand the impact of COVID-19 on grantees without the burden of an additional survey.

Table 2 identifies and defines the constructs the implementation survey measured and provides a sample survey item related to each construct.

Survey Constructs	Construct Description	Sample Item
Recruitment and selection of staff	Activities related to recruiting, interviewing, and hiring practitioners and staff within the organization	My job description provides clear and accurate expectations for my position.
Training	Activities related to providing specialized information, instruction, or skill development in an organized way to practitioners and other key staff in an organization	I was trained prior to beginning to deliver this program.
Supervision and coaching	Supervision and coaching that may include personal observation, instruction, feedback, emotional supports, some form of training on the job, or debriefing sessions	My supervisor/coach models best practices.
Performance assessment	The nature and content of performance assessments relative	l receive regular performance assessments.

Table 2. Implementation Survey Constructs

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Adapted from: Dean Fixsen, Phyllis Panzano, Sandra Naoom, & Karen Blasé. (2008). Measures of Implementation Components of the National Implementation Research Network Frameworks. National Implementation Research Network. Original survey adaptation created under the Mile High United Way Social Innovation Fund Early Literacy Initiative (2012–2017).

Survey Constructs	Construct Description	Sample Item
	to practitioners' use of the program in the organization	
Decision-supportive data system	How organizations assess performance of various units and of the overall organization itself to inform decision-making	My organization has a data-collection and reporting system in place.
Facilitative administration	Any changes that may have occurred in the organization related to the implementation of the program	My organization solicits feedback from youth to improve program implementation.
Systems intervention	Any changes in the external system policies, management, or operating structures or methods in response to experiences gained with the operations of a program	My organization has established relationships with policy- and decision-makers.
Leadership	The nature of leadership within the organization	Leaders within the organization are good at communicating reasons for program changes.
Intent to stay	Respondent desire and intention to continue working with the program and identification of reasons for staying or leaving	Do you intend to or hope to stay in your job/role for at least the next two years?
Impact of COVID-19	Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on program operations	Briefly tell us of any changes your program has made as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

In March 2020, the evaluation team asked each TGYS grantee's designated evaluation contact to provide an email list of all program administrators and direct service providers (paid staff and volunteers). Butler used Qualtrics<sup>™</sup>, a secure electronic survey platform, to administer the annual implementation survey. An email invitation was sent to each identified respondent beginning May 6, 2020, and regular reminders were sent via email until early June to those who had not yet taken the survey. The survey distribution timeline was extended to allow organizations more time to provide email lists, as this request coincided with the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, some organizations were unable to participate as staff had been furloughed during this time.

## **Child/Youth Outcomes Survey**

Butler developed the TGYS Outcomes Measurement Survey based on (1) a review of data collected from a data capacity survey<sup>2</sup> that was administered to all TGYS grantees in February 2018 and (2) a literature search for measures, scales, and items representing

constructs of interest. Constructs of interest represent outcomes targeted by TGYS grantees and include: child abuse and neglect prevention, safety and stability, positive youth development, school engagement, violence prevention, and substance abuse prevention among youth<sup>3</sup>. The evaluation team selected or adapted survey items assessing these constructs from the external resources pictured below. The majority of TGYS survey items were taken or adapted from six existing valid and reliable measures identified in the literature (see Figure 1).

## **KEY TERMS**

**Validity** broadly refers to the ability of a measure to assess what it is intended to assess.

**Reliability** broadly refers to the ability of a measure to consistently assess what it is intended to assess.



#### Figure 1. Description of Outcome Survey Development

Table 3 describes the constructs measured and sample items from the outcome survey.

Table 3. Outcome Survey Constructs and Sample Items

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Results of the data capacity survey can be found in the TGYS Data Capacity Brief.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Outcome survey constructs are distinct and are not the same as the TGYS funding categories.

Survey Constructs	Construct Description	Sample Item
Demographics	Gender, age, race/ethnicity, home language	What language do you speak most at home?
Program involvement	Length of time in program; participation frequency	Since you started this program, about how often have you taken part in available activities?
Protective factors	Conditions or attributes in individuals, families, or communities that help people deal with stressful events	I have others who will listen when I need to talk about my problems.
Positive youth development	Youth perception of self-efficacy and attitudes toward their feelings and beliefs	I can speak up for myself.
School engagement	Youth attitudes, experience, and participation in school	I care about doing well in school.
Substance use	Drug use (administered to youth ages 11 to young adult only – typically 25 years old)	Have you ever smoked part or all of a cigarette?
Perception of substance use risk	Attitudes regarding the risk of substance use (administered to youth ages 11 to young adult only – typically 25 years old)	How much do you think people risk harming themselves when they smoke one or more packs of CIGARETTES per day?
Safety and stability	Feelings of security and safety in their home and at school	I have at least one adult I can depend on.
Violence prevention	Response to anger, bullying, conflict avoidance/de-escalation	I pushed, shoved, slapped, or kicked other students.

#### **Survey Versions**

Butler created three versions of the outcome survey and assigned programs a version based on their funding category as described below. In cases where the grantee served youth under 11 years of age, parents/guardians or program staff were asked to complete a parent/guardian version of the survey on their child's behalf.

**Group 1** – Survey constructs included protective factors, positive youth development, school engagement, and substance use and perception of substance use risk. The following funding categories administered this survey version:

- Before- and After-School
- Education

- Mentoring (includes all subtypes of mentoring)
- Student Dropout Prevention
- Marijuana Prevention (ages 11 to young adult only typically 25 years old)

**Group 2** – Survey included all Group 1 constructs plus safety and stability constructs. This group included the following funding category:

• Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention

**Group 3** – Survey included all Group 1 constructs plus the violence prevention construct. The following funding categories received this survey:

- Restorative Justice
- Violence Prevention

#### **Retrospective Surveys**

The outcome survey for TGYS is a retrospective survey. Retrospective surveys require survey respondents to complete a pre-/post-survey at one time point, asking them how they would respond to a question now as well as at some point in the past (e.g., prior to participating in the program). Retrospective surveys can help with response shift bias or inaccurate pre-test ratings and resulting negative changes between pre- and post-test scores that are mainly attributed to the shift in a respondent's improved understanding of a concept (Drennan & Hyde, 2008; Howard, 1980).

The use of a retrospective survey for TGYS data collection was also important from a practical standpoint. Grantees' capacity to track and match pre-/post-data varies broadly across the TGYS portfolio. The retrospective design eliminates the extra burden of collecting data from youth or their family twice during program administration and removes the need to match surveys across pre- and post-time points. Based on feedback from grantees during our initial data capacity survey, eliminating the need for pre-/post-data collections and matching of surveys across time was an important design consideration for this evaluation.

#### **Multiple Data Collection Options**

The Butler evaluation team provided grantees with two data collection options to accommodate individual program preference and capacity: online or paper survey administration. Online surveys were available through Qualtrics<sup>™</sup>, a secure electronic survey platform that can be accessed via computer or mobile device. Paper surveys, which were formatted for data scanning into Remark Office OMR<sup>™</sup> software, were available in PDF format for grantees to print, administer to youth or parents, and return to Butler via mail. In some cases, grantees chose to integrate the survey into their own data collection systems. Grantees who chose to do so submitted exports of their data to Butler electronically.

#### **Outcome Survey Cleaning**

After all outcome surveys were turned in, the Butler team cleaned and merged all valid data to create two final data sets. One data set contained data from surveys completed by youth; the second contained surveys completed on behalf of children by parents/guardians or program staff. Paper surveys were scanned and cleaned using Remark Office OMR<sup>™</sup> and exported to Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS)<sup>®</sup> files. After the evaluation team merged the data, there were 5,118 surveys (3,567 cases in the youth file and 1,551 surveys in the parent file). Surveys that had missing responses for all outcome questions were removed from each data set, bringing the final count of valid surveys to 4,396 (3,035 surveys in the youth file and 1,361 surveys in the parent file).

#### **COVID-19 Responsiveness**

Although no modifications were made to the outcome survey in response to the pandemic, Butler staff were in close communication with grantees to support them in their data collection efforts in light of the pandemic. Considerations were made for the many organizations that had to quickly pivot to online programming while juggling multiple competing and urgent priorities to ensure continued service delivery.

# Data Analysis

Evaluators analyzed quantitative survey data using SPSS. Descriptive statistics are reported as frequencies (percentages), averages or mean scores (*M*), and standard deviations (*SD*). Strategies for comparing groups or analyzing change included independent and paired sample *t*-tests, McNemar's tests<sup>4</sup>, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)<sup>5</sup>. Statistical significance was tested at p < .05unless there were multiple tests, which decreases the ability to identify whether findings are accurate and required a correction<sup>6</sup> to lower the threshold at which tests were determined to be statistically significant. Evaluators also calculated effect sizes to examine the magnitude of statistically significant findings for programs.

## **KEY TERMS**

**Standard deviations:** An indicator of the extent to which scores spread out from the mean; low standard deviations indicate that scores cluster near the mean, while high standard deviations indicate a greater range of responses.

**Statistical significance:** The observed differences were not likely due to chance.

# Findings

This report presents quantitative results from the battery of measures administered. Evaluators analyzed data by calculating mean scores and frequencies of the survey responses. Additionally, evaluators conducted statistical analyses to determine changes in key areas over time and differences between groups. Due to large sample sizes, these findings should be interpreted with caution, since large sample sizes often reveal statistically significant results for even small differences. These results provide a picture of progress and trends for SFY 2019–2020.

## **Respondent Characteristics**

#### Children/Youth

A total of 85 programs across the TGYS portfolio submitted outcome surveys for 4,396 children and youth in SFY 2019–2020. Outcome data presented in this report are based on data from those surveys. In comparison, all TGYS programs reported serving 83311<sup>7</sup> children/youth across 125 programs. Figure 2 shows the percentage of children/youth surveyed within each of the eight TGYS funding categories.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> McNemar's test is used to compare data that are dichotomized (yes/no) and related (before/after).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> A detailed description of ANOVA methods is provided in Appendix A.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Bonferroni correction was used to control for multiple comparisons, which can result in the identification of an incorrect statistically significant finding. This is sometimes referred to as a false-positive.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Based on data provided by grantees on year-end reporting to TGYS.



#### Figure 2. Percentage of Children/Youth Surveyed in Each TGYS Funding Category

The majority of youth in the sample were between 11 and 18 years old (71%), while 27% of youth were less than 1 year old through 10 years old, and 3% were 19 years old or older. TGYS grantees served youth and their families throughout Colorado and across rural and urban settings.

The gender identities of children/youth in the sample were close to even between female (51%) and male (46%). A smaller group identified as non-binary/third gender (1%) or preferred to self-describe (1%). TGYS programs serve a diverse population of children/youth, but the majority of are split between those of Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish origin (46%) and White or Caucasian (39%), with Black or African American children/youth being the next largest group (7%) (see Figure 3).

Figure 3. Distribution of Youth Served by Race and Ethnicity



In addition to collecting age, race, and ethnicity information, surveys also asked about the primary language spoken by children/youth served. Child/youth's primary language was most commonly English (66%), followed by Spanish (25%) or more than one primary language (4%), with less than 4% speaking some other language.

#### Providers

One thousand forty-two staff and volunteers from 114 programs participated in the implementation survey. Staff primarily identified as female (80%) followed by male (19%). A smaller group of staff identified as gender non-conforming (0.6%) or other (0.6%). TGYS Grantee program staff represent various races and ethnicities, but the majority of staff were White (70%) followed by Latinx (17%) (see Figure 4).

Figure 4. Distribution of TGYS Grantee Staff by Race and Ethnicity



#### Child/Youth and Provider Comparison

Evaluators examined whether TGYS child/youth demographics mirror those of TGYS providers. The proportion of children/youth who identified as female was 51% (see Figure 5). At 80%, TGYS providers had a larger proportion of staff who identified as female than the child/youth population. The proportion of child/youth who identified as male compared to providers who identified as male was 46% to 19%

Figure 5. Comparison of Child/Youth Served and Providers by Gender





The proportion of Hispanic/Latinx children/youth was 45% (see Figure 6). TGYS providers are composed of a smaller proportion of Hispanic/Latinx staff at 18% than the child/youth population. Conversely, the proportion of White (not Hispanic) children/youth compared to providers who serve them was 31% to 70%.

Figure 6. Comparison of Children/Youth Served and Providers by Hispanic/Latinx or White





#### Implementation

• To what extent are grantees effectively implementing funded programs?

#### Implementation Capacity

In May 2020, 1,042 TGYS grantee program staff and volunteers completed the implementation survey.<sup>8</sup> The survey asked program staff and administrators to rate their program on key program implementation drivers and related factors that impact program implementation fidelity. Results show the majority of survey respondents were direct service providers (71%) compared to organizational staff (29%). Of those staff, most respondents indicated that they've worked in their programs between one and five years (see Figure 7) and are employed part-time (see Figure 8).

## **KEY TERMS**

**Competency drivers:** The activities an organization puts in place to support the *people* delivering the program.

**Organizational drivers:** The administrative and structural processes an organization uses to facilitate effective program delivery.

Figure 7. Respondents' Length of Time Employed in Their Organization



<sup>8</sup> For more information on the implementation survey, please see Table 2 in the data collection section of this report.

#### Figure 8. Respondents' Part-Time/Full-Time Status



Across all competency and organizational drivers, the average score was 5.17 (see figure 9). Mean scores were all above 4 on a 6-point scale, with leadership, training, data use, retention and selection, and supervision and coaching scores ranging from 1.00 to 6.00. Facilitative administration scores ranged from 1.44 to 6.00, while systems intervention scores ranged from 2.25 to 6.

Direct service providers and organizational staff reported moderately high competency driver scores with a mean score of 5.10. For direct service providers only, performance assessment was the only construct with an average score below 5.0.

Scores related to organizational drivers were are also high for both direct service providers and organizational staff, with a mean of 5.20. For the purposes of this analysis, we have included the leadership construct within the organizational drivers.

Figure 9. Implementation Scale Scores by Job Type<sup>9,10</sup>

**Competency Drivers** 



### **Organizational Drivers**

Independent-samples *t*-tests were used to determine if there was any difference in how direct service providers and organizational staff rated each driver. Statistically significant differences were found between direct service providers and organizational staff for recruitment and selection<sup>11</sup> and performance assessment<sup>12</sup>, with organizational staff rating both drivers higher than direct service providers. No other differences were found to be statistically significant.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Figure 9 shows scale scores by job type, where 1= strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=slightly agree, 5=agree, 6=strongly agree.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Note, only program administrators were asked questions regarding facilitative administration and systems intervention.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Using an independent samples *t*-test, there was a significant difference between direct service providers (M = .5.40, SD = .76) and organizational staff (M = 5.54, SD = .58); t(991) = -3.20, p < .001).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Using an independent samples *t*-test, there was a significant difference between direct service providers (M = 4.67, SD = 1.19) and organizational staff (M = 5.01, SD = .87); t(934) = -4.83, p <.000).

#### Intent to Stay

The implementation survey also asked respondents about their intent to stay in their jobs and to rank their reasons to both stay and leave. Results showed that 85% of administrators intend or hope to stay in their jobs for the next two years, while 75% of practitioners say the same thing. This difference is statistically significant.<sup>13</sup> The three primary reasons all respondents (practitioners and administrators) gave for leaving their organization were: plans to make a career change, plans to move away from the area where they work, and other (see Figure 10). Overall, respondents also reported that the primary reason they stay in their job is to help children and families (see Figure 11).



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Using an independent samples *t*-test, there was a significant difference in intent to stay for practitioners (M = .75, SD = .43) and administrators (M = .85, SD = .36); t(948) = -3.27, p < .001).

#### Outcome

#### • To what extent does child/youth well-being improve as a result of TGYS programming?

The ultimate purpose of TGYS is to provide funding for prevention, intervention, and education programs for children, youth, and their families to prevent youth crime and violence, youth marijuana use, and child abuse and neglect. The evaluation team measured the impact of TGYS grantees' programming through the evaluation of several outcome domains. The information provided in Table 4 briefly describes each domain and the number of programs using each domain. The majority of programs measured protective factors, positive youth development, school engagement, and substance use and perception of substance use risk, while a smaller portion used the additional measures of violence prevention and safety and stability based on their programming type.

Domain	Description	Programs Measured ( <i>n)</i>
Protective factors	Conditions or attributes in individuals, families, or communities that help people deal with stressful events (7 point scale)	85
Positive youth development	Youth's reflections on their own self-efficacy and attitudes toward their feelings and beliefs (7 point scale)	75
School engagement	Youth attitudes, experience, and participation in school (7 point scale)	74
Perception of substance use risk	Drug use and attitudes (administered to youth ages 11 to young adult only) (5 point scale)	64
Safety and stability	Feelings of security and safety in their home and at school (7 point scale)	22
Violence prevention	Response to anger, bullying, conflict avoidance/de- escalation (7 point scale)	24

#### Table 4. Program Domains, Descriptions, and Number of Programs

#### Youth (age 11 and older)

To understand changes in youth attitudes and behaviors, we compared the means of each outcome domain before and after programming for all youth surveyed (n = 3,035).<sup>14</sup> While scale means can be compared by reviewing the mean change, it is also important to know whether the changes in mean scores over time were statistically significant. Statistically significant changes in knowledge and behavior before and after programming would suggest that programming has a meaningful effect on participant outcomes rather than the changes merely occurring by chance. To understand whether or not the programming changes outcomes, evaluators conducted paired samples *t*-tests, which compare before and after observations to understand the impact of an intervention or, in this case, programming. ).

Statistical significance was tested at p < .05. Overall, there was a statistically significant improvement in youth's means across several domains, with the exception of safety and stability, which did not show a statistically significant change. However, these findings should be interpreted with caution, since large sample sizes often reveal statistically significant results for even the smallest difference. Therefore, it is important to examine the size, or magnitude, of the change as well. To determine the strength of the change for each domain, the evaluation team also calculated effect sizes.

The meaning of effect size varies by context, but the standard interpretation offered by Cohen (1977) is: 0.8 = large, 0.5 = moderate, and 0.2 = small. The larger the effect size, the stronger the impact of programming on the outcome. Tables 5a and 5b present the effect size and the statistical significance of observed changes in

#### **KEY TERMS**

Statistical significance: The observed differences were not likely due to chance.

**Effect Size:** A quantifiable measure of the strength of an intervention.

means for each domain. Table 5b provides the detailed metrics expanding on findings presented in Table 5a including the size of the sample when paired (which are lower than the overall sample), the average score of each construct before and after program participation, the value of the statistical significance, and the effect size. An effect size of 0.00 would indicate that, on average, ratings for youth before and after programming were about the same; however, a positive effect size (above 0.00) means the after-program ratings of the domain were better than the before-program ratings of the domain. Effect sizes on TGYS domains ranged from very small (.006) to small approaching moderate (.31). The largest effect was observed for changes in school engagement, while smaller effects occurred for all other domains.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Detailed item-level descriptives for each scale are in Appendix B.

Table 5a. Results of Paired Sample T-Tests for all Domains



#### Table 5b. Data on Paired Sample T-Test Results

Outcomes	n of Pairs**	Mean Before	Mean After	Effect Size
Protective factors*	2,903	4.84	5.18	.27
Positive youth development*	2,777	5.28	5.66	.30
School engagement*	2,814	5.33	5.63	.31
Perception of substance use risk*	2,443	3.03	3.09	.05
Safety and stability	92	5.33	5.63	.006
Violence prevention*	1,267	2.75	2.61	.20

\*Statistically significant, p <.05.

\*\*Paired samples may be smaller than overall sample due to the requirement that each respondent have a complete pair of data on each outcome.

#### Substance Use

In addition to collecting data on substance use and attitudes, evaluators also assessed use of illicit substances in the 30 days before programming began and in the 30 days before the time of survey. A little over a quarter (28%) of youth indicated use of any substance 30 days prior to beginning participation in TGYS programming. Of those who reported use, there was a statistically significant decrease<sup>15</sup> in substance use reported in the 30 days before the time of the survey for all substances, with the exception of heroin, which did not change. Figure 12 demonstrates the change in the percentage of youth who used illicit substances before and after programming.



Figure 12. Change in Percentage of Youth Who Self-Reported Illicit Substance Use

## **KEY FINDING**

The majority of factors for youth improved significantly in all domains, with notable improvements in positive youth development and school engagement and decreases in substance use.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> McNemar's test determined that there was a statistically significant difference in the proportions before- and after programming, p < .05.

#### Children (age 10 and under)/Parent Report

To understand whether programming affected changes in outcomes on parent measures of protective factors, positive youth development, school engagement, safety and stability, and violence prevention, evaluators again conducted paired samples *t*-tests, which compare before and after observations to understand the impact of programming on parent ratings of the domains. Results from the *t*-tests showed statistically significant changes from before and after programming in most domains. Again, these findings should be interpreted with caution due to the large paired sample size (n = 1,119). Evaluators also examined effect sizes. Tables 6a and 6b contain the effect size and the statistical significance of observed changes in means for each domain parents rated. Effect sizes on TGYS domains parents rated ranged from small/moderate (.36) to moderate (.56).

Table 6a. Results of Paired Sample T-Tests for All Domains



#### Table 6b. Data on Paired Sample T-Test Results

Outcomes	n of Pairs**	Mean Before	Mean After	Effect Size
Protective factors*	1,119	5.33	5.78	.56
Positive youth development*	311	4.96	5.55	.53
School engagement*	273	5.10	5.50	.43
Safety and stability*	960	6.09	6.50	.36

Violence prevention	8	4.70	3.82	Insufficient sample to test for statistical differences or effect

\*Statistically significant, p <.05.

\*\*Paired samples may be smaller than overall sample due to the requirement that each respondent have a complete pair of data on each outcome.

# • To what extent do youth/child outcomes differ by demographics, program participation, and funding category?

To understand group differences on outcome domains, evaluators conducted repeated measures ANOVAs<sup>16</sup>. Repeated measures ANOVA allows us to examine the difference between means for related variables. For example, are changes in school engagement related to gender, how much children/youth participated in programming, or the type of programming they received? Evaluators conducted a repeated measures ANOVA to understand if differences in gender, race, language, program participation, or the funding category of programs had an impact on outcomes from before to after programming. Analyses indicated that there was no statistically significant<sup>17</sup> difference in the change in before and after scores as a result of program participation or demographic characteristics.

## Limitations

This evaluation has the following limitations that should be considered in interpreting results:

**Level of evaluation**: The current evaluation is designed to collect common data about child/youth outcomes across a large portfolio of grantees with a wide variety of programming strategies and objectives. The survey items for the study are not targeted to specific programming nuances and may not measure unique outcomes for any particular program. Likewise, in some cases the tools may measure outcomes that particular programs may not have programming to address. However, the surveys should assess overall outcomes that TGYS largely expects its funded programs to address, and readers should assess results with this context in mind.

**Retrospective surveys**: While retrospective surveys have many benefits that have been explained in this report, they also have limitations. In particular, for programs that run for a longer period of time (e.g., the whole school year), respondents may have issues recalling their specific experiences from before they participated in programming. Respondents may also rate post-programming questions higher due to social desirability. The evaluation team believes these limitations are outweighed by the benefits of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> A detailed description of ANOVA methods is provided in Appendix A.

 $<sup>^{17}</sup>$  Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons using ANOVA was *p*=.008.

reducing survey burden on respondents and programs and by eliminating the need to match individuals' pre-/post-surveys over time.

**Response bias**: Response bias refers to the tendency of survey participants to answer questions untruthfully, usually to portray themselves in a more socially desirable way. For youth, this can show up particularly in questions that ask about behaviors they may know adults don't want them to engage in, like substance use. This is a limitation in any survey of youth, including this one. The evaluation team tried to manage this limitation with carefully worded survey questions from valid and reliable survey instruments. Evaluators also encouraged programs to administer surveys in a way that will give youth as much privacy as possible when answering questions. However, we recognize that there are limitations to our control of this and identify it here for that purpose.

## COVID-19

While the COVID-19 pandemic's long-term impact on communities, youth, and families is still unknown, there was measurable short-term impact on TGYS grantees. Beginning in March 2020, when stay-at-home orders were issued, grantees scrambled to continue service provision online or in-person in accordance with directives from the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment. Survey data from participants highlighted the inequitable access to computers and the internet. Outcome survey participation dropped by about 50% from the previous funding year. Thus, these results reflect those participants who had access to services and TGYS grantees who were able to continue providing services.

## **Discussion and Recommendations**

# • What recommendations do findings from this report suggest for TGYS program structure and administration?

The recommendations offered below were developed from the findings in this report; however, it is important to highlight that these findings reflect the implementation and outcomes found at the conclusion of funding for the 2017-2020 grantee cohort, and the 2020-2023 cohort may be composed of different organizations.

### Implementation Recommendations

#### **Program Staffing**

Analysis of program staff and child/youth demographics revealed a disparity in gender and racial/ethnic alignment between staff and children/youth. Research indicates that child/youth engagement in programming and resulting outcomes are improved when children/youth can form meaningful relationships with staff who reflect their own lived experiences (Grossman & Bulle, 2006). TGYS may consider providing training, technical assistance, or other resources to programs on how to recruit and retain a diverse staff who reflect their population.

#### **Competency Drivers**

Overall implementation capacity scores were relatively high across the TGYS portfolio; the lowest scores were related to coaching and supervision and performance assessment. To help programs continue to enhance their organizational capacity, TGYS might consider creating opportunities for grantee mentoring or sharing processes and protocols across grantees, allowing programs to share their strategies and approaches with programs that have less established processes.

#### Intent to Stay

Results of intent-to-stay analyses indicated that while most practitioners and administrators intend or hope to stay in their jobs for the next two years, the percent of practitioners who reported an intent to stay was lower by a statistically significant amount for practitioners than for administrators. The top reasons practitioners gave for considering leaving were to make a career change, other, or to move away from the area. Respondents were asked to write in their reasons for selecting other, with most indicating they were leaving for reasons related to their education (either graduating and moving on to another job or continuing their education). Based on these reasons, it may be important for TGYS to work with grantees to consider what factors may cause some employees to pursue career changes or to move away from the area. Worker retention can be a complex problem that may be different from community to community within Colorado, and the impact the COVID-19 pandemic has had on employees' opinions is unclear. These results suggest the opportunity for initial dialogues about systemic and policy solutions.

#### Implementation and COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic will, in all likelihood, continue into the upcoming year. Subsequently, grantees may continue to provide a blend of both in-person and online programming with the possibility of switching to fully online programming in response to changes in infection rates. The pandemic has exacerbated the long-standing digital divide that adversely impacts children/youth who live on low income and rural areas (Stelitano et al., 2020). TGYS may consider exploring opportunities to bridge this gap thereby reducing inequities in access to online programming.

## Impact Recommendations

#### Change Over Time

Results showed that across the TGYS portfolio, youth and parent respondents reported a statistically significant improvement in five of the six measured outcomes (protective factors, positive youth development, school engagement, substance use, and violence prevention). The sixth outcome, safety and stability, did not change significantly for youth respondents, but increased significantly according to parent responses. Results indicate that the strength of these changes across all outcomes was generally small to moderate. These findings suggest that TGYS programming is generally having a positive effect on outcomes of interest, and there may be an opportunity to strengthen those effects. Stronger program effects come from interventions that are:

- Well defined
- Consistently implemented
- Able to clearly address the outcomes of interest
- Of sufficient dosage and duration to have a strong impact

To strengthen effect sizes, TGYS should continue efforts to fund programs that meet these criteria and to support those that need additional assistance with defining and refining programming with these criteria in mind.

#### Substance Use

Approximately, 28% of respondents reported experience with substance use in the 30 days prior to beginning programming. This is lower across all substances compared to statewide past 30 day use rates (Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, 2019). Results indicate that for those youth who had experience with substance use, there was a statistically significant decrease in substance use after programming, with the exception of heroin which did not change. TGYS might consider continuing to work with substance use prevention programs to enhance programming, particularly for heroin and opioids.

# Conclusion

The SFY 2019–2020 TGYS evaluation had two key components: (1) an assessment of program implementation, as reported by program staff, volunteers, and administrators and (2) an evaluation of child/youth outcomes relative to six areas of desired change.

The evaluation team collected 1,042 implementation surveys and more than 4,396 children/youth outcome surveys across 114 and 72 programs, respectively. Results indicate that reports of strong program implementation practices are generally high with opportunities for additional support for coaching and supervision and performance assessment. Findings also indicate that, overall, youth and parents are reporting statistically significant improvements in all outcomes of interest. Within the substance use area, on average 28% of respondents indicated having engaged in substance use and that percentage decreased after programming for all substances except heroin.

## References

- Bertram, R., Blasé, K., & Fixsen, D. (2015). Improving programs and outcomes: Implementation frameworks and organization change. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 25(4), 477–487.
  Cohen, J. (1977). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Routledge.
- Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment. (2019). *Healthy kids Colorado survey data*. Retrieved October 22, 2020, from <u>https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/cdphe/healthy-kids-</u>colorado-survey-data
- Drennan, J., & Hyde, A. (2008). Controlling response shift bias: The use of the retrospective pre-test design in the evaluation of a master's program. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,* 33(6), 699–709. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930701773026</u>
- Grossman, J., & Bulle, M. (2006). Review of what youth programs do to increase the connectedness of youth with adults. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 39*(6), 788-799.
- Howard, G. (1980). Response-shift bias: A problem in evaluating interventions with pre/post selfreports. *Evaluation Review*, 4(1), 93–106.
- Stelitano, L., Doan, S., Woo, A., Diliberti, M., Kaufman, J., & Henry, D. (2020). The digital divide and COVID-19: Teachers' perceptions of inequities in students' internet access and participation in remote learning. Rand Corporation. <u>https://doi.org/10.7249/RRA134-3</u>

## Appendix A: ANOVA procedures

To assess differences between groups on identified outcomes, multiple analyses using repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) were conducted. Initial descriptive analysis was performed to identify outliers for each analysis. If cases were identified, they were excluded from the sample when scores were greater than two standard deviations from the treatment level means. The normality of program scores for each level of the independent variable was then assessed following the removal of outliers to determine normality. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was also assessed using Levene's statistic, if statistically significant, Welch's F test was used to compare means and followed up with post-hoc testing robust to violations of the assumption of homogeneity of variance. When group sample sizes were approximately equal, the sample data were considered robust to violation of homogeneity of variance and analysis proceeded. Sphericity was also examined using Mauchley's test, when violated further analyses did not proceed. Due to the nature of the multiple comparisons on the dependent variable required for the analysis, Bonferroni correction was used to control for multiple comparisons. Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons using ANOVA was p=.008.

# Appendix B: Item Level Frequencies and Descriptives

For each question, please select the option that describes how often the following statements are true for you or your family BEFORE THE PROGRAM and NOW.		SD	Mean	Never	Very Rarely	Rarely	About Half the Time	Frequently	Very Frequently	Always
Protective Factors (frequency scale)							Percent	%		
In my family, we talk about	Before	1.83	4.25	9.6	9.9	14.4	20.3	19.0	11.4	15.3
problems.	Now	1.75	4.64	6.5	7.0	10.8	19.3	22.3	16.1	18.0
When we argue, my family listens	Before	1.89	4.34	10.5	9.0	11.9	20.9	17.7	12.2	17.8
to "both sides of the story".	Now	1.82	4.65	7.8	7.0	9.7	19.5	20.5	14.7	20.8
In my family, we take time to	Before	1.80	4.68	6.6	7.4	11.0	17.9	20.9	15.5	20.7
listen to each other.	Now	1.69	5.01	4.5	5.5	7.9	15.7	22.7	19.5	24.1
My family pulls together when	Before	1.79	4.91	6.3	5.4	9.0	16.9	20.7	15.9	25.8
things are stressful.	Now	1.70	5.20	4.6	4.2	6.7	14.3	20.7	19.6	29.9
My family is able to solve our	Before	1.64	5.20	3.7	4.2	6.8	15.9	21.2	19.8	28.3
problems.	Now	1.53	5.45	2.6	3.2	5.0	12.5	21.4	23.6	31.8

For each question, please select the option that describes how much you agree or disagree with the statement BEFORE THE PROGRAM and NOW.		SD	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
Protective Factors (agreement scale)							Percent	%		
I have others who will listen when I need to talk about my	Before	1.74	5.16	4.4	5.3	6.4	18.9	13.0	22.1	29.8
problems.	Now	1.56	5.67	3.0	2.8	3.6	12.2	11.9	26.4	40.1
When I am lonely, there are	Before	1.84	5.05	5.8	6.5	8.5	15.3	13.5	20.8	29.6
several people I can talk to.	Now	1.68	5.52	4.2	3.6	5.2	11.6	11.9	24.9	38.5
If there is a crisis, I have others I	Before	1.71	5.29	4.0	5.1	6.1	15.3	14.3	22.5	32.7
can talk to.	Now	1.55	5.73	2.9	3.0	3.4	10.5	11.7	26.7	41.9
If I needed help with school, I wouldn't know where to go for	Before	1.97	3.15	27.9	19.8	11.5	15.8	8.3	8.0	8.7
help.	Now	2.12	3.02	36.4	17.9	9.1	10.6	6.8	8.5	10.8

For each question, please select the option that describes how much you agree or disagree with the statement BEFORE THE PROGRAM and NOW.		SD	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
Positive Youth Development										
(agreement scale)							Percent	%		
I feel good about my future.	Before	1.69	5.26	4.7	3.5	5.6	18.2	14.2	23.4	30.5
	Now	1.54	5.72	3.3	2.3	2.7	11.9	11.5	26.4	41.7
I finish the things I start.	Before	1.59	5.14	3.3	3.7	8.1	17.1	18.6	26.2	23.0
	Now	1.45	5.54	2.1	2.6	4.4	12.6	16.8	31.2	30.2

I stand up for what I believe in.	Before	1 52	5 63	2.5	2.5	37	13.4	15 3	23.6	38.9
	Defore	1.52	5.05	2.5	2.5	5.7	10.4	15.5	25.0	50.5
	Now	1.39	5.94	2.1	1.7	1.8	9.1	12.5	25.1	47.6
I take responsibility for what I do.	Before	1.47	5.55	2.2	2.5	4.3	13.4	15.8	30.2	31.6
	Now	1.27	5.91	1.5	1.1	2.1	8.6	13.6	32.5	40.5
I can speak up for myself.	Before	1.64	5.49	3.6	2.7	6.2	13.1	14.7	22.1	37.5
	Now	1.44	5.88	2.3	1.5	4.0	8.3	12.3	25.1	46.6
I control my anger when I have a	Before	1.71	5.21	5.1	3.8	6.6	16.1	14.8	25.2	28.4
disagreement with a friend.	Now	1.52	5.63	3.0	2.4	3.8	12.2	13.4	28.9	36.3
I respect other points of view.	Before	1.40	5.66	1.7	2.0	3.4	13.1	15.9	29.1	34.9
	Now	1.34	5.93	1.8	1.5	1.9	9.3	11.6	30.0	43.9
I express my feelings in healthy	Before	1.76	4.96	6.5	5.0	7.0	18.2	16.4	24.5	22.4
ways.	Now	1.62	5.39	4.3	3.1	4.4	14.5	15.1	27.9	30.5
I am comfortable sharing my thoughts and feelings with my	Before	2.05	4.75	11.7	7.0	7.4	15.3	14.1	15.9	28.5
guardian/parent.	Now	1.96	5.12	9.2	5.1	5.6	12.7	13.3	20.0	34.0

For the question below, please select the option that best describes YOUR feelings or experiences BEFORE THE PROGRAM and NOW.		SD	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree			
School Engagement (agreement scale)				Percent %									
I care about doing well in school.	Before	1.64	5.75	3.5	3.5	3.2	11.0	10.0	20.3	48.5			
	Now	1.36	6.21	2.4	1.7	1.1	6.2	6.5	19.6	62.4			

For the question below, please select the option that best describes YOUR feelings or experiences BEFORE THE PROGRAM and NOW.		SD	Mean	Mostly A's	Mostly B's	Mostly C's	Mostly D's	Mostly F's
School Engagement (multiple choice)						Percent %		
In general my grades are	Before	1.17	2.20	34.4	31.0	20.4	8.5	5.7
	Now	0.97	1.89	41.8	36.4	15.4	4.0	2.4

For the question below, please select the option that best describes YOUR feelings or experiences BEFORE THE PROGRAM and NOW.		SD	Mean	Never	Very Rarely	Rarely	About Half the Time	Frequently	Very Frequently	Always		
School Engagement (frequency scale)				Percent %								
In general I go to school	Before	1.22	6.26	1.3	1.2	1.9	5.1	8.2	21.1	61.3		
	Now	0.99	6.46	0.9	0.3	1.0	2.4	7.0	21.8	66.6		
I get in trouble at school	Before	1.57	2.53	29.6	31.6	18.3	8.1	4.8	4.3	3.3		
	Now	1.44	2.28	35.8	32.0	17.4	6.2	3.6	2.5	2.6		

Think back over your entire lifetime and try to remember whether you have EVER used any of the following substances. If you have used any of them, what was your age the FIRST TIME you used the substance?	SD	Mean	Never Used	10 or Younger	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 or Older
Substance Use and Attitudes (age scale)						Perce	ent %				
HAVE YOU EVER SMOKED PART OR ALL OF A CIGARAETTE?	1.58	.052	87.1	2.4	1.5	1.4	2.1	1.8	1.6	1.0	1.1
HAVE YOU EVER USED ANY OTHER TOBACCO PRODUCT?	1.72	.066	84.8	1.5	1.4	2.1	3.0	3.1	2.2	0.9	1.0
HAVE YOU EVER HAD A DRINK OF AN ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE? (Do not include any time when you only had a sip or two from a drink.)	2.23	1.21	71.9	4.4	1.8	3.8	4.1	5.1	4.2	2.9	1.6
HAVE YOU EVER USED MARIJUANA OR HASHISH?	2.11	0.99	78.8	1.8	1.4	2.7	3.6	4.1	3.6	2.2	1.8
HAVE YOU EVER USED METHAMPHETAMINE?	0.63	.07	98.2	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2
HAVE YOU EVER USED COCAINE?	0.93	0.15	96.8	0.5	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.7	0.3	0.4
HAVE YOU EVER USED HEROIN?	0.55	0.06	98.5	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
HAVE YOU EVER USED HALLUCINOGENS, like LSD, ecstasy, PCP, or peyote?	1.20	0.25	95.1	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.7	0.9	1.0	0.7	0.7
HAVE YOU EVER USED INHALANTS OR SNIFFED SUBSTANCES?	0.89	0.16	95.6	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.4
HAVE YOU EVER USED PRESCRIPTION DRUGS WITHOUT A DOCTOR'S ORDERS?	1.17	0.27	93.3	1.3	0.6	0.9	0.7	1.0	1.1	0.4	0.6

For each question, please select the option that shows HOW MUCH you think people RISK HARMING themselves physically or in other ways when they do the following things BEOFRE THE PROGRAM and NOW.		SD	Mean	No Risk	Slight Risk	Moderate Risk	Great Risk	Don't Know or Can't Say
Substance Use and Attitudes (risk scale)						Percent %		
When they smoke one or more packs of CIGARETTES	Before	1.23	2.37	16.4	4.9	14.3	54.0	10.3
per day?	Now	1.21	2.43	15.9	3.5	11.8	59.5	9.3
When they smoke MARIJUANA once or twice a week?	Before	1.35	1.88	23.0	17.1	20.8	27.0	12.2

	Now	1.33	1.93	21.5	16.3	21.0	30.1	11.1
When they use COCAINE once or twice a week?	Before	1.24	2.46	16.1	2.9	12.6	55.7	12.7
	Now	1.21	2.49	15.5	2.6	10.3	60.1	11.5
When they use METHAMPHETAMINE once or twice a	Before	1.26	2.55	16.1	2.2	9.0	55.9	16.7
week?	Now	1.23	2.58	15.4	1.9	7.7	59.7	15.4
When they have five or more drinks of an ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE once or twice a week?	Before	1.26	2.05	16.8	15.5	24.6	32.0	11.2
	Now	1.24	2.16	15.4	12.6	23.9	37.0	11.1

Think about your use of substances before you first started participating in this program and now. Please select the option that best reflects your use of each substance 30 days before starting this program AND within the last 30 days.		SD	Mean	Never	1-5 Times	6-19 Times	20-23 Times	40 Times or More
Substance Use and Attitudes (frequency scale)						Percent %		
How many times did you smoke part or all of a	Before	0.69	0.18	91.0	4.4	1.8	0.8	2.0
cigarette?	Now	0.60	0.13	93.6	2.9	1.5	0.4	1.6
How many times did you use other tobacco products?	Before	0.69	0.18	88.6	4.9	1.7	1.3	3.4
	Now	0.73	0.20	91.0	3.9	1.7	1.1	2.3
How many times did you drink one or more drinks of	Before	0.75	0.32	79.8	12.7	4.7	1.4	1.4
	Now	0.67	0.24	84.6	10.1	3.2	0.8	1.3
How many times did you use marijuana or hashish?	Before	0.96	0.36	83.7	6.9	3.2	2.1	4.2
	Now	0.81	0.26	87.5	5.9	2.3	1.6	2.7
How many times did you use methamphetamine?	Before	0.40	0.05	98.0	0.7	0.3	0.3	0.7
	Now	0.33	0.03	98.8	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.6
How many times did you use crack of crack cocaine?	Before	0.38	0.05	97.5	1.2	0.6	0.1	0.6
	Now	0.36	0.04	98.4	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.6

How many times did you use heroin?	Before	0.31	0.03	98.7	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.4
	Now	0.37	0.04	98.7	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.8
How many times did you use hallucinogens?	Before	0.38	0.06	96.3	2.3	0.5	0.5	0.4
	Now	0.37	0.5	97.5	1.3	0.4	0.2	0.6
How many times did you use inhalants?	Before	0.37	0.05	97.3	1.3	0.6	0.3	0.5
	Now	0.36	0.04	98.1	0.9	0.2	0.2	0.6
How many times did you use prescription drugs without a prescription?	Before	0.42	0.08	94.9	3.1	1.1	0.4	0.4
	Now	0.41	0.06	96.7	2.0	0.4	0.2	0.7

For each question, please select the option that shows HOW MUCH you think people RISK HARMING themselves physically or in other ways when they do the following things BEOFRE THE PROGRAM and NOW.		SD	Mean	No Risk	Slight Risk	Moderate Risk	Great Risk	Don't Know or Can't Say
Substance Use and Attitudes (risk scale)						Percent %		
When they smoke one or more packs of CIGARETTES	Before	1.23	2.37	16.4	4.9	14.3	54.0	10.3
per day?	Now	1.21	2.43	15.9	3.5	11.8	59.5	9.3
When they smoke MARIJUANA once or twice a week?	Before	1.35	1.88	23.0	17.1	20.8	27.0	12.2
	Now	1.33	1.93	21.5	16.3	21.0	30.1	11.1
When they use COCAINE once or twice a week?	Before	1.24	2.46	16.1	2.9	12.6	55.7	12.7
	Now	1.21	2.49	15.5	2.6	10.3	60.1	11.5
When they use METHAMPHETAMINE once or twice a	Before	1.26	2.55	16.1	2.2	9.0	55.9	16.7
week?	Now	1.23	2.58	15.4	1.9	7.7	59.7	15.4
When they have five or more drinks of an ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE once or twice a week?	Before	1.26	2.05	16.8	15.5	24.6	32.0	11.2
	Now	1.24	2.16	15.4	12.6	23.9	37.0	11.1

For each question, please select the option that best describes how much you agree or disagree with the statement BEFORE THE PROGRAM and NOW.		SD	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
Safety and Stability (agreement scale)							Percent	%		
I have at least one adult I can depend	Before	1.73	5.88	5.9	2.0	2.9	6.9	7.8	18.6	55.9
on.	Now	1.94	5.92	9.8	2.2	1.1	3.3	5.4	13.0	65.2
I have a place to go when I feel	Before	1.82	5.62	6.9	3.0	3.0	8.9	10.9	20.8	46.5
unsafe.	Now	1.87	5.77	8.8	2.2	1.1	6.6	7.7	19.8	53.8
I feel safe and secure at home.	Before	1.78	5.91	7.0	2.0	2.0	7.0	4.0	20.0	58.0
	Now	1.89	6.01	10.0	1.1	4.4	1.1	17.8	65.6	10.0
I feel safe at school.	Before	1.71	5.44	5.9	3.0	4.0	8.9	18.8	25.7	33.7
	Now	1.84	5.52	8.9	2.2	2.2	6.7	14.4	25.6	40.0

For the question below, please select the option that best describes how much you agree or disagree with the statement BEFORE THE PROGRAM and NOW.		Std. Deviation	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
Violence Prevention (agreement scale)							Percent %	%		
I know what a healthy relationship	Before	1.65	5.51	4.7	3.3	2.8	12.4	14.5	26.9	35.5
looks like.	Now	1.49	6.05	4.1	1.5	1.0	6.7	6.8	25.9	54.1

For each question, please select the option that best describes YOUR feelings or experiences BEFORE THE PROGRAM and NOW.		Std. Deviation	Mean	Never	Very Rarely	Rarely	About Half the Time	Frequently	Very Frequently	Always
Violence Prevention (frequency scale)							Percent 9	6		
I get angry	Before	1.54	3.81	5.3	13.5	28.6	22.3	15.5	7.4	7.3
	Now	1.50	3.61	5.8	16.7	31.2	21.0	13.1	6.6	5.6
I pushed, shoved, slapped, or kicked	Before	1.43	1.95	55.0	20.7	12.7	4.9	2.2	1.8	2.7
other students	Now	1.43	1.86	59.7	19.9	9.7	4.1	1.4	2.5	2.7
I teased other students	Before	1.44	2.00	53.2	21.1	12.7	5.2	3.4	2.1	2.2
	Now	1.40	1.90	57.3	19.8	11.1	5.5	2.2	1.9	2.1
I threatened to hit or hurt another	Before	1.37	1.70	69.5	69.5	69.5	69.5	69.5	69.5	69.5
student	Now	1.21	1.55	74.4	12.0	6.3	2.5	1.8	1.6	1.3
I protected someone from a bully	Before	2.00	3.64	20.8	20.8	20.8	20.8	20.8	20.8	20.8
	Now	2.08	3.87	19.5	11.2	13.9	15.4	13.9	9.9	16.1

## Parent Outcome Survey Frequencies

Please select the response that describes how often the following statements are true for your family.		SD	Mean	Never	Very Rarely	Rarely	About Half the Time	Frequently	Very Frequently	Always
Protective Factors (frequency scale)							Percent	%		
In my family, we talk about problems.	Before	1.47	5.20	1.6	3.8	6.3	17.6	28.5	16.6	25.6
	Now	1.18	5.83	1.2	0.9	1.7	6.3	24.2	31.4	34.5
When we argue, my family listens to "both sides of the story."	Before	1.53	5.08	2.1	4.8	7.2	18.8	25.3	19.4	22.5
	Now	1.30	5.71	1.5	1.8	2.0	8.5	24.0	29.1	33.1
In my family, we take time to listen to	Before	1.40	5.35	1.7	2.0	5.2	15.5	27.9	21.4	26.2
each other.	Now	1.08	5.97	0.5	0.5	0.8	6.9	21.6	30.6	39.0
My family pulls together when things	Before	1.37	5.56	0.9	1.5	4.6	15.5	23.8	18.9	34.8
are stressful.	Now	1.07	6.11	0.4	0.4	1.0	5.8	19.4	24.6	48.5
Before the program - My family is able to solve our problems.	Before	1.35	5.42	1.4	1.7	3.9	15.8	28.0	22.0	27.2
	Now	1.12	5.89	0.7	0.5	1.2	7.6	22.2	32.1	35.7

Please select the response that best describes how much you agree or disagree with the statement.		SD	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree			
Protective Factors (agreement scale)				Percent %									
I have others who will listen when I need to talk about my problems.	Before	1.51	5.53	2.3	3.0	3.5	16.5	12.6	28.9	66.9			
	Now	1.14	6.10	0.9	1.1	1.7	5.8	8.2	38.6	43.6			
	Before	1.54	5.49	2.4	3.9	3.9	15.0	14.0	28.8	32.2			

When I am lonely, there are several people I can talk to.	Now	1.29	5.98	1.8	1.8	1.2	8.1	8.8	36.1	42.3
I would have no idea where to turn if my family needed food or housing.	Before	1.91	3.16	28.8	17.1	10.1	17.4	11.4	9.9	5.2
	Now	2.24	3.12	37.7	17.6	6.8	7.8	4.6	14.0	11.5
I wouldn't know where to go for help if I had trouble making ends meet.	Before	1.91	3.20	27.0	17.6	11.1	17.8	10.4	10.7	5.3
	Now	2.13	3.01	37.0	18.4	8.2	9.5	6.2	11.4	9.4
If there is a crisis I have others I can	Before	1.57	5.49	2.8	3.6	4.2	14.5	13.9	27.9	33.1
talk to.	Now	1.38	6.01	1.8	2.9	2.3	6.1	7.2	31.7	48.0
If I needed help finding a job, I wouldn't know where to go for help.	Before	1.95	3.23	28.3	15.7	10.0	20.0	9.2	10.0	6.8
	Now	2.18	3.14	36.8	15.3	8.1	10.5	5.6	14.2	9.6
There are many times when I don't	Before	1.82	3.64	16.0	18.7	9.9	19.1	18.7	12.1	5.5
know what to do as a parent.	Now	2.02	3.42	22.0	22.1	12.3	10.4	10.0	15.3	7.8
I know how to help my child learn.	Before	1.48	5.29	2.6	3.3	4.8	17.1	17.6	33.1	21.5
	Now	1.28	5.97	2.0	1.6	1.8	6.3	8.2	40.9	39.3
My child misbehaves just to upset	Before	1.75	2.75	35.0	20.1	7.9	20.2	9.2	3.9	3.7
me.	Now	1.93	2.81	38.4	19.1	6.8	12.6	9.2	10.0	4.0

Please select the response that describes how often the following statements are true for your family.		SD	Mean	Never	Very Rarely	Rarely	About Half the Time	Frequently	Very Frequently	Always
Protective Factors (frequency scale)							Percent	%		
I praise my child when he/she	Before	1.24	5.84	1.0	1.2	2.3	7.9	22.3	26.4	38.9
behaves well.	Now	0.99	6.31	0.6	0.6	0.8	2.5	11.5	29.0	55.0
When I discipline my child, I lose	Before	1.42	2.28	39.0	25.7	18.3	7.7	5.8	2.5	1.2
control.	Now	1.41	2.05	45.6	30.0	13.1	3.9	1.9	3.5	2.0

I am happy being with my child.	Before	0.94	6.4382	0.2	0.4	0.6	3.9	10.6	18.0	66.3
	Now	0.73	6.64	0.1	0.2	0.3	1.7	5.2	18.1	74.4
My child and I are very close to each	Before	0.98	6.34	0.2	0.2	0.9	5.0	12.1	21.5	60.2
other.	Now	0.80	6.64	0.2	0.2	0.2	2.2	7.2	20.4	69.6
I am able to soothe my child when	Before	1.23	5.78	0.3	1.7	2.5	10.1	22.1	27.4	35.9
he/she is upset.	Now	1.00	6.13	0.4	0.6	0.7	5.4	12.2	38.5	42.2
I spend time with my child doing what he/she likes to do.	Before	1.16	5.63	0.4	0.8	2.9	11.5	25.9	32.3	26.1
	Now	0.98	6.01	0.3	0.3	1.1	5.0	18.7	38.6	36.0

Please select the response that best describes how much you agree or disagree with the statement.		SD	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
Positive Youth Development (agreement scale)							Percent	%		
My child feels good about his/her	Before	1.48	5.12	2.2	3.7	3.4	28.6	15.8	25.2	21.1
future.	Now	1.23	5.76	0.6	1.6	2.9	12.3	10.4	42.4	29.8
My child finishes the tasks he/she	Before	1.49	4.69	3.1	7.2	6.3	27.4	23.3	22.3	10.4
starts.	Now	1.29	5.34	0.3	4.5	4.2	13.0	23.1	39.3	15.6
My child stands up for what he/she	Before	1.41	5.11	1.8	2.6	5.1	25.0	23.5	22.4	19.5
believes in.	Now	1.13	5.74	0.4	1.1	3.1	9.2	16.8	44.7	24.8
My child takes responsibility for what	Before	1.51	4.74	3.7	5.9	4.4	31.1	21.6	20.1	13.2
he/she does.	Now	1.25	5.40	0.4	2.3	6.1	13.6	20.1	40.9	16.7
My child speaks up for him/herself.	Before	1.41	5.05	2.6	1.8	5.5	26.8	21.3	25.0	16.9
	Now	1.15	5.68	1.2	1.2	2.3	8.5	18.8	46.5	21.5
My child controls his/her anger when	Before	1.64	4.65	5.5	5.8	8.7	27.8	17.5	20.7	14.2
sne has a disagreement with a friend.	Now	1.42	5.30	2.3	3.0	5.7	13.7	20.2	36.5	18.6
	Before	1.58	4.77	5.9	2.9	6.6	28.9	17.9	24.2	13.6

My child respects other people's point of view, even if he/she disagrees.	Now	1.41	5.322	3.4	1.5	4.5	15.2	17.4	41.3	16.7
My child expresses feelings in healthy	Before	1.58	4.83	3.7	4.3	10.7	24.0	16.7	25.0	15.7
ways.	Now	1.29	5.51	1.0	1.4	6.2	11.3	19.2	38.8	22.0
My child is comfortable sharing	Before	1.60	5.14	4.4	2.2	4.8	25.0	14.7	24.6	24.3
his/her thoughts and feelings with me.	Now	1.26	5.79	1.5	1.1	2.7	8.8	14.5	39.7	31.7

Select the response that best describes YOUR feelings or experience.		SD	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree			
School Engagement (agreement scale)				Percent %									
My child cares about doing well in	Before	1.62	5.37	4.6	2.5	4.3	13.9	21.4	21.7	31.7			
school.	Now	1.30	5.93	1.9	0.4	3.4	7.9	12.0	32.3	42.1			

Select the response that best describes YOUR feelings or experience.		SD	Mean	Mostly A's	Mostly B's	Mostly C's	Mostly D's	Mostly F's	
School Engagement (multiple choice)					Percent %				
In general, my child's grades are	Before	1.07	2.33	25.6	31.7	31.3	7.6	3.4	
	Now	0.96	2.02	34.6	36.2	24.5	2.3	1.9	

Please select the response that describes how often the following statements are true for your family.		SD	Mean	Never	Very Rarely	Rarely	About Half the Time	Frequently	Very Frequently	Always
School Engagement (frequency scale)							F	Percent %		
In general, my child goes to school	Before	1.20	6.11	1.5	1.1	1.5	2.2	18.8	24.7	50.2
	Now	0.83	6.53	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.4	5.4	28.6	35.5
In general, my child gets in trouble at school	Before	1.50	2.84	19.0	28.7	27.2	9.0	8.2	6.3	1.5
	Now	1.49	2.47	27.8	35.5	20.1	5.0	4.2	5.0	2.3

Please select the response that best describes how much you agree or disagree with the statement.		SD	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree	
Safety and Stability (agreement scale)				Percent %							
My child has at least one adult he/she can depend on.	Before	1.27	6.32	2.1	1.1	1.0	4.2	5.5	20.9	65.0	
	Now	0.89	6.75	1.3	0.4	0.1	1.0	1.3	8.9	87.0	
My child feels safe and secure at home.	Before	1.34	6.36	2.6	0.9	0.8	3.9	4.6	17.1	69.6	
	Now	0.88	6.76	1.3	0.4	0.2	1.2	1.1	8.0	87.8	

Please select the response that best describes how much you agree or disagree with the statement.		SD	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree	Child does not attend child care or school
Safety and Stability (agreement scale)					Percent %						
My child feels safe at child care/school.	Before	2.38	5.33	1.3	1.2	0.8	6.3	4.7	17.4	37.4	30.9
	Now	2.22	5.74	0.8	0.5	1.1	4.5	2.1	14.6	47.4	29.1

Please select the response that best describes how much you agree or disagree with the statement.		SD	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
Violence Prevention (agreement scale)						Perce	ent %			
My child knows what a healthy	Before	2 10	4 1 2	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	125	27 5	0.0
	Delote	2.10	4.15	25.0	0.0	0.0	23.0	12.5	57.5	0.0

Select the response that best describes YOUR feelings or experience.		SD	Mean	Never	Very Rarely	Rarely	About Half the Time	Frequently	Very Frequently	Always
Violence Prevention (frequency scale)						Percent %				
My child has gotten angry	Before	0.64	5.88	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	62.5	12.5
	Now	0.99	4.88	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	50.0	25.0	0.0
My child has pushed, shoved, slapped, or kicked other students	Before	2.13	4.38	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	37.5	0.0
	Now	1.25	2.88	25.0	0.0	37.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
My child has teased other students	Before	2.12	3.14	42.9	0.0	0.0	28.6	14.3	14.3	0.0
	Now	1.51	2.57	42.9	0.0	14.3	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
My child has threatened to hit or hurt other students	Before	2.05	4.25	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0
	Now	1.58	3.25	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
My child has protected someone from a bully	Before	1.41	2.38	37.5	12.5	37.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0
	Now	1.25	2.29	42.9	0.0	42.9	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0