National Y-USA Higher Education Service Project (HESP) Report

National Y-USA Higher Education Service Project (HESP) Report

Prepared by: Dawn X. Henderson, M. Ed., M. S.

AEA GEDI Fellow

Evaluation, Assessment and Policy Connections (EvAP) Center

University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill

Submitted: May 6, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Higher Education Service Project (HESP) was launched in 2010 to address community improvement through education and promote the following among Ys across the nation:

- Every Y will integrate strategies to address America's achievement gap in low-income communities.
- Every Y will fulfill its promise to nurture the potential of every child, teen, and adult through opportunities provided by higher education attainment.
- Every Y will recognize its services as educational in that those services promote a better quality of life for its community members.
- Every Y will develop collaborative partnerships that will enhance and sustain effective delivery of services.

In August of 2010, 40 YMCAs were invited to Chicago, IL to attend the National Y-USA's HESP informational meeting and participate in sessions to assist local Ys in developing grant proposals to receive $10,000 to support the development and/or expansion of higher education projects. During this session, Ys were provided with an overview of HESP and resources and tools to assist them in their projects, which included:

- Information CD:
  - o KnowHow2Go materials
  - o Mapping Your Future
  - o CGS Coordinator Contacts
  - o TRIO/GEAR UP Contacts, etc.
- Information Session covered:
  - o Key Definitions: Target Population, Academic, Social and Financial Success.
  - o Steps in Developing a Task Force
  - o Developing Collaborations/Partnerships
  - o Evaluation

It was expected that the Ys would use the resources provided to them to guide the grant proposal process and identify their target population and outline activities associated with the project. Furthermore, the project had to specifically indicate how the Y would address the academic, social and financial success of their target population by either developing or expanding a Task Force.

In response to a request from the National Y-USA, an evaluation team was organized from Evaluation, Assessment, and Policy Connections (EvAP) Center in the School of Education at the University of Chapel-Hill in partnership with the American Evaluation Association (AEA) GEDI Program to evaluate the HESP. The major aim of the evaluation team was to assist invited Ys in the data collection and analysis efforts and prepare a final report. The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of each phase of the 2010 – 2011 HESP evaluation project, highlight outcomes and outline lessons learned.

EVALUATION PROJECT ACTIVITY

Phase 1: Grant Proposal Process

All 40 Ys that attended the National Y-USA August 2010 session in Chicago, IL were invited to submit a grant proposal to receive funding (October 2010) to develop and/or expand higher education initiatives. The 40 Ys were recruited through a variety of venues that included: a survey sent to Ys in CGS states to indicate their interest in enhancing or starting higher education services; recommendations from Y-USA; and solicitation to urban, suburban, and rural Ys requesting their level of interest. A template was provided to each site that included content such as program overview, goals/objectives, evaluation plan, etc.

From the information session in Chicago, it was expected that each of the 40 Ys would integrate the following criteria into their grant proposals**: identified process and outcome objectives**, **parental involvement**, provide an **outline of Task Force members**, **inclusion of partners from higher education institutions**, **utilization of college access materials** (KnowHow2Go, Mapping Your Future, etc.), and an **evaluation plan**. A feedback form was developed (Appendix A) to rate (1= incomplete, 2 = somewhat complete, and 3 = complete) how each proposal addressed the HESP criteria. The following reflects findings from the feedback form:

- Identified process and outcome objectives: Findings from the feedback form indicated that about 59% of the Ys identified goals and objectives aligned with college preparation, access and success in their grant proposal. Of the 40 Ys that submitted grant proposals, 16 identified how the project would address academic success; 23 identified how the

project would address financial success; and 10 identified how the project would address social success.

- Parental involvement. Findings from the feedback form indicated that 34 Ys identified how the project would integrate parents.

- Task force/ inclusion of partners. All of the Ys identified individuals that would be recruited for or comprise the Task Force. Findings from the feedback form indicated that 28 Ys identified how the project would integrate community/social service organizations; 30 Ys identified how the project would integrate higher education institutions; 15 Ys identified how the project would integrate other partners (i.e., public school system); and 6 Ys identified how the project would integrate churches and/or other religious organizations.

- Utilization of college access materials. Findings from the feedback form indicated that 19 Ys identified how they would integrate college access materials into the project.

- Evaluation plan. None of the Ys were able to identify an evaluation plan that generally identified process and outcome objectives and evidence needed to assess achievement of these objectives and the quality of the program.

Phase II: Review of Grant Proposals and Development of Logic Models

Beginning in October 2010, proposals were sent to the evaluation team for review. Initially, 10 grants from the 40 Ys were selected, reviewed, rated by two members of the evaluation team (Dawn Henderson and Alison Mendoza) and placed into the following categories: *1-needs substantial improvement*, *2-needs some improvement*, and *3-satisfactory*. In addition, a synopsis was written to explain the rating and identify areas that needed improvement. The two reviewers met with Johnavae Campbell to establish inter-rater reliability and discuss ratings and a working consensus. They then proceeded with rating the remaining 30 grant proposals.

Of the 40 Ys, 17 needed substantial improvement and received a rating of 1, 20 needed some improvements and received a rating of 2, and 3 were rated as satisfactory (see Appendix B). It was determined that efforts should focus on transitioning twos to a rating of 3 and providing technical support to threes; the ones would receive primary technical assistance in revising logic models and monitoring basic outcomes associated with attendance and program feedback. The evaluation team

gathered information from the grant proposals (e.g., identified process and outcome objectives) and organized it into logic models (Appendix C). Then the evaluation team proceeded to schedule logic model review sessions with each of the 40 Ys. Of the 40 Ys contacted, only thirty-seven Ys responded and scheduled logic model review sessions. Ys that were unable to schedule and participate in this phase of the evaluation project encountered issues such as staff-turnover. Each logic model review session focused on the purpose of logic models, the components and processes in a logic model (process vs. outcome objectives), evidence collected (or planned) to evaluate the achievement of identified process and outcome objectives, and areas that needed additional clarity.

A follow-up email was sent to each Y to provide them with a summary of the call and request information needed to move forward, such as: corrections on revised logic model, submission of evaluation tools, etc. Next, the evaluation team developed post-ratings and placed the sites into the following categories: *1-objectives and evidence not identified/never submitted a revised logic model*, *2-objectives and evidence in logic model identified, did not submit all requested materials, and needs improvement in evidence section*, *3-satisfactory identification of objectives and evidence in logic model, submitted all requested materials*. Of the 37 Ys, 6 received a post rating of one, 11 received a post rating of two, and 20 received a post rating of three. Seventeen of the 20 transitioned to a three from either a one or two in their initial rating. Of those who received a post rating of one, the following issues influenced their rating: staff health issues and weather (winter storm, flooding, etc.), transitioned into a new position, lack of further communication with the evaluation team or National Y-USA representative via email and/or phone.

Phase III: Development of Program Schemes

Beginning in February 2011, the evaluation team reviewed the revised logic models and began to organize the objectives from the Ys into evaluation targets. Evaluation targets were identified from the outcome objectives in Ys' logic models. For example, some Ys indicated a target number of students completing the FAFSA as an outcome objective; therefore, these Ys were grouped together under "completion of FAFSA." Collectively, more than thirty-eight evaluation targets were developed and then organized into seven program schemes: College Knowledge and Pathways (n = 32), Career and Post-Secondary Planning (n = 17), Academics: Grades, ACT/SAT, School Outcomes (n = 10), Financial Aid and Literacy (n = 27), Social Development Skills (n = 11), Program Expansion, Enhancement, and

Improvement (n = 22), and Other (n = 4). These schemes were used to organize Ys into groups by evaluation targets and assist the evaluation team in identifying/designing instruments aligned with identified outcomes. After further review, the seven schemes were then revised and reduced to five major schemes to encompass broader areas. The five schemes were: 1) Financial Aid and Financial Literacy, 2) Higher Education Terminology, Opportunities and Admissions Processes, 3) Academic Outcomes, 4) Developmental Assets, and 5) Post-Secondary and Career Planning.

Phase IV: Instrument Identification and Design

Beginning in February 2010, the evaluation team began conducting a literature review of instruments used to measure attitudes and intentions about higher education. The literature review was designed to determine what current measures were out there and whether they could be used to measure any outcomes identified by Ys under the HESP. Although the literature review provided the evaluation team with some useful tools, the team also developed and modified instruments to specifically address the outcome objectives of the Ys. For example, a retrospective instrument was developed to assess whether there was a change in participants commitment to pursue post-secondary education. During this time the evaluation team also began collecting instruments from Ys to assess what tools were currently being used, whether the tools needed any revisions, and if they were strong enough to share with other Ys.

Using the five schemes that were developed in phase III, the evaluation team aligned outcomes and assessment tools under each scheme (Appendix D) and used this to guide the next phase of the project. In addition, a category was created called "Session/Workshop Feedback" to identify which Ys had instruments in place to assess the quality of sessions and gather program feedback.   Ys that indicated they did not have any instruments or a tool to assess their sessions/workshops were provided with instruments developed by the evaluation team or from other Ys. For example, YMCA of Florida's First Coast (Jacksonville, FL) used a form called "Career Workshop Evaluation" during their project and the evaluation team determined that it was a useful tool to gather feedback on program quality and shared it with other Ys.

Phase V: Webinars

Upon completion of the logic model, review sessions, instrument identification and design, and development of program schemes, the evaluation team organized schemes into five webinars topics: 1)

It's All About the Benjamins: Financial Aid and Financial Literacy, 2) Knowing the Lingo: Higher Education Terminology, Opportunities and Admissions Processes, 3) Making the Grade: Academic Outcomes, 4) The Power Within: Developmental Assets, and 5) What's Your Game Plan: Post-Secondary and Career Planning. In addition, the evaluation team collected instruments and tools that were either being used by other Ys, developed in the EvAP Center, or another popular measure (GEAR UP, Rosenberg Self-Esteem Measure, etc.) and organized them into information packets (later sent out to webinar attendees). The webinar series were facilitated by the evaluation team and included presenters from Ys that had useful tools around each focus area. For example, Florida's First Coast YMCA (Jacksonville, FL) served as the lead presenter for the Financial Aid and Financial Literacy webinar because of their strong partnership with a local bank and the instrument they used to measure participant improvement in this area. All webinars had three main objectives, which included: 1) Ys would receive sample tools to assist in evidence collection efforts, 2) Ys would identify ways to handle challenges in evidence collection for evaluation, and 3) Ys would network with other branch Ys carrying out similar programs.

Invitations were sent to 34 Ys (included late invites extended to Cincinnati, OH and Little Rock, AK) regarding the webinar series. The original communication sent to the Ys indicated that the sessions were required; however, all of the invited Ys did not attend for various reasons (i.e., lateness of notice and prior commitments). Nevertheless, 26 out of the 34 Ys attended at least one of the webinar series. Attendance at the webinar series was on average about 70% (Table 1).

Table 1: Attendance Rates at HESP Webinar Series

Webinar	Total Invited	Total Attended
It's All About the Benjamins: Financial Aid and Financial Literacy	28	18
Knowing the Lingo: Higher Education Terminology, Opportunities and Admissions Processes	32	22
Making the Grades: Academic Outcomes	11	9
The Power Within: Developmental Assets	11	7
What's Your Game Plan: Post-Secondary and Career Planning	20	13

An online evaluation was developed to obtain feedback from the Ys that attended the HESP Webinar series. Table 2 indicates the number of Ys that attended the webinar series versus the number who completed the evaluation. Overall, of those who attended the webinars response rates were relatively high with 18 of the 26 Ys (69%) completing the online evaluation.

Table 2: Response Rates from HESP Webinar Series Evaluation, by Theme

Webinar	Total Attended	Total Completed Evaluation
It's All About the Benjamins: Financial Aid and Financial Literacy	18	12
Knowing the Lingo: Higher Education Terminology, Opportunities and Admissions Processes	22	11
Making the Grades: Academic Outcomes	9	9
The Power Within: Developmental Assets	7	7
What's Your Game Plan: Post-Secondary and Career Planning	13	7

Table 3 provides findings from the online evaluation by item. Findings (Appendix E) suggest that of the sites who completed the evaluation, the majority either *strongly agreed* or *agreed* the webinar increased their knowledge of tools that can be used in their evaluation efforts (mean = 3.4); increased their knowledge of how to deal with challenges in evidence collection (mean = 3.3); provided them with an opportunity to network with other Ys carrying out similar programs (mean = 3.2). Collectively, the webinar achieved its objectives and additional comments from Ys confirmed these findings:

> *"I appreciated hearing others walk through their use of tools, especially their comments on how they found existing tools or how they incorporated their own tools."*

> *"By being able to converse openly with lead facilitators, I was able to see the methodology of accomplishing considerably daunting tasks. I thoroughly enjoyed the openness of the webinars. In other webinars I have attended in the past (non Y-Higher Ed), I did not have the chance to converse with the facilitator. This did not give me an accurate depiction of their methodology."*

> *"The webinar facilitated future opportunities to contact and share promising practices."*

Table 3: Mean Scores from HESP Webinar Series, by Item

Webinar	Mean	Total n
2. The webinar increased my knowledge of tools that can be used in my evaluation efforts.	3.4	17
3. The webinar increased my knowledge of how to deal with challenges in evidence collection.	3.3	18
4. The webinar provided me with an opportunity to network with other Ys carrying out similar programs.	3.2	18

Of those who completed the online evaluation, sites either rated the webinars as *excellent* or *good* (mean = 3.7). In addition, respondents had the ability to provide additional comments and suggestions for the webinars. Some of the findings suggested improvement in the following: increasing time, reducing noise level, sending materials prior to presentation, and increasing audience participation and sharing opportunities.

Phase VI: The Next Steps

As the evaluation project and National Y-USA move forward in their HESP efforts for the next project year, there are a series of steps needed to guide these efforts. One step includes the organization of Ys into tiers. The evaluation team organized the Ys into tiers that are based on project activity throughout the evaluation year. Tiers were developed to assist the National Y-USA in assessing which Ys will be invited to participate in the next HESP phase and funding cycle.

> *Tier 3*: Ys that have completed a logic model, submitted all requested information, began evaluation activities using identified tools, and attended at least one webinar series (if received invitation). Ys with an asterisk (*) are considered strong candidates as lead presenters or exemplary sites[1] during the evaluation project.

---

[1] Criteria included: maintained a high level of communication with the evaluation team, identified tools and began preliminary data collection and analysis, may or may not have served as a presenter during the webinar series, identified strong partnerships, tools were shared amongst other sites, etc.

Albuquerque, NM*	East Lake Atlanta, GA	Batavia, NY	Chapel Hill, NC*
Indianapolis, IN	Cincinnati, OH*	Clarksburg, WV	Davenport, IA*
Milwaukee, WI*	Jacksonville, FL*	Kansas City, MO*	Springfield, MA
Salt Lake City, UT	New Orleans, LA*	Portland, ME	

> *Tier 2*: Ys that have completed a logic model, submitted requested information, began activities and use of evaluation tools, but may need further one-on-one guidance in the evaluation process (some may or may not have attended a webinar series).

Albany, NY	Andrew Walter Atlanta, GA	Birmingham, AL	Charlotte, NC
Cleveland, OH	Ft. Lauderdale, FL	Greenville, MS	Helena, MT
Minneapolis, MN	Nashville, TN	Providence, RI	Yonkers, NY
Wilmington, DE	Marquette, MO	Charleston, SC	San Antonia, TX
Louisville, KY			

> *Tier 1*: Ys that may or may not have participated in a logic model review session, did not submit any requested information, may or may not have attended a webinar series, and need further one-on-one guidance during the evaluation process. The Y with an asterisk (*) attended the webinar series but will need a high level of technical support.

Boonville, MO*	Boston, MA	Eugene, OR	Jamestown, ND
Little Rock, AR	Louisville, KY	Prescott, AZ	Seattle, WA
Trenton, NJ			

Many of the Ys have initiated evaluation activities that include collecting measures from program participants and feedback from the HESP sessions/workshops. For example, Florida's First Coast Family YMCA (Jacksonville) has already collected and analyzed preliminary data regarding their financial aid and financial literacy outcomes. Another Y includes the YMCA of Metropolitan Milwaukee who are collecting academic data (grades) using pre and post measures from participants engaged in the tutoring program. To offer technical assistance and support, follow up sessions will need to be conducted at the end of the funding cycle to determine what evidence has been currently collected and analyzed or whether sites needs assistance in data analysis and report writing efforts.

LESSONS LEARNED

Lesson 1: Importance of Organizational Context: During the project, Ys were contacted on numerous occasions to review logic models and determine where they were in the evaluation process. There were various challenges within the Ys that interfered with the evaluation project, to include: staff health issues, lack of internet accessibility, time constraints, capacity, filtering information from the Chicago session to other Y staff, staff turnover, etc. For example, one Y indicated:

> *I hate to make excuses, as I feel that I have done a lot of that since the project began last August, but I'm in the fourth week of my second new director position here at our Y in the last six months and, needless to say, my head is constantly spinning these days. My new position is really great – it's exactly what I want to be doing – but it's a combination of Membership and Marketing, which creates quite a full plate for me. So, unfortunately, my efforts towards the Higher Education Service Project have been back [burner] as of late… I was, and still am, very excited about the project and its goals, I just feel disappointed that I haven't had the time and focus to really give it what it needs and maximize all of the potential and opportunity.*

Although the Ys expressed a commitment to the HESP goals and objectives, the organizational context presented challenges. Because organizations are highly complex, comprising both internal and external factors that influence daily functions and activities, it is difficult to assess which Ys will have the capacity and infrastructure to implementing the most effective HESP; however, a possible suggestion to this issue may include outlining benchmarks with participating Ys (possibly including sessions with the Executive Director or CEO) to ensure that the organization is ready and has the capacity to implement HESP.

Lesson 2: Develop a Project Timeline: During the project there was no specific timeline as to what kinds of activities should be completed and when. Much of the activity was primarily adapted and modified based on the day-to-day occurrences in the project. For example, when the logic models were developed it was determined that the majority of the projects were not at a point to implement their projects. Although the majority of the Ys were actively engaged in the evaluation process through emails, conference calls, one-on-one phone calls and webinars, three Ys were not able to participate in any of

these main activities (Eugene, OR, Jamestown, ND, and Trenton, NJ). Therefore, a timeline can also address the specific purpose of the evaluation, activities and resources (e.g., human resources, software, time, etc.) associated with completing the project so the Ys and evaluation team can use this to monitor progress and make modifications as needed.

Lesson 3: Improve Selection/Screening Process: As indicated previously, it was unclear in the beginning of the project how Ys were selected to participate in the HESP. To assist the National Y-USA in their efforts, the selection and screening process should use a series of steps or criteria to assess invited Ys readiness, capacity and leadership to implement the HESP.

Lesson 4: Communication of Clear Expectations: During the initial meeting in August, Ys were provided with an overview of the HESP and requirements. However, many of the Ys did not include some of those requirements in their grant proposals. For example, the August 26 – 27 session clearly outlined how to develop a task force and including that into the grant proposal. Yet of those Ys who submitted a grant proposal and completed logic models, only 7 clearly identified organizing a task force in their logic model. Identifying clear expectations can be aligned with identified benchmarks to assist Ys in adhering to the goals of HESP. For example, 37 Ys participated in the logic model reviews sessions yet two Ys never returned requested information, a revised logic model or participate in any follow up calls and webinars (Boston, MA and Seattle, WA). For example, a Y indicated:

> *I don't know if other program participants are in a similar situation, but I've been thinking lately that if I had known what my current function was going to be at our Y back when the project began, I probably wouldn't have been the best candidate from amongst our staff for the project.*

It is possible that outlining clear expectations for the Ys can increase involvement and deliverables throughout the project.

Lesson 5: Integrate Professional Development Opportunities. Although the webinars received high ratings from attendees, integrating the webinars as professional development opportunities may increase attendance. For example, outline the types of webinars that will be offered during the grant period and inform the Ys that they are required to attend a minimum of two, but can use all hours plus additional attendance at other webinars towards an HESP incentive. Although attendance at the webinars on average was above 60%, the webinars may have greater attendance and value among Ys when there is

an incentive for attending and it is tied back into their specific needs. The following webinars are based on feedback received from Ys gathered from the evaluation team throughout the evaluation process:

- Developing Logic Models 101: A webinar on the basic types of logic models and how to develop them.

- Evaluation 101: A webinar on the basic elements of evaluation and evidence.

- Using Excel in Survey Analysis 101: A webinar on how to use excel to track data and develop basic analysis (such as means, totals, etc.)

- Developing Online Surveys: A webinar that demonstrates how sites can use online survey tools in their evaluation efforts.

- Building Partnerships 101: A webinar that provides sites with strategies and tools to develop partnerships to build capacity in their organization.

Lesson 6: Develop a HESP Tool Kit/Box. During the initial meeting in August, some Y attendees expressed the need to have a tool box or portal to share materials, instruments and evaluation tools. Providing a space where Ys can access resources to assist them in their HESP efforts would be extremely useful and beneficial to the goals of the National Y-USA. The tool kit can contain logic models and survey templates, instruments and/or questionnaires that address a particular outcome, and opportunities for Ys to post tools that they are currently using.

Lesson 7: Develop a HESP Portal. During the project Drop Box, GoogleDocs, EvAP Drive and personal computers were used to store and share HEISP materials, activity, etc. This created a lot of confusion in where information was being collected, how it was disseminated and shared, and monitored. Prior to the next phase of the project, a space can be set up and identified where all materials, documents, information, tracking, etc. are stored and accessed by the evaluation team and National Y-USA representative.

Lesson 8: The Value of Collaboration. During the project, there was a high level of collaboration between the National Y-USA representative and evaluation team. Albeit effective in promoting constant communication between each party and identifying the next steps or activities needed to move forward in the project, the majority of the local Ys were not actively engaged in this process until the logic model review process. From this point, collaboration between the evaluation team and Y sites was high,

resulting in improving logic models, identifying measureable outcomes and useful tools to be used during the evidence collection process. The value of collaboration can be further enhanced by engaging the Ys earlier in the evaluation process. For example, Tier 3 sites can work with the evaluation team and National Y-USA to assist possibly Tier 1 and/or 2 with their concerns, challenges and needs. Furthermore, the continued collaboration among the Ys and the evaluation team can assist the National Y-USA in developing best practices from the ground up and disseminating useful and effective knowledge.

Appendices

Appendix A. Y HESP Feedback Form

Program Criteria	Rating		
	1 = Incomplete	2 = Somewhat Complete	3 = Complete
Identified goals and objectives aligned with the following, **college preparation, access, and success.**			
Identified how the project/program will address the following components:			
• Academic Success			
• Financial Success			
• Social Success			
Identified how the project/program will integrate the following partners:			
• Parents			
• Community/Social Service Agencies			
• Higher Education Institutions			
• Churches/Religious Institution/Organization			
• Other ____ _____			
Identified how the project/program will integrate the following resources/program:			
• College Goal Sunday			
• KnowHow2Go			
• Mapping Your Future			
• College Map Game			
Comments:			

Evaluation Criteria	1 = Incomplete	2 = Somewhat Complete	3 = Complete
Identified **process objectives** that were *specific*, *measurable*, *attainable*, *relevant*, and *timely* (SMART).			
Identified **outcome objectives** that were *specific*, *measurable*, *attainable*, *relevant*, and *timely* (SMART).			
Identified the evidence needed to assess achievement of **process objectives** and *quality* of the program.			
Identified the evidence needed to assess achievement of **outcome objectives**.			
Comments:			

Appendix B. 2010 Proposal Ratings of Y Sites

Branch	City	State	Rating	Summary
YMCA of Metropolitan Little Rock	Little Rock	AR 7211	1	Logic model & feedback form sent to Marcia. Need more specifics on program activities. Need to add evidence for process & outcome objectives.
Walnut Street Branch	Wilmington	DE 1980	1	Logic model & feedback form sent to Marcia. Site needs specific outcome objectives and to revise process objectives. Also, need to work on evidence.
YMCA of Broward County	Ft. Lauderdale	FL 3331':	1	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Site needs to revise process and outcome objectives that specifically outline which developmental assets will be assessed. Need to revise plan on how to assess college access and refine evidence.
YMCA of Greater Louisville	Louisville	KY 4020	1	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Need to revise outcome objectives and evidence for process and outcome objectives. Strong collaborations and task force members.
YMCA of Marquette County	Marquette	MI 84106	1	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Need to revise process/outcome objectives, add evidence for process objectives and revise evidence for outcome objectives. Make noted changes to program activities.
Henry L. McCrorey Branch YMCA	Charlotte	NC 2821	1	Logic model sent to Marcia. Marcia rec'd clarification via email. Site visit on 11/18 to develop new logic model. New logic model ready to be sent to site.
James River Family YMCA	Jamestown	ND 5840	1	Logic model sent to Marcia. Comments from Marcia received on 11/24 and feedback form completed (Dawn). Need to revise objectives and evaluation plan. Need to demonstrate how they are creating a pipeline of services from K through college.
Trenton Area Family YMCA	Trenton	NJ 0861C	1	Logic model sent to Marcia. Dawn has feedback form. Need more about what specific activities will take place. Process objectives need to be more clearly stated and aligned with outcome objectives
YMCA of Greater Cincinnati	Cincinnati	OH 4520	1	Phone meeting with Toni Miles to develop logic model revisions. Revised model sent to Toni and Marcia for review. Need more about Latino outreach committee. Process objectives were scattered throughout various sections of the grant. Need to add and clarify outcome objectives. Need to add evidence.
Eugene Family YMCA	Eugene	OR 9740	1	Logic model sent to Marcia. Rec'd Marcia's feedback 11/29. Need to complete feedback form and provide revised process and outcome objectives; as well as evidence to support objectives and assess program quality.
Providence Metropolitan YMCA	Providence	RI 02903	1	Logic model sent to Marcia. Rec'd Marcia's feedback 11/29.Need to complete feedback form and provide revised process and outcome objectives (include specifics around curriculum); as well as evidence to support objectives and assess program quality.
YMCA of Middle Tennessee	Nashville	TN 3720	1	Logic model sent to Marcia. Rec'd Marcia's feedback 11/29. Need to complete feedback form and provide revised process and outcome objectives; as well as evidence to support objectives and assess program quality. There needs to be more specific information regarding college preparedness.
Westside Branch YMCA	San Antonio	TX 7822E	1	Logic model sent to Marcia. Rec'd Marcia's feedback 11/29.Need to complete feedback form and provide revised process and outcome objectives; as well as evidence to support objectives and assess program

				quality.
Meredith Matthews E. Madison Br	Seattle	WA 9812	1	Logic model sent to Marcia. Rec'd Marcia's feedback 11/29.
YMCA of Metropolitan Milwaukee	Milwaukee	*W1* 5320	1	Logic model sent to Marcia. Rec'd Marcia's feedback 11/29. Additional clarity needed around program activities, revision of process and outcome objectives and evidence to assess whether objectives have been attained.
Harrison County YMCA	Clarksburg	2630	1	Logic model sent to Marcia. Rec'd Marcia's feedback 11/29. Need to complete feedback form and provide revised process and outcome objectives and evidence to support objectives and assess program quality.
Northeast Family Branch	Birmingham	AL 35215	2	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Need to add evidence for attendance at events and quality of the program (participants, parents and staff)
Prescott YMCA of Yavapai City	Prescott	AZ 8630	2	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Need to revise process/outcome objectives, add evidence for process objectives and revise evidence for outcome objectives.
East Lake Family YMCA	Atlanta	GA 3031'	2	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Program needs to revise process and outcome objectives to specifically address goals of the project. Need to revise evidence beyond use of SAT/ACT scores and integrate collaborations and CGS
Scott County Family YMCA	Davenport	IA 52801	2	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Need to revise process and outcome objectives and evidence for assessing achievement of objectives.
Urban Mission Branch YMCA	Indianapolis	IN 46204	2	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Process and outcome objectives need to be revised to align with the program goals. Additionally, evidence needs to reflect the information needed to assess achievement of objectives. Program goals need to be revised to include CGS partners.
Dryades YMCA	New Orleans	LA 70113	2	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Need to revise process and outcome objectives to reflect the goals of the program. Also, indicate specific evidence that is aligned to objectives and assesses Program/service quality.
YMCA of Greater Springfield	Springfield	MA 011(	2	Just sent/resent logic model to Marcia.
YMCA of Greater Boston	Boston	MA 0211	2	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Need to revise process and outcome objectives to reflect the goals of the program. Also, indicate specific evidence that is aligned to objectives and assesses program/service quality.
Cumberland County YMCA	Portland	ME 0410	2	Just received Marcia's comments 11/29.
YMCA of Metropolitan Minneapolis	Minneapolis	MN 554(	2	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Need to revise process and outcome objectives needed to address the specific goals of the program; align evidence to specifically assess whether you will achieve your stated objectives.
YMCA of Greater Kansas City	Kansas City	MO 6411	2	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Need to revise process and outcome objectives to specifically address the goals of the project. Also, need specific evidence to assess whether objectives were achieved.

Boonslick Heartland YMCA	Boonville	MO 6523	2	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Revise outcome objectives to identify specific targets as it relates to the process objectives identified. Also, revise and identify evidence to assess whether were achieved or not.
Hodding Carter Memorial YMCA	Greenville	MS 3870	2	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Revise process and outcome objectives to specifically address the goals of the project. Also, need collect evidence that is aligned with your process and outcome objectives as well as assessing I program quality.
YMCA of Helena	Helena	MT 5960	2	Logic model sent to Marcia. Dawn has feedback form. We would like to know more about your relationships with outside college access programs/schools; need more specific objectives.
The YMCA of Central New Mexico	Albuquerque	NM 8718	2	Logic model to Marcia. Dawn has feedback form. Need more delineation of activities and objectives for younger students. Overall, goals and objectives are well written. Some process and outcome objectives need some clarification.
YMCA of Yonkers	Yonkers	NY 1070	2	Logic model sent to Marcia. Dawn has feedback form. Goals, activities, and objectives need some clarification but overall outcome objectives were good.
Genesee Area Family YMCA	Batavia	NY 1402	2	Logic model sent to Marcia. Dawn has feedback form. Need more about how will activities listed serve those of various ages. Also need activities further detailed. Need corresponding outcome objectives for project objectives.
YMCA of Capital District	Albany	NY 1220!	2	Logic model sent to Marcia. Just rec'd Marcia's feedback. Need to finish feedback form. Need specifics on parent engagement; List national TRIO/GU; need local contacts; Need to add evidence for attendance at activities.
YMCA of Greater Cleveland	Cleveland	OH 4411	2	Logic model to Marcia. Dawn has feedback form. Objectives are too broad. Need more about program specifics. Process objectives not lined up at all with outcome objectives. Almost no evidence stated.
Cannon Street YMCA	Charleston	SC 2940	2	Logic model sent to Marcia. Rec'd Marcia's feedback 11/29.Need to complete feedback form and provide revised process and outcome objectives; as well as evidence to support objectives and assess program quality.
Florida's First Coast YMCA	Jacksonville	FL 3225E	3	Logic model and feedback from sent to Marcia. Need More detail on activities and sustainability.
Andrew & Walter Young Family YMCA	Atlanta	GA 3031	3	Logic model and feedback form sent to Marcia. Need to revise process/outcome objectives and evidence for process objectives and outcome objectives.
Chapel Hill-Carrboro YMCA	Chapel Hill	NC 2751	3	Logic model sent to Marcia. Dawn has feedback form. Only grant to divide activities between academic, financial, and social. Process and outcome objectives were well defined, clearly stated, and measurable
YMCA of Greater Salt Lake	Salt Lake City	UT 8410E	1	Logic model sent to Marcia. Rec'd Marcia's feedback 11/29. Need to complete feedback form and provide revised process and outcome objectives; as well as evidence to support objectives and assess program quality. There needs to be more specific information regarding evaluation plan.

Appendix C. Logic Model

Overall Goal: Enhance students' academic, financial, and social success.

Goals and Objectives	Process Objectives	Outcome Objectives	Process Objective Evidence	Outcome Objective Evidence

Appendix D. Y HESP Evaluation Targets and Tools

EVALUATION CATEGORY	OUTCOMES	ASSESSMENT TOOLS
Knowledge of Higher Education Admissions, Terminology, & Opportunities	• Understand the admissions requirements of a college/university • Understand how to apply to college and complete college applications • Understand a college environment (through college visits) • Understand common higher education terminology (College Match Game, etc.) • Understand and identify local and national college/universities • Develop a post-secondary plan/portfolio	KWL Worksheet & College Facts (pgs. 20 - 25; realizingthedream.pdf) KnowHow2Go Webquest-middle school (EvAP) Navigating the College Admissions Process (EvAP) Rough Draft College Preparation (EvAP) College Match Game (Nashville, TN) Senior Checklist (Jacksonville, FL) College Vocab & Attainability Survey (Albuquerque, NM) Tusculum, College Tour (Nashville, TN) College Knowledge, Planning and Access (Modified GEAR UP questions: EvAP) Portfolio Checklist (Salt Lake City, UT)
Knowledge of Post-Secondary and Career Planning	• Increase intent/aspirations in attending higher education • Understand requirements needed for specific careers • Understand careers/jobs that are aligned with specific strengths and interests • Complete career portfolio • Knowledge of courses needed in high school • Job readiness skills, etc. • Increase completion of SAT/ACT exams	Career Interest Survey and Career Research Worksheet (pgs. 11 - 15; realizingthedream.pdf) Pre/Post Test Student Questionnaire (pgs. 183 - 184, realizingthedream.pdf) KnowHow2Go Retrospective Survey (EvAP) Survey of YMCA Higher Education Initiative Post-Secondary Plan (EvAP) Young Achievers Pre/Post Evaluation (Kansas City, MO) College Vocab & Attainability Survey (Albuquerque, NM) Program Evaluation (Quad-City Scholars: Davenport, IA) United Way YD Survey (Milwaukee, WI)

		What Do You Like to Do? (k -5; Prescott, AZ) Portfolio Checklist (Salt Lake City, UT) Vandy Workshop (Nashville, TN) Senior Checklist (Jacksonville, FL)
Knowledge of Financial Aid and Literacy	• Partnering with College Goal Sunday • Completing the FAFSA • Identifying financial aid opportunities (e.g., grants, scholarships, loans, etc.) • Improve financial literacy (money management, etc.) • Applying for financial aid opportunities (e.g., grants, scholarships, etc.) • Understanding financial aid terminology	CGS Evaluation Tool (CGS) Nov Survey Evaluation (Clarksburg, WV) Financial Aid Quiz and Financial Aid Terminology Chart (pgs. 180 - 181; realizingthedream.pdf) Portfolio Checklist (Salt Lake City, UT) Sample FAFSA Retrospective (EvAP)
Increase in Developmental Assets (Internal)	• Improve conflict resolution skills • Improve self-esteem/confidence • Improve life skills (transitioning to college) • Improve social engagement	United Way YD Survey (Milwaukee, WI) Rosenberg Self-Esteem Measure (EvAP)
Increase in Academic Outcomes	• Increase school attendance • Increase school engagement • Increase math and reading skills • Develop positive relationship with school	Take Stock in Children (Jacksonville, FL) United Way YD Survey (Milwaukee, WI)
Session/Workshop Feedback		College Info Night Survey (Albuquerque, NM) Satisfaction Survey (Atlanta East Lake: SurveyMonkey.com) Program Evaluation (Quad-City

		Scholars: Davenport, IA)
		Participant & Facilitator Evaluation (Kansas City, MO)
		Compass Session Evaluation (Milwaukee, WI)
		Youth Evaluation (Minneapolis, MN)
		CGS 2011 Family Survey (Batavia, NY)
		Career Workshop Evaluation (Jacksonville, FL)
		Boomerang Parent Evaluation (Chapel Hill, NC)
		Nov Survey Evaluation (Clarksburg, WV)
		YMCA Teen Survey (Mableton, GA)
		YMCA Youth Evaluation (Minneapolis, WI)
		Black Achievers Session Eval (Wilmington, DE)

Appendix E. Findings from Y HESP Webinar Series Evaluation, by Item

Question	Strongly Agree 4	Agree 3	Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1	Mean
2. The webinar increased my knowledge of tools that can be used in my evaluation efforts (n = 17).	**7**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**3.4**
Please explain your response (n = 9):					
I appreciated the actual tools that were presented and shared. I feel as if the webinar "Making the Grade: Academic Outcomes," was the most beneficial session I attended. I had the chance to hear about the success a particular program had that was similar to the educational program we oversee in Jacksonville. I was very intrigued by their ability to make a strong relationship with some of the Milwaukee public schools. I liked sharing ideas from colleagues across the country. The reference of other Y's program tools was beneficial. The tools that were provided assists in the evaluation efforts in the Higher Education Project as well as other aspects of afterschool programming that the Y is doing in Utah. There were things that I could use, some I couldn't. I did get to hear what others did at their y I appreciated hearing others walk through their use of tools, especially their comments on how they found existing tools or how they incorporated their own tools. I truly like the evaluation tool Mike use for his program I will be sharing this with my committee members. The reference of other Y's program tools was beneficial.					

Question	Strongly Agree 4	Agree 3	Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1	Mean
3. The webinar increased my knowledge of how to deal with challenges in evidence collection (n = 18).	6	12	0	0	3.3
Please explain your response (n = 10):					

Strategies were shared that suggested possible approaches to take.

By being able to converse openly with lead facilitators, I was able to see the methodology of accomplishing considerably daunting tasks. I thoroughly enjoyed the openness of the webinars. In other webinars I have attended in the past (non Y-Higher Ed), I did not have the chance to converse with the facilitator. This did not give me an accurate depiction of their methodology.

I think the collective knowledge of the group provided some great solutions to the problems that I face.

It reminded me that there will always be challenges and there is always a way to overcome them.

The presenters addressed the challenges that they had to overcome to receive data for their projects.

Yes there were evidence given

It was reassuring to hear others who had experienced similar challenges and helpful to hear their solutions.

The information that the other directors shared will be very useful for the program.

I found the assessment scales from the "The Power Within" especially useful. Overall, I have gained a stronger appreciation for the necessity and value of evidence collection.

It reminded me that there will always be challenges and there is always a way to overcome them.

Question	Strongly Agree 4	Agree 3	Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1	Mean
4. The webinar provided me with an opportunity to network with other Ys carrying out similar programs (n = 18).	**8**	**6**	**4**	**0**	**3.2**
Please explain your response (n = 10):					

The webinar facilitated future opportunities to contact and share promising practices.

I only had one negative experience when conversing with other individuals who participated in the webinar. I contacted (via e-mail) another Y with a question that was related to the program I coordinate and I did not get a response. This does not have anything to do with the platform the webinar provided, which I thoroughly enjoyed. Personally, I always seek to help others who look for advice to better their program. Unfortunately, I did not receive the same outreach from another Y.

It was great getting to know the other individuals that are facing similar challenges as myself.

The calls typically targeted 1 YMCA's best practices. The opportunity to share how your tool could be an added benefit to a current tool was limited.

I was very interested in the project that discussed working with suspended youth and the outcomes of that project.

Didn't get to talk much with other organizations

It would have been helpful to hear more from others, besides those who were presenting.

Mike's material will be very useful for the program that we have.

Did not feel that a lot of networking was accomplished.

The calls typically targeted 1 YMCA's best practices. The opportunity to share how your tool could be an added benefit to a current tool was limited.

5. Which terms best describes your overall rating of the webinar:	Excellent 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1	Mean
It's All About the Benjamins: Financial Aid and Financial Literacy	10	2	0	0	3.8
Knowing the Lingo: Higher Education Terminology, Opportunities and Admissions Processes	4	7	0	0	3.4
Making the Grades: Academic Outcomes	6	3	0	0	3.7
The Power Within: Developmental Assets	5	2	0	0	3.7
What's Your Game Plan: Post-Secondary and Career Planning	5	2	0	0	3.7

6. What suggestions, if any, do you have of improving the webinars (n = 11).

The info shares worked well. It would be nice to know in advance what level of experience the presentation is targeted. Although everyone can learn something new, some of the information may be overwhelming to the less experienced and mundane to the more experienced.

I really enjoyed the series. I cannot think of any suggestions! I felt as if the platform was very easy to use but I know there was some concern from others who had difficulty connecting.

Being a new participant to this project the series fit our needs well. We don't deal a lot with the academics but in getting the students in touch with the resources so the resource parts were very helpful. But they were all well done and helpful.

More time.

Beginning and ending on time. All lines muted in order to cut down the background noises of callers.

Overall the webinars were very effective I was not able to attend all the webinars but the ones I did attend especially the Developmental Assets was very helpful in the tools that were provided. I would have liked to hear the Making the Grades: Academic Outcomes because that is our biggest challenge in reporting outcomes in our programs.

Phone in system.

Perhaps sending the materials ahead of time would allow people to review them and have questions. Although understandable, resolving technical difficulties prior to the start of the meeting would be helpful as well. I also wish that there had been more "audience" participation.

Beginning and ending on time. All lines muted in order to cut down the background noises of callers.

7. I would like additional webinars in the following topics (n = 11).
None at this time
Making connections with traditionally conservative institutions (how to approach public administrators).
Nothing at this time
The do's and don'ts of partnering
Fund raising for the following year
Examples of survey evaluation data (surveys collection reports)
Making the Grades: Academic Outcomes
More on making the grades.
Collaborating with others, working with the school system, measuring long term impact
N/A
College Access Organizations

8. Other comments or suggestions (n= 9):
The work that YMCAs are doing/developing in the area of higher ed/ post secondary preparation is outstanding. It would be helpful for a toolkit of evaluation tools, job descriptions, data collection tools, record keeping forms, etc. for the various types of programs to be developed. Also, thanks to Dawn and Alison for all of their assistance. N/A None Great Job from the group leading the webinars. I think that it was just as important to have the individuals from across the country involved with the process as well. Thank you for providing this learning opportunity. I appreciate your efforts to bring these webinars to all of us to help us evaluate our programs. They were informational. I appreciated the chance to learn from other Y's, when my schedule permitted my attendance. Mike did a very good job with the presentation.