RAIKES
FOUNDATION

Lessons for Youth Program Quality Improvement Initiatives

A Summary of the YMCA of Greater Seattle's Initiative

January 2012

Dear Youth Development Leaders,

All young people should have access to enriching out-of-school time programs that promote their social, emotional and academic development. Unfortunately, too often programs fail to meet the high bar of quality that we know is essential for producing meaningful outcomes for young people. Since 2009, the Raikes Foundation has invested in strengthening the quality of out-of-school time programs that serve adolescents in Washington State. Our grantmaking has focused on building the capacity of programs to use research-based quality assessment and continuous improvement practices, with a focus on "point-of-service" quality where youth interact with staff. We support agencies through a 15-month process that includes piloting program quality assessment, data-driven improvement planning, peer learning, and intensive site-based professional development that reflects best practices in youth development. We aim to help agencies embed continuous quality improvement into their organizational culture so that all programs for youth are high quality.

Alongside our partners in the field, we continue to learn about what is most effective in fostering continuous quality improvement. In this spirit, we offer the following case study. While there are many city-funded networks managing quality assessment, we knew of few examples of agencies scaling up and internally managing the full quality improvement process across multiple programs rather than within a single program.

This case study follows one agency, the YMCA of Greater Seattle, as they began the process of expanding program quality assessment and improvement across their organization. We recognize the Y's culture and practice may be unique; however, we are sharing this report of the first year in their expansion effort as a resource to others looking to scale program quality improvement. We hope some of the early learnings that took place around critical elements such as the timing of assessment, importance of staff buy-in and participation, and essential role of ongoing communication will serve as a useful guide, supporting other agencies to make better decisions about scaling organizational quality assessment.

We welcome your feedback about the case and look forward to hearing about your efforts to strengthen the quality of out-of-school time programs in your community.

Sincerely,

Erin Kahn   Jody S. Rosentswieg
Director, Raikes Foundation   Program Officer, Youth Program Quality Initiative

Introduction

For decades, youth advocates have argued for increased availability of out-of-school time programming for youth. Researchers have demonstrated that regular attendance at high-quality youth programs is associated with desirable outcomes including improved academic performance, social skills, and interpersonal behavior, and decreased risky behavior and misconduct. Researchers have also demonstrated that attendance alone does not ensure such outcomes, but rather that the program itself must be of high quality. For this reason, the youth development field is now investing resources in the development and implementation of intentional, research-based efforts to improve program quality.

Like many youth-serving organizations, the YMCA of Greater Seattle (the Y) strives to effectively measure program effectiveness and collect data to inform program improvements. The Y is one of the largest youth-serving agencies in Western Washington. In the past, the organization has engaged evaluation consultants, articulated a theory of change to guide programming, and surveyed participants and parents to understand program impact with both externally validated and internally developed instruments. These methods have provided useful information regarding program *impact* but have not sufficiently informed efforts to insure program *quality*. Consequently, staff sought a different youth program quality assessment process.

About the Youth Program Quality Intervention

The Youth Program Quality Intervention (YPQI) is a model that helps organizations improve youth program quality by providing research-based standards and a process for achieving those standards. Randomized trial research has found the intervention to be effective at improving program quality. The David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality developed the YPQI, which is currently being implemented in education, human service agencies, and community-based settings in more than twenty states.

The intervention is designed to be used with the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA), a research-based instrument designed to assess the quality of service at the point where staff and youth interact. The YPQA observation tool consists of four sections, each focusing on one dimension of program quality: safe environment, supportive environment, interaction, and engagement.

To achieve incremental improvements toward high quality in each of these four areas, the YPQI provides a five-step process:

Step One: Prepare. The first step is to identify and train initiative leads. These leads make decisions about how the process will work based on their knowledge of the organization, community, and available resources, and they introduce the process to agency staff.

Step Two: Assess. The model calls for a two-part assessment strategy: self-assessments and external assessments. Staff receive six hours of training on the scoring for the YPQA self-assessment process, after which they schedule observations and complete formal assessments of their own programs. For external assessments, initiative leadership can choose to use external assessors trained by the Weikart Center or train their own cadre of assessors.

Step Three: Plan. Staff review the self-assessment and external YPQA scores and create an improvement plan based on the data. This is typically associated with a *Planning with Data* workshop facilitated by Weikart Center staff or local, endorsed trainers. The workshop is designed to support staff to efficiently and effectively interpret the data in order to develop an action plan.

Step Four: Improve. Program staff carry out action plans to improve point-of-service quality. This often includes staff participation in *Youth Work Methods* trainings (two- to three-hour workshops on instructional best practices that are directly aligned with the YPQA) or professional coaching for staff.

Step Five: Repeat. The steps are repeated to initiate a cycle of continuous program improvement. This includes conducting a second wave of assessments to determine changes in program quality.

The Y's Rollout of the Youth Program Quality Initiative

The Y offers all newly hired staff a series of required trainings, and supervisors encourage staff to take advantage of these training opportunities to address individual professional development. However, until the Y introduced the YPQI there was no systematic, organization-wide means of linking staff professional development and program delivery to program quality. Consequently, the Y responded to a request for proposals from the Raikes Foundation and received an initial pilot grant and a subsequent expansion grant to implement the YPQI in their teen programs.

This summary documents the Y's successes and challenges during their first-year rollout of the YPQI. It is intended to provide an example of how a youth-serving organization uses the YPQI to intentionally and systematically improve its programming for adolescent youth. The summary describes planning and rolling out the process, including what worked and what did not, as lessons learned for youth-serving organizations undertaking a similar effort.

The Y set a goal to introduce the YPQI process to twenty-six program sites in 2010. The following sections describe the Y's efforts at each of the five steps—Prepare, Assess, Plan, Improve, and Repeat—and the resulting successes and lessons learned.

THE Y'S YOUTH PROGRAM QUALITY INITIATIVE

Step One: Prepare

Preparation is required for an initiative aimed at changing organizational practice. Minimally, this includes defining the scope of participation; identifying leadership; strategizing about staff buy-in; mapping out training, assessment, and planning timelines and other expectations; and developing communication strategies with staff so that they have the information they need to undertake the initiative. This section describes the choices made at the planning stage by Y staff and the resulting successes and challenges.

Program participation. The Y chose to implement the YPQI process across all teen and young adult programs, which includes middle and high school out-of-school time programs located within schools, Y branches, and camps. Additionally, one program that serves foster youth ages seventeen to twenty-four was also included in the initiative because of its similarity with other teen programs.

Leadership. Two mid-level executives shared the leadership role for this process. These individuals had sought, obtained, and managed a Raikes Foundation grant for a pilot YPQI program. In addition to this experience, they completed numerous trainings offered by the Weikart Center in preparation for their role as leads. The leads' positions within the Y gave them direct access to frontline staff (program directors, managers, and youth workers)

and organizational leadership (CEO, branch executives, and board members).

Budget. The cost of the Y's first-year rollout fell into three major categories of expenses: approximately $15,000 was budgeted for training and materials provided by the Weikart Center; approximately $18,000 was budgeted for 10 percent of each lead's time dedicated to managing this process; and the Y's existing human resources budget was tapped for costs associated with trainings, including staff participation time and follow-up tasks.

Consensus Building. Leads shared information about the YPQI with a small group of organizational leaders and program managers prior to rolling out the initiative. Most people involved with the initiative learned of it through the emailed invitation to participate in a training on the YPQA (the Basics Training) and their formal introduction took place at that training.

Timeline. The leads established a 2010 timeline for the major elements of the YPQI five-step process based on the availability of staff and a goal of completing the five-step sequence in one year.

Communication strategies. Communication about the expectations and timeline was intended to develop participant buy-in, cooperation, and fidelity to the YPQI model. No formal, written communication plan was developed by the leads. Rather, the leads depended on their own individual management of communication with their respective teams.

PREPARATION SUCCESSES

Readiness. Staff were generally receptive to the initiative because the Y's organizational culture values the delivery of high-quality programs. Line staff reported a culture of quality that originates from the highest levels of leadership, and consequently the introduction of this particular initiative by executives was palatable.

"I'm all about having the best program we can have. I'm all for quality. It was an easy sell for me. I take pride in being innovative. This tool helped me with that."
— Program Director and Deliverer

"We are always trying to answer the questions: How can we make program improvements? How do we translate information into program changes?"
— Executive Leadership

Leadership. The initiative leads brought sufficient knowledge of the YPQI process and experience with its success at the pilot site to be effective project managers and champions for the effort. They were able to gain buy-in with staff from multiple levels of the organization due to their direct access to both program staff and organizational leadership. The CEO reported that leads were effective at demonstrating to key board members how this initiative would bolster existing program evaluation efforts.

"Having internal champions in the middle of the organization was critical. We got great buy-in for this initiative up and down. Since it started in the middle, they worked up to the CEO and Board metrics committee and down to program staff."
— Executive Leadership

PREPARATION LESSONS LEARNED

Timeline. The variety of programs that the Y sought to include in the initiative posed a challenge for rollout and implementation. Teen programs serve a wide span of ages, from middle school students through young adults. Some programs run during the school year, while others operate year-round or only during the summer. Program sites vary from schools to Y branches to remote outdoor locations. Initiative leads did not identify one implementation timeline that was ideal for all programs. Summer programs did not fit into the assessment schedule during this first year.

Communication. The communication plan was not sufficiently developed at the preparation phase. Leads did not fully anticipate the frequency and level of communication that would be required to maintain staff participation in all elements of the YPQI model. Communication worked best where there were natural learning communities, such as regular monthly meetings for school-based programs and branch programs. Programs without staff at those regular meetings (e.g., the program serving young adults) were less engaged in the process. Also, communication with branch programs during the maternity leave of one of the leads was limited to email and was not sufficient.

"We did a good job managing to the early adopters, but there's a handful for whom we need to do better, including those who resisted and those who are more isolated. There's a difference between managing to those who get it and those who don't, it's two different processes."
— Initiative Lead

RECOMMENDATIONS. *Make thoughtful choices about program and staff participation and the assessment timeline.* The scope and pace of the YPQI rollout influences the success of every component of the process. The larger the number and greater the diversity of programs involved in a YPQI rollout, the harder it is to establish schedules and expectations that work for everyone. In contrast, if too small a portion of the organization is involved, many cycles of rollout are required to shift organizational culture and see positive changes. The appropriate scope and pace of rollout depends on organizational size and other characteristics, but should always reflect a balanced scope and pace.

Invest time up front to gain and maintain buy-in. The degree to which staff accept or resist this process also influences its success. Steps can be taken to foster buy-in. Establishing the right leadership can make a difference: the ideal leads are both well-trained and have existing positive relationships with many or all of those involved in the initiative. Peer testimonials about the value of the process can persuade staff that this is a worthy endeavor. Communication up front about participation expectations, timeline, and details of the assessment process is critical.

Step Two: Assess

The assessment step includes orienting staff to the YPQI, training staff on assessing quality indicators, and implementing the assessment tool for baseline data collection. Staff of each participating site were asked to complete at least one assessment of at least one program, but many chose to conduct more. Thirteen peer assessors conducted external observations of each program.

ASSESSMENT SUCCESSES

High Participation in YPQA Basics and External Assessor Trainings. Because organizational leadership and program managers valued continuous quality improvement and useful evaluation tools, staff members were willing to participate in the optional training to learn about the YPQA. Thirty staff chose to be trained on self-assessment using the YPQA and thirteen staff received additional training to become qualified as external assessors.

"I am interested in outcomes measurement and try to be aware of new approaches. So when I was invited to this training I chose to go...I appreciate that the tool encourages thinking about measurement and program outcomes. I like that it uses different observers for different perspectives."
– Program Director

"This tool is exactly what we wanted to happen. We have external measures that parents complete, and we track program participation and frequency. This is the third prong we needed to provide an intermediate indicator of where our outcomes might be."
– Executive Leadership

ASSESSMENT LESSONS LEARNED

Acceptance of Indicators of Quality. Most staff appreciated the YPQA's definition of youth program quality and the conversation about quality it fosters. However, many also questioned if the four dimensions of youth quality are the appropriate ones for the Y's teen programming. Some staff were concerned that the tool overlooks some important quality features while over-emphasizing others. All staff would have benefitted from greater discussion up front about the research behind the YPQA's four dimensions of quality and how those dimensions apply to each of the Y's programs. This would have provided an opportunity for acknowledgement of areas that are important to the Y but not included on the YPQA.

"The trainings presented a philosophical approach in a world where there are many different philosophical approaches. I don't necessarily know that this one is better than the others. For example, do I always need to split into small groups, solo group, and do large group work, in every session, to be a high quality program?" – Program Director

"What about staff cultural competence? I think the tool should address that." – Program Director

"The Y has a list of values, including fun. Fun isn't an intentional measurement on this tool, but the Y cares about it." – Program Director and Deliverer

Low Fidelity Use of the YPQA. Trainings did not fully prepare staff to use the YPQA as intended by designers, leading to resistance to the tool and its data. Numerous anecdotes of poor use of the tool emerged during interviews: self-assessors attempting to assess their own program while delivering the program; program deliverers chatting with peer assessors rather than focusing on program delivery; assessments occurring on atypical days; assessments being conducted on programs that are not good fits for the initiative. In turn, when program staff received low scores from observations such as these, they often concluded that the tool itself was invalid or poorly designed, rather than under-standing that it was poor use of the tool itself.

"I heard that a colleague didn't agree with the scores that I gave her. I think my presence actually changed her activity—she just talked with me instead of interacting with the students. The intent of the external assessment was not well communicated. The internal assessor was also running the program at the same time as assessing the program." – Program Director

Example Scoring of Items

Each item on the YPQA is scored 1, 3, or 5, based on evidence recorded during observations. As an example, following are descriptions for scores of 1, 3, or 5 for the indicator *Supportive Environment: Activities Support Active Engagement.*

1. The activities provide no opportunities for youth to engage with either materials or ideas **or** to improve a skill through guided practice; activities mostly involve waiting, listening, watching, and repeating.

3. The activities provide limited opportunities for youth to engage with materials or ideas **or** to improve a skill through guided practice.

5. The bulk of the activities involve youth in engaging with (creating, combining, reforming) materials or ideas **or** improving a skill through guided practice.

"There are mixed messages about how much time we should spend at each site—fifteen minutes or much longer. Making sure that you spend enough time there to be able to assess everything that each site is doing would provide a more representative score."

– Program Director and Deliverer

Peer Assessment. Thirteen staff received the advanced training required to be an endorsed external assessor. Thus, the peer assessors were likely to have had prior interaction with the staff they observed. The decision to train Y staff to become "external" assessors was problematic because it risked compromising the neutral stance and objectivity that was intended for this role. When external assessments conducted by peers produced scores that observed staff felt were low, hurt feelings and distrust among colleagues emerged and lingered. This effort may have been more successful if the assessments were formally reframed as "peer assessments," with time consistently allocated for debriefing to minimize miscommunication and unaddressed resentment.

"It's very tough to have someone that you work with come to assess you and to worry about how they will see you now. . . . When the assessor comes in it might be a really chaotic day, and they won't hit all of the points because they are not seeing my whole week. It's frustrating."

– Program Director and Deliverer

"On my wish list is a conversation between the external [peer] evaluation and program team, when constructive feedback can be given."

– Program Director and Deliverer

RECOMMENDATION. Make thoughtful choices around how the assessment is introduced to staff and used within the agency. Valid use of the YPQA is the linchpin of the YPQI process. It is not sufficient to train staff in how to use the tool. Staff need additional input that reinforces valid tool use and manages the anxiety and resistance that can emerge from being assessed. *Staff need clear guidance about logistics related to the self-assessment: what programs to observe, when, and how often*. Use of peer assessors has the benefit of minimizing long-term costs, but requires additional time for observers to debrief with those observed to minimize miscommunication and unaddressed anxiety. Leads should closely monitor the first wave of assessments for valid tool use and to provide follow-up training or guidance.

Step Three: Plan for Program Improvement

Planning for improvement includes reviewing assessment scores to understand the information they provide about a program and creating a plan of action for program improvement.

PLANNING SUCCESSES

Action Planning Around Dimensions of Program Quality. Many staff reported that the assessment data provided useful information in a format that fostered learning and spurred planning. In instances where the external assessor was a supervisor of the staff being assessed, discussions of the YPQA scores took place; staff reported that the debrief conversations helped them to better understand the assessor's perspective and made the data more meaningful for planning. Staff of fourteen programs completed written action plans for improvement based on those scores.

"It helped me look at and concentrate on the lowest scores and see a theme. That provided good motivation to do something different."
– Program Director and Deliverer

"The great part is having someone from the outside give you their perspective on the program. We don't usually get that when we think about our program."
– Program Director and Deliverer

PLANNING LESSONS LEARNED

Anxiety and Resistance. Low scores caused anxiety and contributed to a loss of momentum. Despite the value the Y places on program quality and evaluation, in many instances staff reported losing interest at the point of reviewing their data. Only fourteen of the twenty assessed programs completed written action plans after reviewing their scores, despite a firm deadline established by leads and follow-up requests. Staff recommended that planning occur in

small peer group meetings where participants have trusting relationships and knowledge of each other's programs and can provide supportive recommendations. Also, at this stage more attention was needed from the leads to collect action plans and provide support for sites struggling to complete the plan due to competing priorities.

"I am not worried that my job performance is being assessed. But other people's reactions made me wonder what our organization needs to do to build trust. [The YPQA process] was clearly presented as not a judgment of our performance, yet that's the concern that emerged."
– Program Director and Deliverer

RECOMMENDATION. Prepare in advance for resistance by framing the data as a snapshot that requires informed interpretation rather than a conclusive, summative assessment of the program. *Share the assessment data in settings that reduce anxiety and promote productive, back-and-forth conversations.* In addition, because it is possible for staff to gain enough insights from the process of reflecting on their own YPQA scores that they consider the process largely complete, it is important to support participants to take the next step of planning for improvement. Deadlines for written action plans and a follow-up protocol are ways to do this.

Step Four: Improve

Step four is to make changes at the point of service delivery to improve program quality, and to provide the professional development supports to ensure staff have the skills to make desired changes. YPQA scores for the Y suggested that program quality improvements did occur as a result of this initiative. Assessments conducted at the six-month follow-up resulted in higher scores, on average, than those of the pre-initiative assessment.

IMPROVEMENT SUCCESSES

New Focus on Quality. Staff reported that attention to the four dimensions of quality outlined in the YPQA led to positive shifts in staff practice. They cited the tool's rubric structure, with specific descriptions of the desired program qualities, as helpful for visualizing what changes to make.

"I appreciate that the tool gives very specific examples of a 1, 3, or 5. It doesn't allow for wishy-washiness."

– Program Director

"This tool does a good job of indicating, 'So what do you do about it?' It's built in with the 1, 3, 5 descriptions that it tells you what to do, so even without planning you know what the steps to improvement are."

– Initiative Lead

Program Changes Following Action Planning. Action plans provided effective road maps for improvement for programs that used the plan throughout the year.

"As a result of our improvement plan, we've created a lunchtime training for all instructors, including partner organizations. We don't have a budget to pay them for this time, so we need to provide lunch and weave in other information that they like to have."

– Program Director and Deliverer

"[The planning process] helped me look at and concentrate on the lowest scores and see a theme. That provided good motivation to do something different."

– Program Director and Deliverer

IMPROVEMENT LESSONS LEARNED

Competing Priorities. Of the fourteen sites completing action plans, those that did not make progress reported focusing attention and efforts elsewhere. Competing priorities included addressing staff turnover, providing one-on-one support for students during times of crisis, and program management tasks such as hiring new staff or managing scheduling issues.

"There's a balancing act for each site around what's efficient and doable. That's one of the biggest tricks—when do you allow for flexibility with each site and when does a mandate work better?"

– Program Director and Deliverer

Lack of Dedicated Staff Development Sessions. Program directors reported that they have limited time to provide training and professional development to the front-line staff, and this limits the kinds of program improvements that can be made as a result of action planning. Some programs, such as summer camps that meet for only a few summer months, have the most constraints around finding professional development time with staff, but even year-round programs with part-time or contractual staff brought up this challenge.

"As it is, staff only get a thirty-minute training on behavior management and two hours on Youth Work 101. . . . I would be hard pressed to provide them all a half-day training on the YPQA dimensions in addition to the other things I am mandated to cover."
– Program Director and Deliverer

Too Soon to See Changes. Program directors reported that they intend to make progress on their action plans, but that not enough time has passed to fully implement the plan.

"The timing of all this was at the end of the school year—how do you implement a plan for a program that is about to end for the summer? We will get to it this coming school year."
– Program Director and Deliverer

RECOMMENDATION. *It is important to facilitate training and support to enable the desired changes.* This can include peer-to-peer learning opportunities and formal professional development. Set specific but realistic goals to focus on program improvement through existing training opportunities, regular staff meetings, and on-site modeling or coaching. Leads should monitor progress and help program directors identify opportunities to weave in training. Use cross-site data to identify key training elements that should be included in new staff orientation to support higher quality practice from the onset of program delivery.

Step Five: Repeat

Continuous quality improvement depends on the fifth step in this model—regular repetition of the Assess-Plan-Improve sequence. While it is too soon to evaluate this cycle of continuous quality improvement at the Y, the experience from year one indicates that there is reason for optimism.

The primary reason for optimism is support for the initiative from organizational leadership. The CEO of the Y has indicated that program evaluation and performance measurement is an organizational and board priority. Because the goals and process of the YPQI align closely with organizational priorities, this initiative has gained ongoing support from organizational leadership. In year two, the Y plans to expand YPQI to most of its youth development programs.

RECOMMENDATION. One of the greatest resource investments of the YPQI is the initiative leads' time. *Dedicate sufficient time to managing the process, which should include time for reflection and debriefing of each step prior to subsequent assessment cycles.* Staff confusion at any step of the process contributes to lack of fidelity with the model and decreases the potential for positive impact. Leads should proactively communicate and repeat important messages, actively monitor implementation with deadlines and follow-up, and troubleshoot as necessary while staff is undertaking the process to ensure lessons learned in year one are implemented in subsequent quality improvement cycles.

Conclusion

The Y experienced success in its first year of planning and rolling out the YPQI quality improvement process to teen programs within its organization. At every level of the organization, staff members were open to using the YPQI to improve the youth experience, in part because the leads were able to successfully communicate the goals of the initiative to both executives and program delivery staff. Staff of twenty-six programs voluntarily participated in trainings to become assessors and implement the YPQA. A subset of those programs completed external and self-assessments of their programs and reported valuable learning from reflection on their scores. Fourteen programs translated that learning into written action plans. Initial steps toward making program improvements have been productive for many sites.

At the end of year one, there are indications that this continuous quality improvement process will be integrated into organizational practice. Steps are already underway to engage more Y staff in the process. Participating staff believe the upcoming year will be an opportunity to implement each step of the improvement model with sufficient understanding to gain better program data and make informed action plans. Organizational leadership is committed to the YPQI process and to supporting meaningful changes in program delivery at the Y. Staff and leadership are optimistic about the levels of program quality they can achieve with the help of the YPQI and the difference that will make in the lives of the youth they serve.

Appendix A

The Y's YPQI Implementation Plan vs. Actual Implementation

YPQI Step	YPQI Elements	The Y's 2010 Plan	What Actually Happened
Prepare	Identify Leadership	Identify two project leads.	Two mid-level executives shared the leadership role; each brought experience implementing the YPQI model at a pilot site.
			Leads completed trainings offered by the Weikart Center in preparation for the role.
	Develop Project Plan, Budget, Timeline	Leads make decisions based on local considerations and resources about how the process will take place.	Program participants included teen and young adult programs, Y branches and camps. A spring and fall assessment schedule was set.
	Project Communication	Two leads share communication work, with one managing school-based programs and the other managing branch-based programs (ongoing). Both leads introduce YPQI to staff and manage buy-in process.	Leads introduced staff to the process via email invitations to initial trainings (December 2009–January 2010). One lead held monthly meetings with school-based staff and bi-weekly meetings with site supervisors. One lead was on leave March–August 2010, decreasing communication with branch-based programs.
Assess	Training to Conduct Self-Assessment	Thirty staff representing twenty-six programs to participate in initial training to use YPQA tool (January 2010).	Forty staff participated in optional training (January 2010).
	Training for External Assessors	Ten management-level staff and staff with YPQA experience to be trained to be external assessors (January 2010).	Thirteen staff were trained to be external assessors (January 2010).
	Baseline Self-Assessment and External Assessments	Twenty-four school-year programs to conduct at least one self-assessment and invite one external peer assessment by a colleague (February–April 2010). Two summer programs to conduct at least one self-assessment and invite one peer assessment (July–August 2010).	Twenty school-year programs conducted a total of twenty-nine self-assessments and twenty-four peer assessments (March–June 2010). No summer programs conducted baseline assessments.

YPQI Step	YPQI Elements	The Y's 2010 Plan	What Actually Happened
Plan	Action Planning	Invite all participating staff to *Planning with Data* workshop (April 2010).	Approximately twenty-five staff attended *Planning with Data* workshop (April 2010).
		Twenty-four sites complete action plans (mid-May 2010 due date).	Fourteen action plans completed (July 2010).
Improve	*Youth Work Methods* Trainings	Staff participates in *Voice and Choice* and *Reframing Conflict* workshops (November 2010).	Thirty-three staff participated in *Voice and Choice* or *Reframing Conflict* workshops (November 2010).
	Coaching for Managers or Staff	Coaching is informal, delivered by initiative leads and staff supervisors (ongoing).	Informal coaching was delivered by initiative leads and staff supervisors, but not tracked (ongoing).
Repeat	Post-Initiative Assessment	Twenty-four school year programs complete a second peer and self-assessment (November 2010).	Eighteen school year programs completed a second wave of assessments, with twelve self- and nine peer observations conducted and scored (November 2010).
	Continuous Quality Improvement	Twenty-four sites complete or update action plans after the post-assessment, kicking off a continuous quality improvement cycle (December 2010).	Thirteen action plans completed (December 2010).

Appendix B

Interview and Focus Group Participants

David Affolter, Teen Expeditions Director, Camp Orkila

Rashida Ballard, Youth Development Director, Madison Middle School CLC*

Heidi Bohall, Youth Development Director, Sammamish Family YMCA*

Liz Chase, Youth Development Director, Hamilton International Middle School CLC *

Kalayaan Domingo, Full Service Community School Site Director, Cleveland High School Programs*

Bob Gilbertson, Chief Executive Officer

Bryan Gordon, YTech Technology Instructor, Metrocenter YMCA*

Shawli Hathaway, Independent Living Director, Young Adult Services

Julie Jacobson, Resource Center Director, Young Adult Services

Andrew Jay, BOLD Boys Outdoor Leadership Program Director*

Nina Johnson, Youth Development Director & Volunteer Coordinator, Bellevue Family YMCA*

Jen Landry, Youth Development Director, Dale Turner YMCA*

Hanne Makhani, Youth Development Director, Matt Griffin YMCA *

Erica Mullen, Associate Executive Director, Meredith Mathews East Madison YMCA

Anne Powell, Senior Director - Youth Development, West Seattle High Schoool CLC*

Chris Rossman, Senior Director, Youth Development, Hamilton International Middle School CLC*

Josh Sutton, YMCA Group Executive, West Seattle & Fauntleroy | Camp

Katie Taylor, Senior Director, Madison Middle School CLC*

Chris Tugwell, Technology Programs Director, Metrocenter YMCA

Jessica Paul Werner, Associate Executive Director, Service and Leadership Programs, Metrocenter YMCA

Jerry Washington, Youth Development Director, Coal Creek YMCA*

---

*Indicates staff who both manage and deliver programs