



2007-09 Process Evaluation Report

Governor's Urban Youth Violence Prevention Grant*

Report prepared for the State of Connecticut Office of Policy and Management (OPM)

Center for Applied Research in Human Development
University of Connecticut

June 2009

*This report was supported by grants from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), Office of Justice Programs, and U.S. Department of Justice to the State of Connecticut.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table of Contents

<u>Executive Summary</u>	1
<u>Introduction</u>	2
<u>Section I: An Overview of the Evaluation</u>	4
<u>Section II: Program Attendance</u>	5
<u>Section III: The Youth Involved in the Evaluation</u>	7
<u>Section IV: The Process Evaluation of the NYC Programs</u>	9
<u>C.A.R.D. Foundation</u>	13
<u>Cardinal Shehan Center</u>	20
<u>Carver Foundation of Norwalk, Inc.</u>	27
<u>Casa Otonal, Inc.: Hill Youth Action Team</u>	33
<u>Casa Otonal, Inc.: Youth as Leaders</u>	41
<u>Central Connecticut Coast YMCA</u>	48
<u>City of Bridgeport</u>	55
<u>City of New Britain: Pulaski</u>	62
<u>City of New Britain: Roosevelt</u>	69
<u>City of New Britain: Slade</u>	76
<u>City of New London</u>	83
<u>City of Norwalk</u>	90
<u>Community Renewal Team, Inc.</u>	97
<u>Ebony Horsewomen, Inc.</u>	104
<u>McGivney Community Center, Inc.</u>	111
<u>Original Works, Inc.</u>	118
<u>Town of Enfield</u>	125

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

<u>Town of Manchester</u>	132
<u>Urban League of Greater Hartford, Inc.</u>	139
<u>Waterbury Youth Service System, Inc.</u>	146
<u>Section V: Summary</u>	153
<u>References</u>	155
<u>Appendix</u>	156

Executive Summary

This report provides details of a process evaluation that was conducted by the Center for Applied Research in Human Development (CARHD) at the University of Connecticut for the State of Connecticut's Office of Policy and Management. The evaluation was conducted with 19 youth programs located in urban centers within Connecticut.

One of the principal functions of a process evaluation is the use of evaluation data to inform the policies and practices employed by a youth program (Sabatelli, Anderson, & LaMotte, 2001; 2005; Sabatelli, Anderson, Kosutic, Sanderson, & Rubinfeld, 2009). The process evaluation that was conducted with Connecticut's youth programs consisted of several components. First, attendance data were collected from all of the programs involved in the evaluation. Second, data were collected from the youth at the programs on their perceptions of "supports and opportunities" present within the programs. Third, summaries of these perceptions were shared with the directors of the programs, who then worked on an improvement plan. Finally, one year after the initial data were collected, youth were re-surveyed to determine whether the improvement objectives had been achieved.

The improvement plans were developed in consultation with the Youth Development Training and Resource Center (YDTRC) at Yale. Personnel from the YDTRC worked with staff and youth teams from each of the 19 programs to develop specific goals and objectives. They developed implementation strategies for the targeted goals, and they involved both staff and youth in the execution of these strategic attempts to improve the quality of the programming offered through each of the 19 programs.

This report consists of several parts:

- ◆ An overview of the evaluation (Section I);
- ◆ Description of youth program operation and young people's attendance data (Section II);
- ◆ Description of youth across the 19 programs (Section III);
- ◆ Results of the process evaluation, presented for each program involved in the evaluation (Section IV);
- ◆ A project summary (Section V).

Introduction

Since the mid 1990s, many programs targeting youth in high-risk environments have shifted their focus from deterrence to youth development. Youth within programs that emphasize youth development are provided opportunities for developing constructive skills and competencies within a supportive environment (Pruett, Davidson, McMahon, Ward, & Griffith, 2000; Roth et al., 1998). The skills and competencies gained by youth are thought to prevent problems before they occur. That is, rather than implementing programs to combat specific youth problems such as teen pregnancy or gang involvement, programs emphasizing youth development seek to positively influence youth development by fostering intellectual, social, and emotional competencies within youth. These skills and competencies are thought to proactively prevent negative outcomes by increasing young people's abilities to make positive choices and demonstrate a higher degree of resistance skills (Catalano et al., 2002; Masten, 1994; Werner & Smith, 2001).

Examples of the desired "endpoints" or outcomes of "youth development programs" (based on reports by Lerner et al., 2000, and Eccles & Gootman, 2002) include the following developmental skills and competencies:

- ◆ Competence in academic, social, and vocational arenas;
- ◆ Constructive connections to community, family, and peers;
- ◆ Character or positive values, integrity, and moral commitment;
- ◆ Caring and empathy;
- ◆ Confidence in self or positive identity;
- ◆ Intrinsic motivation (self-control);
- ◆ An increasing sense of competence and mastery (communication, leadership, abilities);
- ◆ Feelings of safety and well-being;
- ◆ Attachment to family, community, and social institutions.

In order to accomplish these youth development objectives, Roth and Brooks-Gunn (2000) and Eccles and Gootman (2002) highlight the need for youth programs to organize their approach to programming around "universal building blocks." These universal building blocks focus specifically on the following:

- ◆ Involved interactions between youth and staff;
- ◆ Engagement in program and activities;
- ◆ A sense of membership;
- ◆ Physical and psychological safety;
- ◆ Developmentally appropriate structure;
- ◆ Positive social norms/rules;
- ◆ Supportive relationships;

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

- ◆ Support for efficacy/mattering;
- ◆ A sense of belonging and opportunities for skill building;
- ◆ An integration of family, school, and community.

In sum, effective youth development programs help adolescents master skills and competencies that then help them to take charge of their lives (Larson, 2000). Programs that promote the acquisition of these “protective factors” are thought to be more likely to have a positive impact on youth than programs addressing the problem behaviors themselves (Barton, Watkins, & Jarjoura, 1997). Along these lines, participation in these programs has been linked—in many studies—to higher self-esteem, self-control, and educational goals and achievement (Larson, 2000). Furthermore, youth development programs have been found to help youth develop social skills and self-esteem (directly) and reduce delinquency and substance use (indirectly), although longitudinal research is limited (Larson, 2000). Lastly, programs that involve youth in their communities have an empowering effect (increasing connection and reducing alienation), especially when youth are given choices in their types of involvement (Allen, Leadbeater, & Aber, 1990).

Section I

An Overview of the Evaluation

The process evaluation described in this report was conducted as part of the Governor's Urban Youth Violence Prevention (GUYVP) Program, which is intended to reduce urban youth violence by providing grants for programs to serve young people ages 12 to 18. The youth programs that received GUYVP funding are located in low-income urban neighborhoods in Connecticut.

The GUYVP Program is administered by the State of Connecticut Office of Policy and Management (OPM). This is a competitive program with re-bidding every two years. A key element of this program is an intensive focus on specific neighborhoods within urban centers; it is not intended to support general citywide programs. For the fiscal years (FY) 2007-08 and 2008-2009, 17 grants were awarded¹.

The Center for Applied Research in Human Development (CARHD) at the University of Connecticut was contracted to conduct a process evaluation of programs that received GUYVP funding during FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09. The evaluation was designed to provide the directors and staff of participating youth programs with information on youth's perceptions of their programming efforts. These data were then used by personnel at the respective programs to develop action plans that targeted desired changes in the programming.

The evaluation team from the CARHD was responsible for the design and implementation of the evaluation study. Specifically, the evaluation team reviewed relevant literature on programs designed to foster youth development and finalized evaluation plans based upon the review of this literature. The team then provided training sessions for programs to familiarize them with the evaluation procedures, provided technical assistance for the evaluation, analyzed data, and completed this final report.

The evaluation team also contained personnel from the YDTRC at Yale University. The team from the YDTRC provided training in youth development principles and assisted the program staff with the interpretation of their process data. In addition, personnel from the YDTRC worked with staff and youth teams from each of the 19 programs to develop specific goals for improving the programs based on analyses of the process data. They developed implementation strategies for the targeted goals, and they involved both staff and youth in the execution of these strategic attempts to improve the quality of the programming efforts.

¹ One grantee, City of New Britain, offers three different programs, one in Pulaski middle school, one in Roosevelt, and one in Slade middle school. Hence, although 17 grants were awarded for programs to serve young people, 19 youth programs participated in this evaluation.

Section II

Youth Program Operation and Program Attendance

The youth programs included in this evaluation operate in low-income neighborhoods of Connecticut's larger urban areas. Each of the programs is conveniently located within an urban neighborhood, and each offers activities that are designed to promote psychosocial development and resilience. More specifically, the programs include the following:

- ◆ Safe, appropriate, accepting, and accessible environment;
- ◆ Staff who are qualified, supervised, and supported to insure the safety of the youth;
- ◆ A strong parent component;
- ◆ Youth involvement, including youth leadership activities;
- ◆ An implementing agency/organization for each program that is actively involved in the neighborhood.

All programs that participated in this evaluation are open in the evenings, and many offer activities on the weekends, either on a regular basis or on special occasions. Over the course of this research (i. e., from March 2008 through March 2009), the programs were open an average of 18 days per month. For some programs, the average number of days open each month was as low as 12.15, whereas for others the average was as high as 25.77.

In addition to information about program operation, Table 1 provides a summary of the attendance data collected by each program. These data provide insight into the numbers of youth who attended the programs as well as how often the youth were engaged with the programs. Across the 19 programs, the average number of different youth served in the course of a typical month was about 65; this ranged from a low of 19 to a high of 148. In terms of the number of youth served daily, the average across the 19 programs was 27, with a range from about 9 to approximately 60 youth. Finally, across the 19 programs, young people attended programs for an average of 8 days per month, with a low of about 3 to a high of approximately 20 days per month.

Table 1—Attendance data for March 2008 through March 2009

Youth Program	Average Days / Month Open	Average Hours / Month Open	Average # Dif. Youth Attending Monthly	Average # Youth Attending Daily	Average # Days Youth Attend Monthly	# of Youth Surveys Submitted 3/08	# of Youth Surveys Submitted 3/09
C.A.R.D. Foundation	21.62	193.92	53.15	9.77	3.86	29	28
Cardinal Sheehan Center	21.27	150.27	68.73	51.06	15.38	42	67
Carver Foundation of Norwalk	21.85	131.76	148.08	45.44	7.28	82	65
Casa Otonal, Inc.	17.62	72.00	29.77	15.32	8.78	13	45

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Youth Program	Average Days / Month Open	Average Hours / Month Open	Average # Dif. Youth Attending Monthly	Average # Youth Attending Daily	Average # Days Youth Attend Monthly	# of Youth Surveys Submitted 3/08	# of Youth Surveys Submitted 3/09
Central Connecticut Coast YMCA	18.54	70.50	54.31	14.99	4.98	79	48
City of Bridgeport	19.92	136.69	60.54	21.60	7.32	55	72
City of New Britain: Pulaski	16.00	52.11	55.11	25.60	7.25	17	68
City of New Britain: Roosevelt	15.78	51.11	77.78	34.51	6.95	26	101
City of New Britain: Slade	15.89	51.22	87.89	34.17	6.13	35	71
City of New London	14.08	48.42	33.46	10.37	6.35	23	20
City of Norwalk	18.85	101.77	69.00	34.03	8.94	49	96
Community Renewal Team	15.58	58.58	25.17	10.83	6.72	13	25
Ebony Horsewomen, Inc.	24.4	104.7	19.33	8.99	11.68	16	23
McGivney Community Center	17.09	88.23	66.10	44.14	11.28	38	41
Original Works, Inc.	16.64	78.81	55.81	23.58	7.40	19	43
Town of Enfield	15	73.85	47.38	10.03	3.35	12	58
Town of Manchester	19.77	73.46	117.69	21.86	3.62	26	47
Urban League of Greater Hartford	12.15	48.22	82.23	41.16	7.99	43	93
Waterbury Youth Services, Inc.	25.77	265.38	78.08	59.98	19.64	65	79

Section III

The Youth Involved in This Evaluation

Two waves of data were collected from the youth attending Connecticut's youth programs. Baseline data were collected in March of 2008 and follow-up data in March of 2009. Both surveys contained process measures.

Table 2 summarizes the demographic profile for the youth who filled out the survey in March 2008 (Wave 1) and in March 2009 (Wave 2). As Table 2 shows, six hundred and eighty two ($n = 682$) young people participated in Wave 1. This sample was composed of a greater percentage of males than females (56.2% male, 43.8% female) and was populated primarily by youth of color (62.9% Black/African American, 18.6% Latino(a)/Hispanic, 8.0% White, 4.2% Multiracial, 0.7% Asian American, 0.7% Native American, and 4.8% other). Most youth in the sample were low-income or poor, as 68.6% of the youth reported that they received free or reduced-cost meals at school. Family status varied, with the majority of youth (83.1%) living with their mothers; 31.3% with their fathers; 7.6% with mother and partner; 2.1% with father and partner; 1.6% with foster mother; 0.9 with foster father; 1% with parent's friend; 10.4% with grandmother; 3.2% with grandfather; 3.7% with uncle; 4.7% with aunt; 47.3% with siblings; 5.1% with cousins, and 1% with foster children. The breakdown of the sample by grade in school was as follows: 5th grade (2.4%); 6th grade (16%); 7th grade (14.2%); 8th grade (15.1%); 9th grade (13.6%); 10th grade (14.3%); 11th grade (11.4%); and 12th grade (9.7%). Grades for the sample were 14.1% mostly As, 43.3% mostly Bs, 33.8% mostly Cs, 4.2% mostly Ds, and 2.0% mostly Fs. The youth reported their aspirations for level of future education to be mostly college degree (49.3%), followed by 17.6% graduate degree, 11.1% diploma, 4.6% GED, 4.5% non-degree professional, and 12.9% did not know their plans for future education.

One thousand ninety ($n = 1090$) youth participated in Wave 2. This sample was composed of a greater percentage of males than females (56.4% male, 43.6% female) and was populated primarily by youth of color (53.0% Black/African American, 24.9% Latino(a)/Hispanic, 9.3% White, 6.2% Multiracial, 1.0% Asian American, 0.2% Native American, and 5.4% other). Most youth in the sample were low-income or poor, as 69.2% of the youth reported that they received free or reduced-cost meals at school. Family status varied, with the majority of youth (83.8%) living with their mothers, 37% with their fathers, 6.4% with mother and partner, 1.8% with father and partner, 1.5% with foster mother, 0.7 with foster father, 0.8% with parent's friend, 11.9% with grandmother, 4.3% with grandfather, 5.3% with uncle, 5.9% with aunt, 45.6% with siblings, 5.6% with cousins, and 1% with foster children. The breakdown of the sample by grade in school was as follows: 5th grade (1.9%); 6th grade (12.7%); 7th grade (21.0%); 8th grade (16.9%); 9th grade (11.8%); 10th grade (12.9%); 11th grade (11.7%); and 12th grade (10.5%). Grades for the sample were 15.7% mostly As, 46.2% mostly Bs, 32.0% mostly Cs, 3.6% mostly Ds, and 0.7% mostly Fs. The youth reported that their aspirations for intended level of future education were mostly college degree (46.5%), followed by 18.8% graduate degree, 9.6% high school diploma, 4.3% GED, 4.1% non-degree professional, and 16.7% did not know their plans for future education.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 2—Background characteristics of youth who completed questionnaires at Wave 1 and Wave 2

	Wave 1 (n = 682)	Wave 2 (n=1090)		Wave 1 (n = 682)	Wave 2 (n=1090)
Gender	%	%	Reduced meals	%	%
Male	56.2	56.4	Yes	68.6	69.2
Female	43.8	43.6	No	31.4	30.8
Race/Ethnicity	%	%	Educational aspirations	%	%
Black /African American	62.9	53.0	GED	4.6	4.3
Latino/a or Hispanic	18.6	24.9	High School Diploma	11.1	9.6
Native American	0.7	0.2	Non-Degree Professional	4.5	4.1
Asian American	0.7	1.0	College Degree	49.3	46.5
White	8.0	9.3	Graduate Degree	17.6	18.8
Multi Racial	4.2	6.2	Don't Know	12.9	16.7
Other	4.8	5.4	GPA	%	%
Household Members	%	%	A	14.1	15.7
Mother	83.1	83.8	B	43.3	46.2
Father	31.3	37.0	C	33.8	32.0
Mother's Partner	7.6	6.4	D	4.2	3.6
Father's Partner	2.1	1.8	F	2.0	.7
Foster Mother	1.6	1.5	Other or N/A	2.6	1.9
Foster Father	0.9	0.7	Grade	%	%
Parent's Friend	1.0	0.8	5	2.4	1.9
Grandmother	10.4	11.9	6	16.0	12.7
Grandfather	3.2	4.3	7	14.2	21.0
Uncle	3.7	5.3	8	15.1	16.9
Aunt	4.7	5.9	9	13.6	11.8
Siblings	47.3	45.6	10	14.3	12.9
Cousins	5.1	5.6	11	11.4	11.7
Foster Children	1.0	1.1	12	9.7	10.5
			Not in School	0.9	.6

Section IV

The Process Evaluation of Youth Programs

Process evaluation is a form of program evaluation that applies descriptive research methods to compare the program being delivered with the program that was originally intended by planners (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 1985). Process evaluations are thought to complement other forms of program evaluation (Judd, 1987; Scheirer, 1994) and can offer program directors a better understanding of how a program concept has been implemented. They provide insight into the strengths and weaknesses of a program's structure and delivery, and they enhance the ability of program directors to describe their programs to outside sources.

Although process evaluations have been used widely in community programs addressing health promotion, disease prevention, community policing, and juvenile justice (Dehar et al., 1993; Robinson & Cox, 1998), in terms of youth programs they have remained largely overshadowed by outcome evaluations (Judd, 1987). To date, there are few examples of process evaluations being used to improve youth programming. Gambone and her associates (2003), in partnership with the Institute for Research and Reform in Education, are an exception. They have developed what they refer to as a Community Action Framework for youth development.

The Community Action Framework integrates basic knowledge about youth development and the community conditions that influence it with hypotheses about what is required to transform communities into places where all youth can thrive (Gambone et al., 2003). The framework highlights the notion that supports and opportunities are the critical building blocks of development across all settings in which youth spend their time. A cornerstone of this framework is the use of longitudinal research to examine the relationship between supports, opportunities, and long-term developmental youth outcomes.

According to Gambone and her colleagues (2003), supports and opportunities are "non-negotiable" community factors needed to promote youth development. Youth need to have multiple supportive relationships with adults and peers, from whom they receive guidance, emotional support, and advice (supports). They also need meaningful involvement in decision-making, leadership opportunities, and other practices that foster a sense of belonging. They need challenging activities, which are fun yet also enable them to develop skills and to experience a sense of growth and progress (opportunities). Finally, youth need to feel safe, both physically and emotionally.

Working with the Community Network for Youth Development in San Francisco, Gambone and her colleagues (2003) collected data on supports and opportunities from local youth development agencies and used these data to conduct an improvement project with these agencies. Youth were asked to report on their experiences in the programs. Data then were summarized for the agencies and used to engage staff in a self-assessment process. Staff members were then asked to develop action plans that identified program practices that needed to be strengthened or added and to come up with an implementation plan for improvement in these areas. Youth were resurveyed at the end of the year, and they reported increases in the levels of supports and opportunities available to them. There was some variation, but every agency improved in some area. Results showed that areas of improvement were directly linked to the strategies agencies had targeted in their action plans. Thus, these results indicated that agencies can reliably measure supports and opportunities for youth, and if improvement strategies are intentionally implemented, compelling and meaningful programmatic changes can result.

The Community Action Framework is the only example of process evaluation data being used to improve youth development programs. This framework tracks program activities and suggests adjustments based on the feedback from participants; uses clear performance standards to judge intermediate results; and engages programs in

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

ongoing planning, partner-building, and capacity-building to implement community action strategies. The current evaluation study builds upon the work of Gambone and her colleagues. In this evaluation, a sample of urban youth programs participated in a process evaluation with the goal of refining their approaches to youth programming.

PHASES OF PROCESS EVALUATION

The overarching goal of this project was to assess how information obtained from youth ultimately influences the ways in which programs are run. The several phases of this process and outcome evaluation are outlined below.

Phase 1: Process questionnaires were administered in March 2008. Process evaluation results were shared with youth programs in May 2008.

Phase 2: Process questionnaires were administered in March 2009. Results were shared with youth programs in May 2009.

DESCRIPTION OF THE MEASUREMENT TOOL USED IN THIS PROCESS EVALUATION

The Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD; Sabatelli et al., 2009) was used to assess youth’s perceptions of the characteristics and qualities of the programs found within the urban youth programs. This measure was developed under the auspices of the CARHD for a process evaluation of urban youth programs conducted between 2003 and 2005. Based on the work of researchers and theorists who have identified criteria for effective youth programs (Catalano et al., 2002; Connell, Gambone, & Smith, 2000; Durlak & Wells, 1997; 1998; Eccles & Gootman, 2002; Kahne et al., 2001; Posner & Vandell, 1994; Walker, Marczak, Blyth, & Borden, 2005; Yohalem, Pittman, & Wilson-Ahlstrom, 2004) the YDAD was designed to assess the developmental quality of youth programs from the perspective of the youth. Developmental quality is the extent to which a program provides a set of program components that have been found to facilitate positive youth development (Eccles & Gootman, 2002).

In the development of the YDAD, the goal was to construct survey items that reflected the supports and opportunities conceptually linked to developmental quality. Specifically, questionnaire items were created to assess the program attributes of (a) emotional safety and well-being; (b) challenge and involvement; and (c) supportive environment. Table 5 provides an overview of these dimensions and sample items used to assess them. Table 6 presents descriptive information on the reliabilities of these YDAD subscales. A copy of the entire instrument is available in [Appendix](#).

Table 5—The process indicators contained within the YDAD

Conceptual Dimension	Sample Items
Emotional Safety and Well-being	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out. • I can be myself when I am at the Center. • The center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.
Challenge and Involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a staff member who is a role model for me. • The staff at the Center believe in me. • Going to the center and participating in activities makes me feel part of my community.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Conceptual Dimension	Sample Items
Supportive Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself. • The staff at the center help me do what is right. • I am able to be creative at the center.

Table 6—Internal consistency reliability of YDAD subscales

YDAD Subscales	# of items	Wave 1 α	Wave 2 α
Emotional Safety and Well-being	7	.953	.950
Challenge and Involvement	7	.905	.908
Supportive Environment	7	.829	.933

To fulfill the objectives of this evaluation, it was necessary to provide the youth programs with information that was both descriptive and evaluative. In this regard, Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) was used as the principal approach to the management of these data. In statistical terms, the MCA model compares the mean values of each program's scores on the questionnaire to the overall or grand mean across all other youth programs. That is, each program received a description of the data derived from the youth who participated in it. In addition, each program's data were contrasted to the grand means derived from all the other programs, thereby highlighting how the supports and opportunities present within the program differed from those found in other similar programs.

In other words, the goals of these analyses were twofold. First, each program received results that described youth perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* their program. These analyses contrasted subgroups of youth within each program according to age and gender. This was done to enable programs to assess their effectiveness in reaching older versus younger youth, or males versus females, and to target program improvements toward specific groups of youth, if necessary. Second, programs received results that emphasized *between* program differences. To accomplish this second goal, the data from each program were contrasted with the aggregate results from the other participating programs, which highlighted the supports and opportunities present within the program that were significantly higher or lower than those found in other similar programs.

RESULTS OF THE PROCESS EVALUATION

With respect to the presentation of the findings, it is important to note that the results summarized here are based on data from 19 programs. ***That is, the process evaluation described herein is really 19 different process evaluations.*** Each program was provided with a summary of the data describing youth perceptions of the supports and opportunities present within that program. These data were used by each program to engage the staff, along with representative youth from the programs, in a planning process. This process involved strategically identifying or targeting certain goals for change and discussing with the YDTRC a strategy for implementing these changes.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

The second wave of process data that was collected was used to examine the changes that occurred in the youth perceptions of the programs over time. Presumably, positive changes in youth perceptions could be attributed, at least in part, to the ways in which the programs altered their structure and organization as a result of the evaluation and planning process. These analyses, summarized for all 19 programs, are presented in the following sections of the report².

² Two reports were prepared for Casa Otonal, as this program provides separate services for two groups of young people.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

C.A.R.D. Foundation
B.O.O.S.T. Program

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County (formerly known as C.A.R.D.) offers after-school, evening, and summer outpatient mental health services and therapeutic programs.

The Center is 1,400 sq. ft. and includes seven rooms that are used for therapy, YAC, and PAC meetings. All rooms are used by youth.

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	9:00am-8:00pm	9:00am-8:00pm	9:00am-8:00pm	9:00am-8:00pm	9:00am-8:00pm	Closed

**During the summer, the Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County offers a summer program that runs for four weeks from 8:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.*

The Center has 5 FTEs, and 80% of their time is spent administering youth programs or working with youth.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of males than females participated in the evaluation (67.9% vs. 32.1%). Youth in this sample attended grades 5 through 12; most reported relatively good grade point averages; most identified as White (88.9%); and most reported living with their mothers (78.6%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 32.1%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (42.9%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	9	32.1
Male	19	67.9
Total	28	100.0
Age	n	%
11	10	35.7
12	1	3.6
13	4	14.3
14	4	14.3
15	5	17.9
16	1	3.6
17	1	3.6
18	2	7.1
Total	28	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Black or African American	1	3.7
Latino/a or Hispanic	2	7.4
White	24	88.9
Total	27	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	22	78.6
Father	14	50.0
Mother's Partner	1	3.6
Father's Partner	0	0.0
Foster Mother	1	3.6
Foster Father	1	3.6
Grandmother	8	28.6
Grandfather	4	14.3
Uncle	3	10.7
Aunt	1	3.6
Siblings	22	78.6
Other Foster Children	0	0.0

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	9	32.1
No	19	67.9
Total	28	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
High school diploma	5	17.9
Non-degree training	1	3.6
College degree	12	42.9
Graduate degree	3	10.7
Don't know	7	25.0
Total	28	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	8	28.6
Mostly Bs	11	39.3
Mostly Cs	9	32.1
Total	28	100.0
Grade	n	%
5th	7	25.0
6th	3	10.7
7th	4	14.3
8th	3	10.7
9th	5	17.9
10th	3	10.7
11th	1	3.6
12th	2	7.1
Total	28	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN CHILD AND FAMILY INSTITUTE OF FAIRFIELD COUNTY

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County, (*n* = 28)

This table compares the average scores for Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from this program who chose each of the seven response options.	Average for CFI Program	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.29	6.19	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	10.7	28.6	53.6
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.32	6.10	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	14.3	28.6	53.6
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	6.39	6.06	0.0	0.0	3.6	3.6	10.7	14.3	67.9
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.36	6.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	10.7	32.1	53.6
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	6.29	5.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	17.9	14.3	60.7
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	6.54	6.13	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	7.1	17.9	71.4
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	6.21	6.07	0.0	3.6	0.0	3.6	14.3	21.4	57.1
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.36	5.53	0.0	7.1	3.6	25.0	7.1	25.0	32.1
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.52	5.73	3.6	0.0	0.0	21.4	21.4	14.3	35.7
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	6.14	5.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	28.6	17.9	50.0
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.32	5.34	0.0	3.6	7.1	25.0	14.3	17.9	32.1
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	4.61	4.91	7.1	7.1	10.7	25.0	17.9	7.1	25.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from this program who chose each of the seven response options.	Average for CFI Program	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	4.61	4.89	7.1	17.9	7.1	10.7	17.9	10.7	28.6
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	6.04	5.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.9	10.7	21.4	50.0
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	6.36	5.92	0.0	0.0	3.6	7.1	7.1	14.3	67.9
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	6.07	5.75	0.0	0.0	7.1	10.7	3.6	21.4	53.6
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	6.59	6.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.7	17.9	67.9
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	6.30	6.01	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.7	7.1	21.4	57.1
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	6.37	6.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.1	25.0	57.1
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	6.15	5.99	0.0	3.6	0.0	7.1	14.3	14.3	57.1
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	6.19	5.94	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	10.7	14.3	57.1

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 29)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 28)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	6.24	6.34
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	5.10	5.37
Supportive Environment	6.03	6.01	6.29

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 10)	Boys (n = 19)	Girls (n = 9)	Boys (n = 19)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.05	6.34	6.62	6.21
Challenge & Involvement	4.45*	5.46*	5.40	5.35
Supportive Environment	5.80	6.10	6.63	6.12

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 24) [§]	16-18 (n = 5) [§]	11-15 (n = 24) [§]	16-18 (n = 4) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.29	5.97	6.30	6.61
Challenge & Involvement	5.08	5.17	5.26	6.04
Supportive Environment	6.04	5.82	6.25	6.54

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County and all other programs. That is, information from Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Program (n = 10)	Others (n = 277)	Your Program (n = 19)	Others (n = 338)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.05	6.02	6.34*	5.75*
Challenge & Involvement	4.45*	5.35*	5.46	4.92
Supportive Environment	5.80	5.87	6.10	5.64
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Program (n = 9)	Others (n = 451)	Your Program (n = 19)	Others (n = 571)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.62	6.10	6.21	6.07
Challenge & Involvement	5.40	5.48	5.35	5.32
Supportive Environment	6.63	6.02	6.12	5.92

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Program (n = 24)	Others (n = 411)	Your Program (n = 5) [§]	Others (n = 212) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.29*	5.78*	5.97	6.03
Challenge & Involvement	5.09	5.00	5.17	5.33
Supportive Environment	6.04*	5.63*	5.82	5.92
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Program (n = 24)	Others (n = 707)	Your Program (n = 4) [§]	Others (n = 325) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.30	6.08	6.61	6.09
Challenge & Involvement	5.26	5.35	6.04	5.50
Supportive Environment	6.24	5.99	6.54	5.91

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN CHILD AND FAMILY INSTITUTE OF FAIRFIELD COUNTY

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for Child and Family Institute of Fairfield County for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures two aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year. Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 29)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 28)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	3.86	1.19	3.62	1.35
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.02	1.15	2.54	1.31
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.26	1.02	2.93	1.35
Alienation	1	6	2.67	.79	2.61	.82

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 29 in 2008, n = 27 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
In the last year, how many times did you...	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	"+2" (%)	"+2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	75.9	77.8	13.8	11.1	6.9	7.4	3.4	3.7
2. Skip classes or school?	75.9	70.4	6.9	3.7	0.0	11.1	17.2	14.8
3. Drink in a public place?	86.4	85.2	0.0	11.1	10.3	3.7	3.4	0.0
4. Damage or destroy property?	72.4	66.7	13.8	14.8	0.0	14.8	13.8	3.7
5. Steal or try to steal something?	58.6	70.4	17.2	11.1	10.3	3.7	13.8	14.8
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	65.6	81.5	13.8	11.1	3.4	0.0	17.2	7.4
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	55.2	53.8	13.8	15.4	6.9	11.5	24.1	19.2
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	79.3	77.8	0.0	14.8	10.3	3.7	10.3	3.7
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	79.3	92.6	3.4	7.4	3.4	0.0	13.8	0.0
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	93.1	100.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0

Cardinal Shehan Center

H.O.P.E. Initiative

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The Cardinal Shehan Center provides after-school, evening, and summer programs that focus on educational, recreational, and cultural activities.

The Center is 5,500 sq. ft. and includes the following:

- Indoor swimming pool
- Gymnasium
- Fitness center
- Tennis court
- Game room
- Arts & crafts room
- Member's lounge
- Dark room (photography lab)
- Computer lab
- Library and outdoor facilities (two outdoor basketball courts)
- Kitchen
- Outside softball field and a playground site

Youth use 100% of the facility.

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	2:30pm-9:00pm	2:30pm-9:00pm	2:30pm-9:00pm	2:30pm-9:00pm	2:30pm-9:00pm	12:00pm-4:00pm

**The Center is open during vacations.*

The Center has 9 FTEs and 20 part-time staff. Twelve staff members spend 100% of their time working with the youth. The other seven employees work with the youth indirectly.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of Cardinal Shehan Center youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of males than females participated in the evaluation (68.7% vs. 31.3%). Participating youth attended grades 6 through 12; most reported relatively good grade point averages; most identified as Black/African American (59.7%); and most reported living with their mothers (82.1%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 32.3%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (47.7%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	21	31.3
Male	46	68.7
Total	67	100.0
Age	n	%
12	3	4.5
13	8	11.9
14	9	13.4
15	8	11.9
16	9	13.4
17	23	34.3
18	7	10.4
Total	67	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	1	1.5
Black or African American	40	59.7
Latino/a or Hispanic	7	10.4
Native American	1	1.5
White	13	19.4
Multiracial	4	6.0
Total	67	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	55	82.1
Father	32	47.8
Mother's Partner	5	7.5
Father's Partner	1	1.5
Foster Mother	1	1.5
Foster Father	0	0.0
Grandmother	5	7.5
Grandfather	1	1.5
Uncle	4	6.0
Aunt	3	4.5
Siblings	30	44.8
Other foster children	1	1.5

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	21	32.3
No	44	67.7
Total	65	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	3	4.6
High school diploma	7	10.8
Non-degree training	1	1.5
College degree	31	47.7
Graduate degree	12	18.5
Don't know	11	16.9
Total	65	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	10	15.6
Mostly Bs	28	43.8
Mostly Cs	19	29.7
Mostly Ds	5	7.8
Mostly Fs	1	1.6
N/A	1	1.6
Total	64	100.0
Grade	n	%
6th	2	3.0
7th	6	9.0
8th	7	10.4
9th	11	16.4
10th	13	19.4
11th	14	20.9
12th	14	20.9
Total	67	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN CARDINAL SHEHAN CENTER

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in Cardinal Shehan Center as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in Cardinal Shehan Center, (n = 67)

This table compares the average scores for Cardinal Shehan Center with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Cardinal Shehan Center who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Cardinal Shehan	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.03	6.19	0.0	0.0	1.5	13.4	6.0	38.8	40.3
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.03	6.10	0.0	0.0	1.5	10.4	11.9	35.8	40.3
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	5.73	6.06	0.0	3.0	1.5	14.9	11.9	35.8	31.3
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	5.75	6.17	0.0	3.0	1.5	11.9	14.9	38.8	29.9
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	5.79	5.93	0.0	1.5	1.5	16.4	9.0	40.3	31.3
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	5.85	6.13	0.0	0.0	1.5	13.4	14.9	38.8	31.3
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	5.90	6.07	0.0	0.0	1.5	11.9	11.9	44.8	29.9
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.40	5.53	1.5	1.5	3.0	19.4	19.4	34.3	20.9
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.64	5.73	1.5	1.5	0.0	19.4	10.4	38.8	26.9
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.47	5.62	4.5	0.0	0.0	22.4	11.9	32.8	26.9
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.23	5.34	4.5	3.0	4.5	20.9	13.4	25.4	26.9
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	4.94	4.91	6.0	6.0	3.0	23.9	13.4	26.9	19.4

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for Cardinal Shehan Center with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Cardinal Shehan Center who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Cardinal Shehan	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	4.82	4.89	11.9	6.0	3.0	16.4	14.9	22.4	23.9
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	5.37	5.78	6.0	3.0	3.0	11.9	14.9	29.9	28.4
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	5.60	5.92	3.0	0.0	3.0	14.9	14.9	35.8	28.4
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.47	5.75	3.0	4.5	4.5	10.4	11.9	37.3	26.9
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	5.97	6.15	0.0	0.0	1.5	7.5	14.9	43.3	31.3
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	5.65	6.01	0.0	0.0	6.0	13.4	17.9	32.8	28.4
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	5.58	6.08	3.0	0.0	1.5	17.9	14.9	32.8	28.4
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	5.64	5.99	1.5	1.5	3.0	13.4	19.4	26.9	32.8
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	5.65	5.94	3.0	0.0	3.0	19.4	6.0	32.8	34.3

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in Cardinal Shehan Center: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 42)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 67)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	6.15	5.87
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	5.06	5.26
Supportive Environment	6.03	6.00	5.65

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* Cardinal Shehan Center for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within Cardinal Shehan Center are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in Cardinal Shehan Center. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in Cardinal Shehan Center. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Cardinal Shehan Center: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 9)	Boys (n = 32)	Girls (n = 21)	Boys (n = 46)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.54	6.03	6.16*	5.73*
Challenge & Involvement	5.94*	4.78*	5.84*	5.01*
Supportive Environment	6.16	5.95	5.82	5.57

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Cardinal Shehan Center: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 20)	16-18 (n = 22)	11-15 (n = 28)	16-18 (n = 39)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.19	6.12	6.02	5.76
Challenge & Involvement	5.08	5.04	5.03	5.42
Supportive Environment	6.12	5.90	5.64	5.65

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between Cardinal Shehan Center and all other programs. That is, information from Cardinal Shehan Center is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Cardinal Shehan Center: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Program (n = 9)	Others (n = 278)	Your Program (n = 32)	Others (n = 325)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.54	6.01	6.03	5.75
Challenge & Involvement	5.94*	5.29*	4.78	4.97
Supportive Environment	6.16	5.86	5.95	5.64
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Program (n = 21)	Others (n = 439)	Your Program (n = 46)	Others (n = 544)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.16	6.11	5.73*	6.10*
Challenge & Involvement	5.84	5.47	5.01	5.35
Supportive Environment	5.82	6.04	5.57*	5.96*

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Cardinal Shehan Center: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Program (n = 20)	Others (n = 415)	Your Program (n = 22)	Others (n = 195)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.19*	5.78*	6.12	6.02
Challenge & Involvement	5.08	5.00	5.04	5.35
Supportive Environment	6.12*	5.63*	5.90	5.93
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Program (n = 28)	Others (n = 703)	Your Program (n = 39)	Others (n = 290)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.02	6.09	5.76	6.14
Challenge & Involvement	5.03	5.36	5.42	5.52
Supportive Environment	5.64	6.02	5.65	5.96

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN CARDINAL SHEHAN CENTER

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within Cardinal Shehan Center. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for Cardinal Shehan Center for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 41)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 67)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	4.61	.97	4.17	1.19
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.37	.94	3.09	.95
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.77	.92	3.50	1.07
Alienation	1	6	2.18	1.05	2.34	.98

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 42 in 2008, n = 67 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	" +2" (%)	" +2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	95.1	75.4	2.4	7.7	2.4	3.1	0.0	13.8
2. Skip classes or school?	78.0	57.6	14.6	10.6	2.4	1.5	4.9	30.3
3. Drink in a public place?	87.8	65.6	2.4	7.8	2.4	1.6	7.3	25.0
4. Damage or destroy property?	73.2	64.6	17.1	10.8	4.9	7.7	4.9	16.9
5. Steal or try to steal something?	85.4	64.6	9.8	16.9	2.4	4.6	2.4	13.8
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	80.0	51.6	15.0	14.1	2.5	9.4	2.5	25.0
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	55.3	40.9	23.7	18.2	7.9	12.1	13.2	28.8
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	74.4	62.5	10.3	6.3	7.7	4.7	7.7	26.6
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	92.7	67.7	4.9	7.7	2.4	0.0	0.0	24.6
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	100.0	78.5	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.8

Carver Foundation of Norwalk, Inc.
Youth Development Program

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The Carver Center provides after-school and evening programs focusing on academic, enrichment and recreational activities.

The Center is 24,000 sq. ft. and includes the following:

- Gymnasium (60% used by youth)
- Kitchen (60% used by youth)
- Conference room
- 12-station computer lab (70% used by youth)
- 10 offices
- 9 classrooms (100% used by youth)
- Drop-in teen center (100% used by youth)

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Scheduled Basketball	2:30pm-8:00pm	2:30pm-8:00pm	2:30pm-8:00pm	2:30pm-8:00pm	2:30pm-9:00pm	Scheduled Basketball

**The Center is open late for at least two nights per month to facilitate teen events. On those days, the center is open until 12 (midnight).*

The Center has 25 FTEs, and 32% work on the youth programs.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of Carver Center youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of females than males participated in the evaluation (56.9% vs. 43.1%). Participating youth attended grades 6 through 12; most reported relatively good grade point averages; most identified as Black/African American (84.6%); and most reported living with their fathers (36.9%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 56.9%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (54.1%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	37	56.9
Male	28	43.1
Total	65	100.0
Age	n	%
11	2	3.1
12	8	12.3
13	11	16.9
14	9	13.8
15	12	18.5
16	11	16.9
17	8	12.3
18	4	6.2
Total	65	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	4	6.2
Black or African American	55	84.6
Latino/a or Hispanic	1	1.5
Multiracial	5	7.7
Total	65	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	55	15.4
Father	24	36.9
Mother's Partner	4	6.2
Father's Partner	3	4.6
Foster Mother	0	0.0
Foster Father	1	1.5
Grandmother	11	16.9
Grandfather	3	4.6
Uncle	3	4.6
Aunt	3	4.6
Siblings	40	61.5
Other foster children	0	0.0

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	37	56.9
No	28	43.1
Total	65	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	5	8.2
High school diploma	5	8.2
College degree	33	54.1
Graduate degree	10	16.4
Don't know	8	13.1
Total	61	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	11	17.5
Mostly Bs	34	54.0
Mostly Cs	15	25.4
Mostly Ds	2	3.2
Total	63	100.0
Grade	n	%
6th	6	9.2
7th	9	13.8
8th	10	15.4
9th	9	13.8
10th	14	21.5
11th	11	16.9
12th	6	9.2
Total	65	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN CARVER CENTER

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences at the Carver Center as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in Carver Center, (n = 65)

This table compares the average scores for Carver Center with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Carver Center who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Carver	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	5.72	6.19	4.6	3.1	0.0	10.8	18.5	15.4	47.7
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	5.65	6.10	4.6	4.6	4.6	6.2	15.4	16.9	47.7
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	5.84	6.06	1.5	4.6	3.1	6.2	12.3	26.2	44.6
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	5.82	6.17	3.1	4.6	3.1	6.2	12.3	21.5	49.2
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	5.53	5.93	3.1	4.6	4.6	13.8	9.2	24.6	38.5
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	5.94	6.13	3.1	1.5	6.2	6.2	10.8	15.4	56.9
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	5.82	6.07	4.6	3.1	1.5	10.8	9.2	18.5	52.3
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	4.67	5.53	10.8	3.1	7.7	18.5	23.1	16.9	18.5
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.43	5.73	6.2	4.6	1.5	10.8	20.0	18.5	38.5
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.19	5.62	6.2	4.6	3.1	16.9	15.4	21.5	29.2
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	4.80	5.34	10.8	6.2	6.2	12.3	20.0	20.0	23.1
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	4.20	4.91	15.4	9.2	7.7	23.1	10.8	15.4	16.9

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for Carver Center with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Carver Center who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Carver	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	4.12	4.89	21.5	7.7	9.2	13.8	15.4	10.8	21.5
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	5.22	5.78	9.2	4.6	6.2	9.2	13.8	16.9	38.5
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	5.68	5.92	9.2	3.1	0.0	9.2	7.7	18.5	52.3
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.15	5.75	10.8	4.6	4.6	9.2	13.8	23.1	33.8
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	5.69	6.15	7.7	4.6	0.0	6.2	7.7	26.2	46.2
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	5.46	6.01	7.7	3.1	6.2	6.2	13.8	21.5	41.5
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	5.78	6.08	3.1	6.2	1.5	7.7	12.3	16.9	50.8
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	5.55	5.99	7.7	4.6	4.6	1.5	12.3	26.2	41.5
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	5.49	5.94	4.6	4.6	6.2	6.2	15.4	21.5	38.5

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in Carver Center: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 80)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 65)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	5.52	5.76
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	4.56	4.81
Supportive Environment	6.03	5.47	5.54

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* Carver Center for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within Carver Center are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in Carver Center. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in Carver Center. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Carver Center: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 50)	Boys (n = 30)	Girls (n = 37)	Boys (n = 28)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.59	5.38	5.82	5.68
Challenge & Involvement	4.69	4.35	4.93	4.64
Supportive Environment	5.57	5.30	5.81	5.18

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Carver Center: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 53)	16-18 (n = 27)	11-15 (n = 42)	16-18 (n = 23)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.40	5.75	5.70	5.86
Challenge & Involvement	4.42	4.85	4.76	4.90
Supportive Environment	5.27	5.86	5.44	5.71

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between Carver Center and all other programs. That is, information from Carver Center is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Carver Center: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Program (n = 50)	Others (n = 237)	Your Program (n = 30)	Others (n = 327)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.59*	6.11*	5.38	5.81
Challenge & Involvement	4.69*	5.44*	4.35*	5.01*
Supportive Environment	5.57	5.99	5.30	5.70
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Program (n = 37)	Others (n = 423)	Your Program (n = 28)	Others (n = 562)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.82	6.14	5.68	6.10
Challenge & Involvement	4.93*	5.53*	4.64*	5.37*
Supportive Environment	5.81	6.06	5.18*	5.98*

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Carver Center: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Program (n = 53)	Others (n = 382)	Your Program (n = 27)	Others (n = 190)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.40*	5.85*	5.75	6.07
Challenge & Involvement	4.42*	5.09*	4.85	5.39
Supportive Environment	5.27*	5.71*	5.86	6.00
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Program (n = 42)	Others (n = 689)	Your Program (n = 23)	Others (n = 306)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.70	6.12	5.86	6.12
Challenge & Involvement	4.76*	5.39*	4.90*	5.55*
Supportive Environment	5.44*	6.04*	5.71	5.94

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN CARVER CENTER

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth in Carver Center. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for Carver Center for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 78)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 64)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	3.83	1.15	3.90	1.32
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.61	.96	3.34	1.08
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.80	1.04	3.62	1.06
Alienation	1	6	2.50	1.02	2.53	1.07

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 78 in 2008, n = 64 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	" +2" (%)	" +2" (%)
In the last year, how many times did you...								
1. Run away from home?	89.7	84.4	6.4	10.9	2.6	0.0	1.3	4.7
2. Skip classes or school?	51.9	37.1	13.0	17.7	14.3	17.7	20.8	27.4
3. Drink in a public place?	75.3	79.0	7.8	8.1	3.9	4.8	13.0	8.1
4. Damage or destroy property?	63.6	70.0	11.7	15.0	5.2	10.0	19.5	5.0
5. Steal or try to steal something?	70.1	68.9	14.3	13.1	5.2	9.8	10.4	8.2
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	70.5	59.4	16.7	10.9	2.6	12.5	10.3	17.2
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	52.6	50.0	24.4	12.9	14.1	14.5	9.0	22.6
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	67.9	66.1	17.9	11.3	2.6	11.3	11.5	11.3
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	91.0	74.2	1.3	14.5	2.6	1.6	5.1	9.7
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	97.4	96.7	2.6	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Casa Otonal, Inc.

Youth Violence Prevention Program: Hill Youth Action Team

CENTER DESCRIPTION

Casa Otonal (Casa Latina) Hill Youth Action Team Center provides after-school, evening, and summer programs focusing on the arts, career exploration, community service, and leadership development.

The Center is approximately 1,200 sq. ft. and includes the following:

- Large multi-purpose room (used by youth and adults)
- Receptionist area
- Waiting area
- Conference room
- Small kitchenette
- Copier/intake room
- Older youth/adult computer lab
- 4 offices
- Computer lab/main room (used by youth)
- Arts/craft room (used by youth)
- Lounge area room (used by youth)
- 2 classrooms (used by youth)

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	Closed	3:00pm-6:00pm	3:00pm-6:00pm	3:00pm-6:00pm	Closed	Open for special occasions

**During the summer, the program usually operates Monday thru Thursday from 8:30AM – 3:30PM for about five weeks.*

The Center has 3 FTEs. The Youth Empowerment Specialist spends 100% administering youth programming or working with youth. The Director spends 25% of time administering youth programs. The Case Manager spends 50% of time working with youth program.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of Casa Otonal (Casa Latina) Hill Youth Action Team Center youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of males than females participated in the evaluation (66.7% vs. 33.3%). Participating youth attended grades 9 through 12; most reported relatively good grade point averages; most identified as Black/African American (83.3%); and most reported living with their mothers (83.3%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 66.7%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (50.0%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	4	33.3
Male	8	66.7
Total	12	100.0
Age	n	%
14	2	16.7
15	3	25.0
16	1	8.3
17	4	33.3
18	2	16.7
Total	12	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Black or African American	10	83.3
Latino/a or Hispanic	1	8.3
Multiracial	1	8.3
Total	12	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	10	83.3
Father	3	25.0
Mother's Partner	0	0.0
Father's Partner	0	0.0
Foster Mother	0	0.0
Foster Father	0	0.0
Grandmother	0	0.0
Grandfather	0	0.0
Uncle	0	0.0
Aunt	1	8.3
Siblings	4	33.3
Other foster children	0	0.0

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	8	66.7
No	4	33.3
Total	12	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
Non-degree training	1	8.3
College degree	6	50.0
Graduate degree	3	25.0
Don't know	2	16.7
Total	12	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	1	8.3
Mostly Bs	7	58.3
Mostly Cs	4	33.3
Total	12	100.0
Grade	n	%
9th	3	25.0
10th	3	25.0
11th	3	25.0
12th	3	25.0
Total	12	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN CASA OTONAL HILL YOUTH ACTION TEAM

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Hill Youth Action Team as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in Casa Otonal Hill Youth Action Team, (*n* = 12)

This table compares the average scores for Casa Otonal with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Casa Otonal who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Casa Otonal	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	5.67	6.19	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	58.3
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	5.75	6.10	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	66.7
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	5.75	6.06	8.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	58.3
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	5.42	6.17	8.3	8.3	0.0	8.3	16.7	8.3	50.0
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	5.67	5.93	8.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	25.0	8.3	50.0
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	5.67	6.13	8.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	8.3	58.3
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	5.33	6.07	8.3	8.3	0.0	8.3	16.7	16.7	41.7
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.42	5.53	8.3	8.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	50.0
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.33	5.73	8.3	0.0	8.3	8.3	25.0	8.3	41.7
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.42	5.62	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	16.7	41.7	25.0
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.25	5.34	8.3	0.0	8.3	16.7	8.3	25.0	33.3
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	5.08	4.91	8.3	0.0	8.3	16.7	16.7	25.0	25.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for Casa Otonal with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Casa Otonal who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Casa Otonal	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	5.17	4.89	8.3	8.3	0.0	8.3	16.7	33.3	25.0
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	5.58	5.78	8.3	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	25.0	50.0
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	5.25	5.92	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	0.0	25.0	41.7
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.17	5.75	8.3	8.3	0.0	16.7	16.7	8.3	41.7
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	5.42	6.15	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	50.0
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	5.33	6.01	8.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	33.3
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	5.58	6.08	8.3	0.0	8.3	8.3	8.3	16.7	50.0
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	5.67	5.99	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	25.0	0.0	58.3
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	5.83	5.94	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	16.7	58.3

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Hill Youth Action Team: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 6)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 12)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	6.40	5.61
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	6.00	5.32
Supportive Environment	6.03	6.17	5.46

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* Casa Otonal Hill Youth Action Team for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within Casa Otonal are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Hill Youth Action Team. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Hill Youth Action Team. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Hill Youth Action Team: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 2) [§]	Boys (n = 4) [§]	Girls (n = 4) [§]	Boys (n = 8) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.50	6.36	4.89	5.96
Challenge & Involvement	5.71	6.14	4.71	5.62
Supportive Environment	6.28	6.11	4.54	5.93

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Hill Youth Action Team: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 0)	16-18 (n = 6)	11-15 (n = 5) [§]	16-18 (n = 7) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	--	6.40	6.46	5.00
Challenge & Involvement	--	6.00	5.77	5.00
Supportive Environment	--	6.17	6.03	5.06

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between Casa Otonal Hill Youth Action Team and all other programs. That is, information from Casa Otonal Hill Youth Action Team is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Hill Youth Action Team: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Program (n = 2) [§]	Others (n = 285) [§]	Your Program (n = 4) [§]	Others (n = 353) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.50	6.02	6.36	5.77
Challenge & Involvement	5.71	5.31	6.14	4.94
Supportive Environment	6.29	5.87	6.11	5.66
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Program (n = 4) [§]	Others (n = 456)	Your Program (n = 8) [§]	Other (n = 582)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	4.89	6.12	5.96	6.07
Challenge & Involvement	4.71	5.49	5.62	5.32
Supportive Environment	4.54	6.04	5.93	5.93

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Hill Youth Action Team: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Program (n = 0)	Others	Your Program (n = 6)	Others (n = 211)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	--	--	6.40	6.02
Challenge & Involvement	--	--	6.00	5.30
Supportive Environment	--	--	6.17	5.92
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Program (n = 5) [§]	Others (n = 726)	Your Program (n = 7) [§]	Others (n = 322)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.46	6.09	5.00	6.12
Challenge & Involvement	5.77	5.35	5.00	5.51
Supportive Environment	6.03	6.00	5.06	5.94

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN CASA OTONAL HILL YOUTH ACTION TEAM

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within Casa Otonal Hill Youth Action Team. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for Casa Otonal Hill Youth Action Team for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 6)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 12)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	3.33	1.13	3.85	1.36
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.28	.71	3.00	.38
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.39	.98	3.53	.70
Alienation	1	6	2.28	.56	2.30	.74

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 12)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
In the last year, how many times did you...	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	"+2" (%)	"+2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	83.3	91.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	8.3
2. Skip classes or school?	33.3	41.7	33.3	16.7	0.0	8.3	33.3	33.3
3. Drink in a public place?	83.3	100.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Damage or destroy property?	83.3	83.3	16.7	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0
5. Steal or try to steal something?	66.7	58.3	33.3	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	8.3
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	83.3	58.3	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	66.7	58.3	0.0	8.3	16.7	0.0	16.7	25.0
8. Drink bear, wine, or any other liquor?	100.0	58.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	100.0	83.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	100.0	91.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0

Casa Otonal, Inc.

Youth Violence Prevention Program: Youth as Leaders

CENTER DESCRIPTION

Casa Otonal (Casa Latina) Youth as Leaders Center provides after-school, evening, and summer programs focusing on the arts, career exploration, community service, and leadership development.

The Center is approximately 1,200 sq. ft. and includes the following:

- Large multi-purpose room (used by youth and adults)
- Receptionist area
- Waiting area
- Conference room
- Small kitchenette
- Copier/intake room
- Older youth/adult computer lab
- 4 offices
- Computer lab/main room (used by youth)
- Arts/craft room (used by youth)
- Lounge area room (used by youth)
- 2 classrooms (used by youth)

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	3:00pm-7:00pm	3:00pm-7:00pm	3:00pm-7:00pm	3:00pm-7:00pm	3:00pm-6:00pm	Open for special occasions

**The Center operates on an adjusted schedule during school half days and vacation days. During the summer, the program converts to a six-week full-day summer camp Monday through Friday from 8:30am to 4:00pm.*

The Center has one FTE, and 100% of all staff members dedicate their time to working with youth.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of Casa Otonal (Casa Latina) Youth as Leaders Center youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of females participated in the evaluation (51.5%). Participating youth attended grades 5 through 10; most reported relatively good grade point averages; most identified as Black/African American (45.5%) and Latino(a)/Hispanic (45.5%), most reported living with their mothers (87.9%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 93.8%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (39.4%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	17	51.5
Male	16	48.5
Total	33	100.0
Age	n	%
11	4	12.1
12	14	42.4
13	7	21.2
14	4	12.1
15	3	9.1
16	1	3.0
Total	33	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	2	6.1
Black or African American	15	45.5
Latino/a or Hispanic	15	45.5
White	1	3.0
Total	33	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	29	87.9
Father	10	30.3
Mother's Partner	2	6.1
Father's Partner	0	0.0
Foster Mother	1	3.0
Foster Father	0	0.0
Grandmother	6	18.2
Grandfather	2	6.1
Uncle	2	6.1
Aunt	1	3.0
Siblings	20	60.6
Other foster children	0	0.0

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	30	93.8
No	2	6.3
Total	32	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
High school diploma	3	9.1
College degree	13	39.4
Graduate degree	6	18.2
Don't know	11	33.3
Total	33	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	2	6.1
Mostly Bs	22	66.7
Mostly Cs	8	24.2
N/A	1	3.0
Total	33	100.0
Grade	n	%
5th	1	3.1
6th	9	28.1
7th	12	37.5
8th	4	12.5
9th	4	12.5
10th	2	6.3
Total	32	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN CASA OTONAL YOUTH AS LEADERS CENTER

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center, (n = 33)

This table compares the average scores for Casa Otonal with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Casa Otonal who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Casa Otonal	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.18	6.19	3.0	3.0	3.0	6.1	3.0	12.1	69.7
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.30	6.10	3.0	6.1	0.0	3.0	0.0	12.1	75.8
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	6.39	6.06	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	6.1	6.1	78.8
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.44	6.17	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	9.1	75.8
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	6.00	5.93	6.1	3.0	0.0	6.1	3.0	24.2	57.6
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	6.41	6.13	6.1	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	12.1	75.8
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	6.27	6.07	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	72.7
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.97	5.53	3.0	3.0	0.0	9.1	9.1	21.2	51.5
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.94	5.73	6.1	3.0	0.0	0.0	21.2	9.1	57.6
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	6.00	5.62	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	18.2	18.2	51.5
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.66	5.34	6.1	6.1	3.0	6.1	6.1	21.2	48.5
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	5.84	4.91	6.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	30.3	45.5

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for Casa Otonal with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Casa Otonal who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Casa Otonal	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	5.78	4.89	9.1	3.0	0.0	6.1	9.1	12.1	57.6
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	6.00	5.78	6.1	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	27.3	54.5
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	6.24	5.92	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	30.3	57.6
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	6.21	5.75	6.1	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	21.2	66.7
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	6.45	6.15	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	15.2	75.8
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	6.09	6.01	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	30.3	54.5
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	6.27	6.08	6.1	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.2	69.7
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	6.30	5.99	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	21.2	66.7
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	6.30	5.94	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	66.7

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 7)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 33)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	6.84	6.29
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	6.28	5.87
Supportive Environment	6.03	6.90	6.27

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 4) [§]	Boys (n = 3) [§]	Girls (n = 17)	Boys (n = 16)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.89	6.76	6.20	6.38
Challenge & Involvement	6.32	6.24	5.99	5.74
Supportive Environment	7.00	6.76	6.22	6.31

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 7) [§]	16-18 (n = 0) [§]	11-15 (n = 32) [§]	16-18 (n = 1) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.84	--	6.27	--
Challenge & Involvement	6.28	--	5.84	--
Supportive Environment	6.90	--	6.24	--

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center and all other programs. That is, information from Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Program (n = 4) [§]	Others [§] (n = 283) [§]	Your Program (n = 3) [§]	Others (n = 354) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.89	6.01	6.76	5.77
Challenge & Involvement	6.32	5.30	6.24	4.94
Supportive Environment	7.00	5.85	6.76	5.65
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Program (n = 17)	Others (n = 443)	Your Program (n = 16)	Others (n = 574)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.20	6.11	6.38	6.06
Challenge & Involvement	5.99	5.46	5.74	5.32
Supportive Environment	6.22	6.02	6.31	5.92

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Program (n = 7)	Others (n = 428)	Your Program (n = 0) [§]	Others (n = 217) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.84*	5.78*	--	--
Challenge & Involvement	6.28*	4.99*	--	--
Supportive Environment	6.90*	5.64*	--	--
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Program (n = 32)	Others (n = 699)	Your Program (n = 1) [§]	Other Centers [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.27	6.08	--	--
Challenge & Involvement	5.84*	5.33*	--	--
Supportive Environment	6.24	5.99	--	--

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN CASA OTONAL YOUTH AS LEADERS CENTER

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for Casa Otonal Youth as Leaders Center for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 7)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 32)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	4.21	1.51	4.23	1.17
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.43	1.15	3.50	1.02
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.52	1.29	3.91	.89
Alienation	1	6	3.50	1.08	2.61	1.30

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 7 in 2008, n = 32 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	"+"2" (%)	"+"2" (%)
In the last year, how many times did you...								
1. Run away from home?	71.4	81.3	14.3	12.5	14.3	6.3	0.0	0.0
2. Skip classes or school?	42.9	71.0	28.6	6.5	0.0	3.2	28.6	19.4
3. Drink in a public place?	71.4	93.8	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	6.3
4. Damage or destroy property?	57.1	71.9	14.3	21.9	0.0	6.3	28.6	0.0
5. Steal or try to steal something?	100.0	93.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	3.2
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	28.6	56.3	0.0	18.8	0.0	0.0	71.4	25.0
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	28.6	56.3	14.3	25.0	0.0	3.1	57.1	15.6
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	100.0	87.5	0.0	9.4	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Central Connecticut Coast YMCA
Dwight Youth Violence Prevention Program

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The Central Connecticut Coast (New Haven) YMCA Center provides after-school and summer programs focusing on social recreational, leadership, and vocational activities.

The Center includes the following:

- 2 full size gymnasiums (used by youth)
- Pool (used by youth)
- 4 pre-school classrooms
- Older youth game room with 2 pool tables, ping pong, TV, air hockey, treadmill, board games, video games (used by youth)
- Kitchen (used by youth)
- Homework room (used by youth)
- Boys and girls locker room
- 4 office spaces

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	1:30pm-6:30pm	1:30pm-6:30pm	1:30pm-6:30pm	1:30pm-6:30pm	1:30pm-6:00pm	Closed

**During the summer and school vacations, the Center is open from 12:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.*

The Center has 19 FTEs, and 26% work directly with the youth.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of Central Connecticut Coast (New Haven) YMCA Center youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of males participated in the evaluation (77.1%). Participating youth attended grades 7 through 12; most reported relatively good grade point averages; most identified as Black/African American (83.3%); and most reported living with their mothers (85.4%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 78.3%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (46.8%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	11	22.9
Male	37	77.1
Total	48	100.0
Age	n	%
12	3	6.3
13	3	6.3
14	4	8.3
15	9	18.8
16	8	16.7
17	16	33.3
18	5	10.4
Total	48	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	1	2.1
Black or African American	40	83.3
Latino/a or Hispanic	1	2.1
White	3	6.3
Multiracial	3	6.3
Total	48	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	41	85.4
Father	7	14.6
Mother's Partner	2	4.2
Father's Partner	0	0.0
Foster Mother	0	0.0
Foster Father	0	0.0
Grandmother	6	12.5
Grandfather	2	4.2
Uncle	2	4.2
Aunt	2	4.2
Siblings	21	43.8
Other foster children	0	0.0

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	36	78.3
No	10	21.7
Total	46	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	2	4.3
High school diploma	9	19.1
Non-degree training	2	4.3
College degree	22	46.8
Graduate degree	6	12.8
Don't know	6	12.8
Total	47	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	3	6.7
Mostly Bs	26	57.8
Mostly Cs	14	31.1
Mostly Ds	2	4.4
Total	45	100.0
Grade	n	%
7th	7	14.6
8th	1	2.1
9th	6	12.5
10th	8	16.7
11th	17	35.4
12th	9	18.8
Total	48	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN NEW HAVEN YMCA

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in New Haven YMCA as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in New Haven YMCA, (n = 48)

This table compares the average scores for New Haven YMCA with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from New Haven YMCA who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for N.H. YMCA	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.35	6.19	0.0	4.2	2.1	0.0	2.1	29.2	58.3
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.35	6.10	0.0	0.0	4.2	2.1	2.1	35.4	52.1
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	6.36	6.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	2.1	37.5	47.9
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.30	6.17	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	2.1	37.5	50.0
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	6.06	5.93	2.1	0.0	2.1	2.1	14.6	35.4	41.7
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	6.19	6.13	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	8.3	37.5	45.8
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	6.33	6.07	0.0	0.0	2.1	2.1	6.3	35.4	47.9
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.70	5.53	0.0	4.2	6.3	4.2	16.7	33.3	31.3
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.93	5.73	0.0	0.0	4.2	4.2	14.6	43.8	29.2
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.93	5.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	8.3	45.8	27.1
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.39	5.34	2.1	0.0	6.3	12.5	22.9	33.3	18.8
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	5.13	4.91	4.2	4.2	6.3	12.5	20.8	29.2	18.8

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for New Haven YMCA with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from New Haven YMCA who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for N.H. YMCA	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	5.17	4.89	0.0	8.3	8.3	12.5	16.7	29.2	20.8
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	6.07	5.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	16.7	35.4	35.4
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	6.24	5.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	12.5	35.4	43.8
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.69	5.75	2.1	4.2	2.1	8.3	12.5	39.6	31.3
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	6.17	6.15	0.0	0.0	4.2	2.1	10.4	39.6	43.8
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	5.93	6.01	2.1	0.0	4.2	6.3	8.3	33.3	37.5
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	6.02	6.08	0.0	0.0	4.2	6.3	8.3	43.8	35.4
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	5.92	5.99	0.0	2.1	0.0	8.3	18.8	35.4	35.4
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	5.77	5.94	2.1	2.1	2.1	8.3	16.7	33.3	35.4

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in New Haven YMCA: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 73)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 48)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	5.69	6.27
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	5.02	5.61
Supportive Environment	6.03	5.56	5.96

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* New Haven YMCA for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within New Haven YMCA are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in New Haven YMCA. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in New Haven YMCA. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in New Haven YMCA: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 16)	Boys (n = 57)	Girls (n = 11)	Boys (n = 35)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.61	5.72	6.53	6.19
Challenge & Involvement	4.65	5.12	6.00*	5.48*
Supportive Environment	5.36	5.62	6.30	5.86

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in New Haven YMCA: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 43)	16-18 (n = 30)	11-15 (n = 18)	16-18 (n = 28)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.68	5.72	6.48	6.13
Challenge & Involvement	4.89	5.20	5.90	5.42
Supportive Environment	5.48	5.68	6.27	5.77

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between New Haven YMCA and all other programs. That is, information from New Haven YMCA is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in New Haven YMCA: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 16)	Others (n = 271)	Your Center (n = 57)	Others (n = 300)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.61	6.05	5.72	5.79
Challenge & Involvement	4.65	5.35	5.12	4.92
Supportive Environment	5.36	5.90	5.62	5.67
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 11)	Others (n = 449)	Your Center (n = 35)	Others (n = 555)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.53	6.10	6.19	6.06
Challenge & Involvement	6.00*	5.47*	5.48	5.32
Supportive Environment	6.30	6.02	5.86	5.93

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in New Haven YMCA: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 43)	Others (n = 392)	Your Center (n = 30)	Others (n = 187)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.68	5.81	5.72	6.08
Challenge & Involvement	4.89	5.02	5.20	5.34
Supportive Environment	5.48	5.68	5.68	5.96
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 18)	Others (n = 713)	Your Center (n = 28)	Others (n = 301)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.48*	6.08*	6.13	6.09
Challenge & Involvement	5.90*	5.34*	5.42	5.51
Supportive Environment	6.27	6.00	5.78	5.94

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN NEW HAVEN YMCA

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within New Haven YMCA. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for New Haven YMCA for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 73)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 48)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	4.00	1.34	4.12	1.15
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.23	1.18	3.11	1.02
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.38	1.18	3.32	1.10
Alienation	1	6	2.56	1.14	2.57	1.11

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 73 in 2008, n = 48 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
In the last year, how many times did you...	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	"+" (%)	"+" (%)
1. Run away from home?	83.3	89.6	11.1	6.3	1.4	4.2	4.2	0.0
2. Skip classes or school?	54.3	48.9	18.6	27.7	15.7	10.6	11.4	12.8
3. Drink in a public place?	87.0	81.3	4.3	12.5	1.4	6.3	7.2	0.0
4. Damage or destroy property?	67.6	74.5	19.7	14.9	8.5	6.4	4.2	4.3
5. Steal or try to steal something?	75.4	70.8	15.9	18.8	2.9	2.1	5.8	8.3
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	58.9	66.0	20.5	21.3	5.5	4.3	15.1	8.5
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	56.9	57.4	15.3	19.1	8.3	19.1	19.4	4.3
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	75.7	70.8	10.0	12.5	5.7	8.3	8.6	8.3
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	73.6	68.8	18.1	8.3	2.8	10.4	5.6	12.5
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	90.1	95.8	5.6	2.1	2.8	0.0	1.4	2.1

City of Bridgeport
Trumbull Gardens Teen Center

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The City of Bridgeport (Trumbull Gardens) Center provides after-school and evening programs focusing on sports, recreational, and educational activities.

The Center is 12,024 sq. ft. and contains the following:

- 1 full court gym
- 3 full basketball
- 2 tennis courts outside
- 2 classrooms
- 1 full kitchen
- 1 stage
- 1 computer lab

Youth use 100% of facility.

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Scheduled Basketball	Closed	2:00pm-10:00pm	2:00pm-10:00pm	2:00pm-10:00pm	2:00pm-10:00pm	2:00pm-10:00pm

**The Center is open during vacations.*

The program has one FTE, 4 part time employees; 70% of staff time is utilized for programming and actually working with the youth directly.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of City of Bridgeport (Trumbull Gardens) Center youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of males participated in the evaluation (84.1% vs.15.9%). Participating youth attended grades 6 through 12; most reported relatively good grade point averages; most identified as Black/African American (77.1%); and most reported living with their mothers (80.3%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 72.5%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (43.5%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	11	15.9
Male	58	84.1
Total	69	100.0
Age	n	%
12	4	5.6
13	13	18.3
14	14	19.7
15	6	8.5
16	14	19.7
17	13	18.3
18	7	9.9
Total	71	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	1	1.4
Black or African American	54	77.1
Latino/a or Hispanic	8	11.4
White	6	8.6
Multiracial	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	57	80.3
Father	24	33.8
Mother's Partner	4	5.6
Father's Partner	0	0.0
Foster Mother	0	0.0
Foster Father	0	0.0
Grandmother	11	15.5
Grandfather	4	5.6
Uncle	2	2.8
Aunt	4	5.6
Siblings	27	38.0
Other foster children	0	0.0

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	50	72.5
No	19	27.5
Total	69	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	8	11.6
High school diploma	9	13.0
College degree	30	43.5
Graduate degree	12	17.4
Don't know	10	14.5
Total	69	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	10	14.3
Mostly Bs	27	38.6
Mostly Cs	19	41.4
Mostly Ds	2	2.9
N/A	2	2.9
Total	70	100.0
Grade	n	%
6th	3	4.3
7th	11	15.7
8th	16	22.9
9th	11	15.7
10th	5	7.1
11th	14	20.0
12th	9	12.9
Not in school	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN TRUMBULL GARDENS CENTER

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in Trumbull Gardens Center as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in Trumbull Gardens Center, (n = 71)

This table compares the average scores for Trumbull Gardens Center with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Trumbull Gardens Center who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for T.G. Center	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.24	6.19	5.6	0.0	1.4	2.8	2.8	22.5	64.8
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.01	6.10	5.6	1.4	1.4	4.2	9.9	18.3	57.7
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	5.74	6.06	4.2	1.4	2.8	9.9	14.1	22.5	43.7
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	5.86	6.17	4.2	1.4	4.2	5.6	11.3	25.4	47.9
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	5.96	5.93	4.2	2.8	0.0	8.5	7.0	23.9	52.1
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	6.03	6.13	4.2	2.8	0.0	4.2	14.1	14.1	57.7
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	6.09	6.07	7.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	9.9	15.5	62.0
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.64	5.53	4.2	0.0	2.8	18.3	11.3	19.7	42.3
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.86	5.73	4.2	2.8	1.4	7.0	12.7	19.7	49.3
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.43	5.62	7.0	1.4	4.2	12.7	16.9	16.9	39.4
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.53	5.34	4.2	2.8	1.4	18.3	12.7	19.7	39.4
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	4.91	4.91	8.5	2.8	7.0	23.9	9.9	18.3	26.8

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for Trumbull Gardens Center with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Trumbull Gardens Center who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for T.G. Center	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	4.90	4.89	7.0	4.2	5.6	21.1	18.3	12.7	25.4
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	5.61	5.78	7.0	1.4	0.0	16.9	8.5	18.3	45.1
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	5.70	5.92	8.5	0.0	0.0	8.5	16.9	16.9	46.5
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.54	5.75	7.0	4.2	1.4	11.3	5.6	28.2	39.4
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	5.78	6.15	5.6	1.4	1.4	7.0	14.1	15.5	46.5
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	5.76	6.01	1.4	2.8	1.4	11.3	16.9	22.5	39.4
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	5.88	6.08	2.8	1.4	0.0	9.9	18.3	16.9	46.5
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	5.79	5.99	4.2	1.4	0.0	11.3	12.7	23.9	42.3
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	5.64	5.94	4.2	1.4	1.4	15.5	15.5	12.7	43.7

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in Trumbull Gardens Center: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 50)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 71)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	5.99	6.00
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	5.17	5.40
Supportive Environment	6.03	5.72	5.72

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* Trumbull Gardens Center for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within Trumbull Gardens Center are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in Trumbull Gardens Center. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in Trumbull Gardens Center. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Trumbull Gardens Center: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 8)	Boys (n = 42)	Girls (n = 11)	Boys (n = 58)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.00	5.98	6.28	5.93
Challenge & Involvement	5.30	5.15	5.70	5.37
Supportive Environment	5.96	5.67	6.31	5.61

*Statistically significant differences. §Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Trumbull Gardens Center: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 25)	16-18 (n = 25)	11-15 (n = 37)	16-18 (n = 34)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.06	5.91	5.93	6.07
Challenge & Involvement	5.25	5.09	5.10	5.72
Supportive Environment	5.93	5.50	5.64	5.80

*Statistically significant differences. §Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between Trumbull Gardens Center and all other programs. That is, information from Trumbull Gardens Center is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Trumbull Gardens Center: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 8)	Others (n = 279)	Your Center (n = 42)	Others (n = 315)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.00	6.02	5.99	5.75
Challenge & Involvement	5.30	5.32	5.15	4.92
Supportive Environment	5.96	5.87	5.67	5.66
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 11)	Others (n = 449)	Your Center (n = 58)	Others (n = 532)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.28	6.11	5.93	6.09
Challenge & Involvement	5.70	5.48	5.37	5.32
Supportive Environment	6.31	6.03	5.61	5.96

*Statistically significant differences. §Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Trumbull Gardens Center: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 25)	Others (n = 410)	Your Center (n = 25)	Others (n = 192)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.06	5.78	5.91	6.04
Challenge & Involvement	5.26	4.99	5.09	5.35
Supportive Environment	5.93	5.64	5.50	5.98
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 37)	Others (n = 694)	Your Center (n = 34)	Others (n = 295)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.93	6.10	6.07	6.10
Challenge & Involvement	5.10	5.36	5.72	5.48
Supportive Environment	5.64	6.02	5.80	5.93

*Statistically significant differences. §Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN TRUMBULL GARDENS CENTER

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within Trumbull Gardens Center. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for Trumbull Gardens Center for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 50)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 70)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	4.35	1.37	4.31	1.57
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.34	1.11	3.29	.96
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.59	.99	3.56	.88
Alienation	1	6	2.22	1.06	2.46	1.34

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 50 in 2008, n = 70 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	"+2" (%)	"+2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	100.0	90.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	4.3	0.0	1.4
2. Skip classes or school?	54.0	57.1	20.0	12.9	8.0	12.9	18.0	17.1
3. Drink in a public place?	85.4	85.3	8.3	2.9	2.1	1.5	4.2	10.3
4. Damage or destroy property?	81.3	74.3	6.3	12.9	4.2	4.3	8.3	8.6
5. Steal or try to steal something?	82.0	82.6	4.0	7.2	4.0	1.4	10.0	8.7
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	66.0	58.6	10.0	15.7	14.0	4.3	10.0	21.4
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	56.0	62.9	12.0	8.6	4.0	7.1	28.0	21.4
8. Drink bear, wine, or any other liquor?	84.0	84.3	2.0	5.7	6.0	0.0	8.0	10.0
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	92.0	82.9	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	8.0	10.0
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	100.0	92.9	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7

City of New Britain

Exercise the Right Choice: Pulaski

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The City of New Britain Pulaski Center provides after-school, evening, and summer programs focusing on educational, recreational/wellness, and cultural arts, and leadership activities.

The Center is approximately 157,459 sq. ft. plus an additional 10,000 sq. ft. for portable classrooms and includes the following:

- 37 classrooms
- Auditorium
- Kitchen
- Cafeteria
- Media center

Youth use approximately 90% of the school.

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	3:00pm-6:00pm	3:00pm-6:00pm	3:00pm-6:00pm	12:00pm-4:00pm	3:00pm-6:00pm	9:00 am-1:00 pm

The program has .5 of a FTE staff employed. Of the 6 part time staff onsite at Pulaski, 85% of staff time is spent directly administering youth programs and working with the youth.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of City of New Britain Pulaski youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of males participated in the evaluation (67.6%). Participating youth attended grades 6 through 8; most reported relatively good grade point averages; most identified as Latino(a)/Hispanic (54.4%); and most reported living with their mothers (89.7%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 73.1%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (58.2%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	22	32.4
Male	46	67.6
Total	68	100.0
Age	n	%
11	10	14.7
12	21	30.9
13	24	35.3
14	11	16.2
15	2	2.9
Total	68	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	1	1.5
Black or African American	12	17.6
Latino/a or Hispanic	37	54.4
Asian American	4	5.9
White	3	4.4
Multiracial	11	16.2
Total	68	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	61	89.7
Father	31	45.6
Mother's Partner	7	10.3
Father's Partner	1	1.5
Foster Mother	1	1.5
Foster Father	1	1.5
Grandmother	6	8.8
Grandfather	2	2.9
Uncle	4	5.9
Aunt	3	4.4
Siblings	31	45.6
Other foster children	1	1.5

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	49	73.1
No	18	26.9
Total	67	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	3	4.5
High school diploma	3	4.5
Non-degree training	1	1.5
College degree	39	58.2
Graduate degree	13	19.4
Don't know	8	11.9
Total	67	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	16	24.6
Mostly Bs	31	47.7
Mostly Cs	16	24.6
Mostly Ds	1	1.5
Mostly Fs	1	1.5
Total	65	100.0
Grade	n	%
6th	17	25.0
7th	27	39.7
8th	24	35.3
Total	68	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN PULASKI

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in Pulaski as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in Pulaski, (*n* = 68)

This table compares the average scores for Pulaski with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Pulaski who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Pulaski	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.59	6.19	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	2.9	30.9	64.7
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.34	6.10	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	5.9	41.2	48.5
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	6.28	6.06	0.0	0.0	1.5	4.4	8.8	35.3	50.0
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.48	6.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	5.9	30.9	58.8
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	6.14	5.93	1.5	0.0	1.5	4.4	10.3	35.3	44.1
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	6.30	6.13	0.0	2.9	1.5	0.0	10.3	27.9	55.9
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	6.24	6.07	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	5.9	39.7	44.1
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.78	5.53	2.9	2.9	0.0	8.8	16.2	29.4	38.2
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.93	5.73	0.0	1.5	1.5	8.8	14.7	36.8	35.3
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.75	5.62	2.9	0.0	0.0	10.3	22.1	30.9	32.4
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.75	5.34	1.5	5.9	0.0	4.4	17.6	36.8	32.4
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	4.92	4.91	8.8	7.4	4.4	13.2	19.1	16.2	27.9

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for Pulaski with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Pulaski who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Pulaski	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	4.93	4.89	8.8	8.8	1.5	20.6	11.8	19.1	29.4
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	5.91	5.78	4.4	0.0	0.0	7.4	16.2	26.5	44.1
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	6.04	5.92	2.9	1.5	2.9	2.9	13.2	23.5	52.9
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.88	5.75	2.9	2.9	0.0	7.4	14.7	27.9	44.1
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	6.38	6.15	1.5	0.0	1.5	1.5	7.4	27.9	60.3
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	6.10	6.01	1.5	1.5	0.0	1.5	16.2	36.8	42.6
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	6.30	6.08	2.9	0.0	0.0	1.5	7.4	32.4	54.4
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	6.07	5.99	2.9	0.0	0.0	1.5	14.7	41.2	39.7
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	6.19	5.94	2.9	1.5	1.5	2.9	8.8	23.5	58.8

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in Pulaski: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 17)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 68)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	6.49	6.33
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	6.06	5.44
Supportive Environment	6.03	6.48	6.14

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* Pulaski for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within Pulaski are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in Pulaski. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in Pulaski. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Pulaski: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 10)	Boys (n = 7)	Girls (n = 22)	Boys (n = 46)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.50	6.47	6.66*	6.18*
Challenge & Involvement	6.31	5.71	6.15*	5.26*
Supportive Environment	6.66	6.22	6.54*	5.95*

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Pulaski: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 17)	16-18 (n = 0)	11-15 (n = 68)	16-18 (n = 0)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.49	--	6.33	--
Challenge & Involvement	6.06	--	5.44	--
Supportive Environment	6.48	--	6.14	--

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between Pulaski and all other programs. That is, information from Pulaski is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Pulaski: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 10)	Others (n = 277)	Your Center (n = 7)	Others (n = 350)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.50*	6.00*	6.47	5.76
Challenge & Involvement	6.31*	5.28*	5.71	4.94
Supportive Environment	6.66*	5.84*	6.22	5.65
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 22)	Others (n = 438)	Your Center (n = 46)	Others (n = 544)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.66*	6.09*	6.18	6.06
Challenge & Involvement	6.15*	5.45*	5.26	5.33
Supportive Environment	6.54*	6.01*	5.95	5.93

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Pulaski: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 17)	Others (n = 418)	Your Center (n =)	Other Centers
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.49*	5.77*	--	--
Challenge & Involvement	6.06*	4.96*	--	--
Supportive Environment	6.48*	5.62*	--	--
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 68)	Others (n = 663)	Your Center (n = 0)	Others (n = 329)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.33*	6.07*	--	--
Challenge & Involvement	5.54	5.33	--	--
Supportive Environment	6.14	5.99	--	--

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN PULASKI

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within Pulaski. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for Pulaski for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 17)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 68)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	4.70	1.48	4.28	1.33
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	4.00	.79	3.34	1.07
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	4.12	.87	3.75	1.06
Alienation	1	6	2.32	.78	2.48	.89

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 16 in 2008, n = 68 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
In the last year, how many times did you...	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	" +2" (%)	" +2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	93.8	89.7	0.0	5.9	6.3	2.9	0.0	1.5
2. Skip classes or school?	68.8	69.7	18.8	10.6	0.0	13.6	12.5	6.1
3. Drink in a public place?	93.8	91.2	0.0	4.4	0.0	2.9	6.3	1.5
4. Damage or destroy property?	81.3	67.2	12.5	16.4	0.0	9.0	6.3	7.5
5. Steal or try to steal something?	87.5	70.1	12.5	20.9	0.0	4.5	0.0	4.5
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	68.8	61.8	18.8	25.0	12.5	7.4	0.0	5.9
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	43.8	52.9	37.5	25.0	12.5	10.3	6.3	11.8
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	87.5	88.2	6.3	7.4	0.0	0.0	6.3	4.4
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	93.8	92.6	6.3	2.9	0.0	2.9	0.0	1.5
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	100.0	98.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5

City of New Britain

Exercise the Right Choice: Roosevelt

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The City of New Britain Roosevelt Center provides after-school, evening, and summer programs focusing on educational, recreational/wellness, cultural arts, and leadership activities.

The Center is approximately 100,800 sq. ft. and includes the following:

- 28 classrooms
- Cafeteria
- Kitchen
- Gymnasium
- Media center

Youth use approximately 90% of the school.

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	3:00pm-6:00pm	3:00pm-6:00pm	3:00pm-6:00pm	12:00pm-4:00pm	3:00pm-6:00pm	9:00 am-1:00 pm

The program has .5 of a FTE staff employed. Of the 7 part time staff onsite at Roosevelt, 85% of staff time is spent directly administering youth programs and working with the youth.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of City of New Britain Roosevelt youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of males participated in the evaluation (54.5%). Participating youth attended grades 6 through 8; most reported relatively good grade point averages; most identified as Latino(a)/Hispanic (42.6%); and most reported living with their mothers (83.2%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 67.3%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (48.5%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	46	45.5
Male	55	54.5
Total	101	100.0
Age	n	%
11	13	12.9
12	40	39.6
13	29	28.7
14	15	14.9
15	4	4.0
Total	101	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	3	3.0
Black or African American	37	36.6
Latino/a or Hispanic	43	42.6
Asian American	2	2.0
White	8	7.9
Multiracial	8	7.9
Total	101	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	84	83.2
Father	49	48.5
Mother's Partner	11	10.9
Father's Partner	5	5.0
Foster Mother	1	1.0
Foster Father	1	1.0
Grandmother	12	11.9
Grandfather	4	4.0
Uncle	7	6.9
Aunt	5	5.0
Siblings	48	47.5
Other foster children	1	1.0

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	68	67.3
No	33	32.7
Total	101	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	3	3.0
High school diploma	4	4.0
Non-degree training	4	4.0
College degree	49	48.5
Graduate degree	22	21.8
Don't know	19	18.8
Total	101	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	12	12.2
Mostly Bs	45	45.9
Mostly Cs	36	36.7
Mostly Ds	4	4.1
Total	98	100.0
Grade	n	%
6th	24	23.8
7th	50	49.5
8th	27	26.7
Total	101	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN ROOSEVELT

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in Roosevelt as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in your Roosevelt, (n = 101)

This table compares the average scores for Roosevelt with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Roosevelt who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Roosevelt	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.05	6.19	2.0	1.0	1.0	10.9	8.9	23.8	52.5
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	5.98	6.10	2.0	0.0	1.0	10.9	11.9	29.7	44.6
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	6.02	6.06	2.0	1.0	2.0	10.9	6.9	25.7	50.5
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.22	6.17	2.0	0.0	2.0	5.9	11.9	16.8	61.4
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	5.64	5.93	2.0	2.0	4.0	11.9	19.8	22.8	37.6
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	6.05	6.13	2.0	1.0	4.0	6.9	7.9	25.7	52.5
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	6.03	6.07	1.0	1.0	4.0	5.9	11.9	27.7	47.5
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.62	5.53	3.0	2.0	4.0	12.9	16.8	21.8	39.6
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.73	5.73	1.0	1.0	3.0	12.9	18.8	27.7	35.6
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.46	5.62	4.0	5.9	2.0	11.9	14.9	27.7	33.7
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.25	5.34	5.0	5.0	4.0	13.9	19.8	23.8	28.7
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	4.75	4.91	7.9	8.9	5.0	17.8	19.8	17.8	21.8

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for Roosevelt with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Roosevelt who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Roosevelt	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	4.82	4.89	8.9	7.9	2.0	18.8	20.8	16.8	23.8
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	5.57	5.78	4.0	4.0	1.0	12.9	21.8	10.9	43.6
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	5.71	5.92	3.0	2.0	2.0	12.9	17.8	16.8	43.6
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.81	5.75	2.0	4.0	1.0	12.9	11.9	19.8	47.5
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	6.25	6.15	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	9.9	22.8	59.4
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	6.13	6.01	1.0	1.0	0.0	7.9	11.9	25.7	49.5
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	6.07	6.08	2.0	3.0	0.0	5.9	12.9	21.8	53.5
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	5.98	5.99	3.0	2.0	2.0	5.0	11.9	25.7	48.5
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	6.08	5.94	2.0	2.0	0.0	5.9	12.9	25.7	50.5

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in Roosevelt: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 24)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 101)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	5.37	6.00
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	4.73	5.32
Supportive Environment	6.03	5.27	6.00

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* Roosevelt for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within Roosevelt are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in Roosevelt. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in Roosevelt. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Roosevelt: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 11)	Boys (n = 13)	Girls (n = 46)	Boys (n = 55)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.35	5.38	5.83	6.14
Challenge & Involvement	4.66	4.79	5.24	5.39
Supportive Environment	5.26	5.28	5.77	6.20

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Roosevelt: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 24)	16-18 (n = 0)	11-15 (n = 101)	16-18 (n = 0)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.37	--	6.00	--
Challenge & Involvement	4.73	--	5.32	--
Supportive Environment	5.27	--	6.00	--

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between Roosevelt and all other programs. That is, information from Roosevelt is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Roosevelt: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 11)	Others (n = 276)	Your Center (n = 13)	Others (n = 344)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.35	6.05	5.38	5.79
Challenge & Involvement	4.66	5.34	4.79	4.96
Supportive Environment	5.26	5.89	5.28	5.68
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 46)	Others (n = 414)	Your Center (n = 55)	Others (n = 535)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.83	6.14	6.14	6.06
Challenge & Involvement	5.24	5.51	5.39	5.32
Supportive Environment	5.77	6.06	6.20*	5.90*

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Roosevelt: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 24)	Others (n = 411)	Your Center (n = 0)	Other (n = 217)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.37	5.82	--	--
Challenge & Involvement	4.73	5.02	--	--
Supportive Environment	5.27	5.68	--	--
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 101)	Others (n = 630)	Your Center (n = 0)	Others (n = 329)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.00	6.11	--	--
Challenge & Involvement	5.32	5.36	--	--
Supportive Environment	6.00	6.00	--	--

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN ROOSEVELT

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within Roosevelt. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for Roosevelt for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 24)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 100)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	3.99	1.56	4.04	1.41
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	2.99	1.24	3.38	1.18
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.35	1.10	3.63	1.07
Alienation	1	6	2.94	1.34	2.80	1.08

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 25 in 2008, n = 100 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
In the last year, how many times did you...	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	" +2" (%)	" +2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	80.0	85.1	16.0	11.9	0.0	0.0	4.0	3.0
2. Skip classes or school?	72.0	70.3	8.0	11.9	4.0	6.9	16.0	10.9
3. Drink in a public place?	88.0	85.9	0.0	6.1	4.0	1.0	8.0	7.1
4. Damage or destroy property?	60.0	69.0	20.0	16.0	8.0	7.0	12.0	8.0
5. Steal or try to steal something?	56.0	70.7	24.0	15.2	4.0	3.0	16.0	11.1
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	72.0	66.0	12.0	13.0	8.0	11.0	8.0	10.0
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	48.0	47.5	28.0	22.8	0.0	11.9	24.0	17.8
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	76.0	84.2	8.0	10.9	8.0	2.0	8.0	3.0
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	92.0	94.1	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	8.0	2.0
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	96.0	97.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	4.0	0.0

City of New Britain

Exercise the Right Choice: Slade

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The City of New Britain Slade Center provides after-school, evening and summer programs focusing on educational, recreational/wellness, cultural arts, and leadership activities.

The Center is approximately 153,711 sq. ft. plus an additional 10,000 sq. ft. for portable classrooms and includes the following:

- 65 classrooms
- Cafeteria
- Auditorium
- Gymnasium
- Kitchen
- Media center

Youth use approximately 90% of the school.

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	3:00pm-6:00pm	3:00pm-6:00pm	3:00pm-6:00pm	12:00pm-4:00pm	3:00pm-6:00pm	9:00 am-1:00 pm

The Center has .5 of a FTE staff employed for the center. Of the seven part time staff onsite at Slade, 85% of staff time is spent directly administering youth programs and working with the youth.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of City of New Britain Slade program youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A slightly greater percentage of females participated in the evaluation (53.5%). Participating youth attended grades 6 through 8; most reported relatively good grade point averages; most identified as Latino(a)/Hispanic (46.5%); and most reported living with their mothers (90.1%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 70.4%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (32.4%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	38	53.5
Male	33	46.5
Total	71	100.0
Age	n	%
11	19	26.8
12	22	31.0
13	19	26.8
14	8	11.3
15	3	4.2
Total	71	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	3	4.2
Black or African American	19	26.8
Latino/a or Hispanic	33	46.5
White	5	7.0
Multiracial	11	15.5
Total	71	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	64	90.1
Father	34	47.9
Mother's Partner	8	11.3
Father's Partner	2	2.8
Foster Mother	2	2.8
Foster Father	2	2.8
Grandmother	6	7.0
Grandfather	0	0.0
Uncle	5	7.0
Aunt	3	4.2
Siblings	32	45.1
Other foster children	4	5.6

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	50	70.4
No	21	29.6
Total	71	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	4	5.6
High school diploma	4	5.6
Non-degree training	3	4.2
College degree	23	32.4
Graduate degree	16	22.5
Don't know	21	29.6
Total	71	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	16	23.5
Mostly Bs	30	44.1
Mostly Cs	14	20.6
Mostly Ds	5	7.4
Mostly Fs	1	1.5
N/A	2	2.9
Total	68	100.0
Grade	n	%
6th	26	36.6
7th	22	31.0
8th	23	32.4
Total	71	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN SLADE

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in Slade as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in Slade, (n = 71)

This table compares the average scores for Slade with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Slade who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Slade	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.24	6.19	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.4	12.7	38.0	46.5
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.21	6.10	1.4	0.0	0.0	2.8	16.9	28.2	50.7
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	6.07	6.06	1.4	1.4	1.4	8.5	8.5	29.6	49.3
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.27	6.17	1.4	0.0	0.0	5.6	9.9	28.2	54.9
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	6.03	5.93	2.8	0.0	0.0	5.6	15.5	32.4	43.7
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	6.24	6.13	2.8	0.0	0.0	2.8	9.9	29.6	53.5
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	6.17	6.07	2.8	0.0	0.0	2.8	12.7	32.4	49.3
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.46	5.53	1.4	0.0	0.0	23.9	19.7	29.6	22.5
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.80	5.73	1.4	0.0	1.4	14.1	16.9	29.6	36.6
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.70	5.62	1.4	1.4	1.4	18.3	11.3	31.0	35.2
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.20	5.34	2.8	4.2	1.4	23.9	19.7	22.5	23.9
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	5.08	4.91	4.2	4.2	5.6	23.9	8.5	33.8	19.7

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for Slade with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Slade who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Slade	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	5.14	4.89	8.5	2.8	4.2	14.1	18.3	22.5	28.2
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	6.14	5.78	1.4	0.0	0.0	9.9	9.9	28.2	50.7
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	6.51	5.92	1.4	0.0	1.4	1.4	9.9	11.3	74.6
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	6.14	5.75	1.4	0.0	0.0	11.3	8.5	26.8	52.1
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	6.45	6.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	9.9	26.8	60.6
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	6.23	6.01	1.4	0.0	0.0	7.0	9.9	28.2	53.5
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	6.43	6.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	11.3	21.1	62.0
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	6.23	5.99	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.5	11.3	29.6	50.7
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	6.42	5.94	1.4	0.0	0.0	5.6	2.8	26.8	63.4

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in Slade: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 35)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 71)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	4.58	6.18
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	4.04	5.51
Supportive Environment	6.03	4.18	6.34

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* Slade for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within Slade are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in Slade. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in Slade. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Slade: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 13)	Boys (n = 20)	Girls (n = 38)	Boys (n = 33)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	4.87	4.66	6.08	6.29
Challenge & Involvement	4.28	4.04	5.58	5.43
Supportive Environment	4.08	4.43	6.19*	6.52*

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Slade: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 35)	16-18 (n = 0)	11-15 (n = 71)	16-18 (n = 0)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	4.58	--	6.18	--
Challenge & Involvement	4.04	--	5.51	--
Supportive Environment	4.18	--	6.34	--

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between Slade and all other programs. That is, information from Slade is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Slade: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 13)	Others (n = 274)	Your Center (n = 20)	Others (n = 337)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	4.87	6.08	4.66*	5.84*
Challenge & Involvement	4.28*	5.36*	4.04*	5.01*
Supportive Environment	4.08*	5.96*	4.43*	5.73*
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 38)	Others (n = 422)	Your Center (n = 33)	Others (n = 557)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.08	6.12	6.29	6.06
Challenge & Involvement	5.58	5.47	5.43	5.32
Supportive Environment	6.19	6.02	6.52*	5.89*

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Slade: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 35)	Others (n = 400)	Your Center (n = 0)	Other (n = 217)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	4.58*	5.90*	--	--
Challenge & Involvement	4.04*	5.09*	--	--
Supportive Environment	4.18*	5.78*	--	--
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 71)	Others (n = 660)	Your Center (n = 0)	Others (n = 329)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.18	6.08	--	--
Challenge & Involvement	5.51	5.33	--	--
Supportive Environment	6.34*	5.97*	--	--

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN SLADE

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within Slade. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for Slade for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 35)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 71)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	3.71	1.50	4.31	1.24
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.25	.91	3.13	.95
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.38	1.03	3.59	.80
Alienation	1	6	2.48	1.03	2.97	1.27

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 35 in 2008, n = 71 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
In the last year, how many times did you...	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	" +2" (%)	" +2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	82.9	90.1	14.3	7.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.8
2. Skip classes or school?	82.4	73.2	5.9	8.5	0.0	9.9	11.8	8.5
3. Drink in a public place?	85.3	92.9	0.0	2.9	5.9	2.9	8.8	1.4
4. Damage or destroy property?	55.9	67.6	26.5	21.1	8.8	5.6	8.8	5.6
5. Steal or try to steal something?	77.1	70.4	11.4	15.5	5.7	8.5	5.7	5.6
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	65.7	64.8	17.1	18.3	2.9	5.6	14.3	11.3
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	64.7	58.6	20.6	21.4	2.9	7.1	11.8	12.9
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	91.4	85.5	0.0	5.8	0.0	2.9	8.6	5.8
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	94.1	91.4	0.0	4.3	0.0	2.9	5.9	1.4
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	97.1	97.2	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0

City of New London

New London Violence Prevention

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The New London Youth Affairs Center offers after-school and evening programs focusing on multidisciplinary activities spanning arts, history, science, culture, sports, employment, community service, prevention issues.

The Center is approximately 53,913 sq. ft. and includes the following:

- 20 offices/rooms
- Senior center (with kitchen, all purpose room, meeting rooms, lounge, computer room, sewing room – used by youth)
- Ceramics room
- Storage room
- Center for the Blind
- Recreation department
- Dance studio
- Auditorium (used by youth)
- Gymnasium (used by youth)
- Miscellaneous generic rooms (for meetings, work spaces, activities)
- Youth Affairs Office
- Youth Affairs Book Bank (used by youth)
- Youth Affairs Family Center (2 offices, two activity rooms – used by youth)

Youth Affairs does not have regular days and hours. Its schedule is program based; the program types and days/times vary widely from month to month. For instance, one month could include a Monday through Friday all day vacation week program at varied local and statewide sites, evening ethnic cooking class at the Martin Center Senior Center, and lunchtime portfolio development workshop at the High School Career Center, with another month including a weekly after school theater series at the Martin Center auditorium, Friday evening Students Night Out recreational event at the New London High School, and off-site University of Connecticut college tour with Latino dance performance.

The Center has six employees with hours ranging from 25 to 35 hours per week; 68% of total staff time is dedicated to youth program administration and direct service. Forty percent of total staff time is dedicated to the 12- to 18-year-old population.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of New London Youth Affairs Center youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A slightly greater percentage of males than females participated in the evaluation (55.0%). Participating youth attended grades 9 through 12; most reported relatively good grade point averages; most identified as Black/African American (60.0 %); and most reported living with their mothers (75.0%). Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a graduate degree (50.0%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	9	45.0
Male	11	55.0
Total	20	100.0
Age	n	%
15	2	10.0
16	4	20.0
17	9	45.0
18	5	25.0
Total	20	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Black or African American	12	60.0
Latino/a or Hispanic	3	15.0
White	4	20.0
Multiracial	1	5.0
Total	20	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	15	75.0
Father	8	40.0
Mother's Partner	1	5.0
Father's Partner	1	5.0
Foster Mother	1	5.0
Foster Father	0	0.0
Grandmother	3	15.0
Grandfather	1	5.0
Uncle	0	0.0
Aunt	1	5.0
Siblings	12	60.0
Other foster children	1	5.0

Educational Goals	n	%
High school diploma	2	10.0
Non-degree training	1	5.0
College degree	6	30.0
Graduate degree	10	50.0
Don't know	1	5.0
Total	20	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	4	20.0
Mostly Bs	14	70.0
Mostly Cs	2	10.0
Total	20	100.0
Grade	n	%
9th	1	5.0
10th	2	10.0
11th	5	25.0
12th	12	60.0
Total	20	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN NEW LONDON YOUTH AFFAIRS CENTER

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in New London Youth Affairs Center as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in New London Youth Affairs Center, (n = 20)

This table compares the average scores for New London Youth Affairs with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Youth Affairs who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for N.L. Youth Affairs	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.85	6.19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	90.0
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.75	6.10	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	85.0
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	6.85	6.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	90.0
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.70	6.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	80.0
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	6.65	5.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	20.0	75.0
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	7.00	6.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	7.00	6.07	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.85	5.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	25.0	35.0	30.0
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	6.45	5.73	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	15.0	10.0	70.0
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	6.15	5.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	25.0	20.0	50.0
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	6.05	5.34	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	40.0	40.0
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	4.85	4.91	10.0	5.0	0.0	20.0	25.0	20.0	20.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for New London Youth Affairs with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Youth Affairs who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for N.L. Youth Affairs	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	5.10	4.89	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	40.0	25.0	15.0
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	6.30	5.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	15.0	25.0	55.0
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	6.50	5.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	5.0	80.0
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	6.65	5.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	15.0	75.0
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	6.85	6.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	85.0
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	6.35	6.01	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	15.0	20.0	60.0
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	6.55	6.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	20.0	70.0
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	6.50	5.99	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	20.0	65.0
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	6.58	5.94	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	15.0	70.0

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in New London Youth Affairs Center: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 23)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 20)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	6.76	6.83
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	6.12	5.82
Supportive Environment	6.03	6.76	6.57

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* New London Youth Affairs Center for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within New London Youth Affairs Center are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in New London Youth Affairs Center. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in New London Youth Affairs Center. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in New London Youth Affairs Center: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 17)	Boys (n = 6)	Girls (n = 9)	Boys (n = 11)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.70	6.93	6.75	6.90
Challenge & Involvement	6.12	6.12	5.65	5.96
Supportive Environment	6.73	6.86	6.52	6.61

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in New London Youth Affairs Center: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 3) [§]	16-18 (n = 20) [§]	11-15 (n = 2) [§]	16-18 (n = 18) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.76	6.76	6.93	6.82
Challenge & Involvement	6.29	6.10	6.00	5.80
Supportive Environment	6.57	6.79	6.86	6.54

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between New London Youth Affairs Center and all other programs. That is, information from New London Youth Affairs Center is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in New London Youth Affairs Center: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 17)	Others (n = 270)	Your Center (n = 6)	Others (n = 351)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.70*	5.98*	6.92*	5.76*
Challenge & Involvement	6.12*	5.26*	6.12*	4.93*
Supportive Environment	6.73*	5.81*	6.86*	5.64*
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 9)	Other (n = 451)	Your Center (n = 11)	Other (n = 579)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.75	6.10	6.90*	6.06*
Challenge & Involvement	5.65	5.48	5.96*	5.31*
Supportive Environment	6.52	6.02	6.61*	5.92*

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in New London Youth Affairs Center: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 3) [§]	Others (n = 432) [§]	Your Center (n = 20)	Others (n = 197)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.76	5.79	6.76	5.96
Challenge & Involvement	6.29	5.00	6.10	5.24
Supportive Environment	6.57	5.65	6.79	5.90
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 2) [§]	Others (n = 729) [§]	Your Center (n = 18)	Others (n = 311)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.93	6.09	6.82*	6.06*
Challenge & Involvement	6.00	5.35	5.80	5.49
Supportive Environment	6.86	6.00	6.54*	5.89*

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN NEW LONDON YOUTH AFFAIRS CENTER

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within New London Youth Affairs Center. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for New London Youth Affairs Center for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 20)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 20)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	4.20	.91	4.59	.95
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.87	.69	3.05	1.15
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.82	.59	3.30	1.17
Alienation	1	6	2.33	1.06	2.01	.94

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 20 in 2008, n = 20 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	" +2" (%)	" +2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	95.0	100.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Skip classes or school?	60.0	65.0	25.0	15.0	0.0	10.0	15.0	10.0
3. Drink in a public place?	90.0	85.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
4. Damage or destroy property?	85.0	100.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0
5. Steal or try to steal something?	80.0	75.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	90.0	90.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	80.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	5.0
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	75.0	65.0	5.0	20.0	0.0	5.0	20.0	10.0
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	80.0	80.0	15.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	95.0	100.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

City of Norwalk

Norwalk Violence Prevention Program

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The Norwalk Center provides after-school, evening, and summer programs focusing on educational, social, and physical/recreational activities.

The Center is approximately 4,376 sq. ft. and includes the following:

- 3 classrooms
- Computer lab
- 3 offices

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	2:30pm-7:30pm	2:30pm-7:30pm	2:30pm-7:30pm	2:30pm-7:30pm	2:30pm-7:30pm	Closed

**During the summer the Center is open from 9:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. During school vacations, the Center is open from 9:00 A.M. to 2:30 P.M.*

The Center has three FTEs, and 100% of the staff time is spent working with youth.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of the Norwalk Center youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of males participated in the evaluation (58.1%). Participating youth attended grades 5 through 11; most reported relatively good grade point averages; most identified as Black/African American (58.5%); and, most reported living with their mothers (81.1%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 72.3%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (40.4%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	39	41.9
Male	54	58.1
Total	93	100.0
Age	n	%
11	10	10.5
12	33	34.7
13	20	21.1
14	14	14.7
15	10	10.5
16	4	4.2
17	2	2.1
18	2	2.1
Total	95	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	14	14.9
Black or African American	55	58.5
Latino/a or Hispanic	16	17.0
Asian American	1	1.1
White	2	2.1
Multiracial	6	6.4
Total	94	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	77	81.1
Father	30	31.6
Mother's Partner	2	2.1
Father's Partner	0	0.0
Foster Mother	0	0.0
Foster Father	0	0.0
Grandmother	11	11.6
Grandfather	5	5.3
Uncle	5	5.3
Aunt	7	7.4
Siblings	32	33.7
Other foster children	0	0.0

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	68	72.3
No	26	27.7
Total	94	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	3	3.2
High school diploma	14	14.9
College degree	38	40.4
Graduate degree	17	18.1
Don't know	22	23.4
Total	94	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	14	15.1
Mostly Bs	49	52.7
Mostly Cs	18	19.4
Mostly Ds	5	5.4
N/A	7	7.5
Total	93	100.0
Grade	n	%
5th	1	1.1
6th	25	26.3
7th	28	29.5
8th	20	21.1
9th	9	9.5
10th	11	11.6
11th	1	1.1
Total	95	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN NORWALK CENTER

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in Norwalk Center as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in Norwalk Center, (n = 95)

This table compares the average scores for Norwalk Center with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Norwalk Center who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Norwalk Center	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	5.72	6.19	6.3	6.3	2.1	8.4	7.4	7.4	60.0
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	5.53	6.10	6.3	6.3	5.3	9.5	6.3	9.5	52.6
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	5.54	6.06	4.2	3.2	9.5	10.5	7.4	14.7	46.3
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	5.78	6.17	2.1	5.3	7.4	8.4	6.3	10.5	55.8
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	5.43	5.93	6.3	4.2	6.3	11.6	8.4	12.6	45.3
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	5.66	6.13	4.2	6.3	6.3	8.4	5.3	10.5	54.7
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	5.34	6.07	6.3	7.4	7.4	8.4	8.4	12.6	45.3
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	4.82	5.53	11.6	6.3	5.3	13.7	15.8	9.5	31.6
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	4.82	5.73	9.5	5.3	11.6	11.6	10.5	21.1	25.3
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	4.77	5.62	9.5	7.4	10.5	14.7	9.5	12.6	30.5
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	4.48	5.34	15.8	7.4	6.3	12.6	14.7	11.6	25.3
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	4.24	4.91	22.1	1.1	14.7	8.4	14.7	4.2	27.4

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for Norwalk Center with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Norwalk Center who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Norwalk Center	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	4.28	4.89	18.9	5.3	8.4	13.7	11.6	13.7	21.1
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	4.88	5.78	12.6	5.3	7.4	11.6	9.5	13.7	33.7
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	5.27	5.92	8.4	3.2	8.4	8.4	10.5	21.1	36.8
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.16	5.75	12.6	1.1	6.3	10.5	10.5	16.8	37.9
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	5.77	6.15	2.1	3.2	7.4	8.4	10.5	12.6	50.5
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	5.88	6.01	4.2	1.1	4.2	7.4	9.5	17.9	50.5
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	5.67	6.08	4.2	5.3	4.2	8.4	11.6	9.5	51.6
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	5.69	5.99	5.3	3.2	5.3	8.4	6.3	18.9	48.4
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	5.48	5.94	8.4	4.2	4.2	9.5	7.4	13.7	48.4

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in Norwalk Center: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 42)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 91)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	5.52	5.58
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	4.79	4.63
Supportive Environment	6.03	5.52	5.57

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* Norwalk Center for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within Norwalk Center are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in Norwalk Center. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in Norwalk Center. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Norwalk Center: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 13)	Boys (n = 28)	Girls (n = 39)	Boys (n = 51)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.88	5.41	5.43	5.66
Challenge & Involvement	5.15	4.65	4.74	4.50
Supportive Environment	5.84	5.42	5.49	5.58

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Norwalk Center: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 40) [§]	16-18 (n = 2) [§]	11-15 (n = 83)	16-18 (n = 8)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.60	3.86	5.53	6.07
Challenge & Involvement	4.86	3.43	4.56	5.39
Supportive Environment	5.59	4.21	5.51	6.23

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between Norwalk Center and all other programs. That is, information from Norwalk Center is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Norwalk Center: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 13)	Others (n = 274)	Your Center (n = 28)	Others (n = 329)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.88	6.03	5.42	5.81
Challenge & Involvement	5.15	5.32	4.65	4.98
Supportive Environment	5.84	5.87	5.43	5.68
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 39)	Others (n = 421)	Your Center (n = 50)	Others (n = 540)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.43*	6.18*	5.66	6.11
Challenge & Involvement	4.74*	5.55*	4.50*	5.40*
Supportive Environment	5.49*	6.08*	5.58	5.96

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Norwalk Center: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 40)	Others (n = 395)	Your Center (n = 2) [§]	Others (n = 215) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.60	5.81	3.86	6.05
Challenge & Involvement	4.86	5.02	3.43	5.34
Supportive Environment	5.59	5.66	4.21	6.00
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 83)	Other (n = 648)	Your Center (n = 8)	Others (n = 321)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.53*	6.16*	6.07	6.10
Challenge & Involvement	4.56*	5.45*	5.39	5.51
Supportive Environment	5.51*	6.07*	6.23	5.91

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN NORWALK CENTER

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within Norwalk Center. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for Norwalk Center for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 41)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 93)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	3.85	1.58	4.16	1.26
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	2.84	1.17	3.41	1.17
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.39	1.27	3.51	1.15
Alienation	1	6	2.41	1.08	2.55	1.08

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 41 in 2008, n = 93 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
In the last year, how many times did you...	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	" +2" (%)	" +2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	95.3	92.5	4.7	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
2. Skip classes or school?	74.4	73.9	7.0	12.0	2.3	4.3	16.3	9.8
3. Drink in a public place?	88.4	93.4	4.7	4.4	2.3	2.2	4.7	0.0
4. Damage or destroy property?	74.4	75.8	7.0	12.1	4.7	5.5	14.0	6.6
5. Steal or try to steal something?	72.1	81.1	14.0	8.9	4.7	2.2	9.3	7.8
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	69.8	81.7	16.3	11.8	2.3	1.1	11.6	5.4
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	41.9	60.9	25.6	16.3	2.3	6.5	30.2	16.3
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	88.4	86.7	7.0	7.8	2.3	3.3	2.3	2.2
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	97.7	96.7	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.2
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	97.7	97.8	0.0	1.1	2.3	1.1	0.0	0.0

Community Renewal Team, Inc.
Youth Arts and Technology Center

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The Community Renewal Team Youth Arts and Technology Center (CRT YAT) provides after-school and summer programs focusing on educational and positive youth development activities in the creative arts and related technology as a preparation for higher education.

The Center is approximately 15,000 sq. ft. and includes the following:

- Gallery and presentation stage
- Small cyber café
- Recording studio
- Art studio
- 1 small classroom
- Large game room
- Storage room
- 2 offices for staff

Youth use 90% of the facility.

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	2:30pm-6:00pm	2:30pm-6:00pm	2:30pm-6:00pm	2:30pm-6:00pm	Closed	Closed

**During the summer, the Center is open from 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.*

The Center has one FTE and two part-time instructors. About 80% of all staff time is spent working with the youth.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of the Community Renewal Team Youth Arts and Technology Center who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of males participated in the evaluation (62.5%). Participating youth attended grades 6 through 12; most reported average grade point averages; most identified as Latino(a)/Hispanic (50.0%); and most reported living with their mothers (91.7%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 83.3%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (29.2%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	9	37.5
Male	15	62.5
Total	24	100.0
Age	n	%
12	4	16.7
13	4	16.7
14	4	16.7
15	1	4.2
16	2	8.3
17	4	16.7
18	5	20.8
Total	24	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	1	4.2
Black or African American	8	33.3
Latino/a or Hispanic	12	50.0
Multiracial	3	12.5
Total	24	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	22	91.7
Father	5	20.8
Mother's Partner	0	0.0
Father's Partner	0	0.0
Foster Mother	0	0.0
Foster Father	0	0.0
Grandmother	4	16.7
Grandfather	1	4.2
Uncle	2	8.3
Aunt	4	16.7
Siblings	9	37.5
Other foster children	0	0.0

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	20	83.3
No	4	16.7
Total	24	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	2	8.3
High school diploma	5	20.8
College degree	7	29.2
Graduate degree	4	16.7
Don't know	6	25.0
Total	24	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	3	12.5
Mostly Bs	13	54.2
Mostly Cs	6	25.0
Mostly Ds	1	4.2
N/A	1	4.2
Total	25	100.0
Grade	n	%
6th	2	8.7
7th	7	30.4
8th	1	4.3
9th	2	8.7
10th	1	4.3
11th	4	17.4
12th	5	26.1
Not in school	1	4.2
Total	23	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN CRT YAT

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in CRT YAT as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in CRT YAT, (*n* = 24)

This table compares the average scores for CRT YAT with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from CRT YAT who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for CRT YAT	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.54	6.19	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.8	75.0
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.29	6.10	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	8.3	33.3	54.2
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	5.71	6.06	0.0	12.5	0.0	4.2	16.7	20.8	45.8
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.29	6.17	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	12.5	70.8
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	5.92	5.93	4.2	0.0	4.2	4.2	8.3	37.5	41.7
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	5.75	6.13	4.2	8.3	4.2	8.3	0.0	16.7	58.3
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	6.08	6.07	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	25.0	58.3
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	4.88	5.53	8.3	8.3	0.0	16.7	20.8	29.2	16.7
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.54	5.73	4.2	0.0	4.2	8.3	16.7	45.8	20.8
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.29	5.62	4.2	0.0	4.2	20.8	20.8	25.0	25.0
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.25	5.34	0.0	4.2	8.3	16.7	25.0	20.8	25.0
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	4.67	4.91	8.3	0.0	12.5	25.0	16.7	25.0	12.5

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for CRT YAT with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from CRT YAT who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for CRT YAT	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	4.25	4.89	0.0	20.8	12.5	20.8	25.0	8.3	12.5
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	5.71	5.78	4.2	4.2	0.0	16.7	4.2	25.0	45.8
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	5.67	5.92	4.2	0.0	12.5	0.0	16.7	25.0	41.7
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.50	5.75	8.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	8.3	33.3	33.3
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	5.75	6.15	8.3	0.0	8.3	4.2	4.2	20.8	54.2
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	5.92	6.01	4.2	4.2	0.0	4.2	8.3	33.3	45.8
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	6.21	6.08	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	20.8	66.7
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	5.92	5.99	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.0	16.7	29.2	45.8
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	6.04	5.94	4.2	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	16.7	58.3

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in CRT YAT: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 13)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 24)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	5.74	6.08
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	4.92	5.08
Supportive Environment	6.03	5.76	5.85

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* CRT YAT for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within CRT YAT are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in CRT YAT. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in CRT YAT. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in CRT YAT: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 9) [§]	Boys (n = 3) [§]	Girls (n = 9)	Boys (n = 15)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.92	5.14	6.36	5.91
Challenge & Involvement	5.31	2.64	5.67	4.73
Supportive Environment	5.74	5.76	6.13	5.68

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in CRT YAT: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 12) [§]	16-18 (n = 1) [§]	11-15 (n = 13)	16-18 (n = 11)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.98	--	6.22	5.92
Challenge & Involvement	5.07	--	5.34	4.78
Supportive Environment	5.90	--	6.30	5.32

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between CRT YAT and all other programs. That is, information from CRT YAT is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in CRT YAT: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 9)	Others (n =278)	Your Center (n = 3) [§]	Others (n = 354)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.92	6.03	5.14	5.78
Challenge & Involvement	5.31	5.32	2.64	4.96
Supportive Environment	5.74	5.87	5.76	5.66
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 9)	Others (n =451)	Your Center (n = 15)	Others (n = 575)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.36	6.11	5.91	6.08
Challenge & Involvement	5.67	5.48	4.73	5.34
Supportive Environment	6.13	6.03	5.68	5.94

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in CRT YAT: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 12)	Others (n = 423)	Your Center (n = 1) [§]	Others (n = 216) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.98	5.79	--	6.04
Challenge & Involvement	5.07	5.00	--	5.33
Supportive Environment	5.90	5.65	--	5.93
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 13)	Others (n =718)	Your Center (n = 11)	Others (n = 318)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.22	6.09	5.92	6.10
Challenge & Involvement	5.34	5.35	4.78	5.53
Supportive Environment	6.30	6.00	5.32	5.94

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN CRT YAT

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within CRT YAT. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for CRT YAT for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 13)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 24)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	3.05	1.46	4.29	1.24
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.05	1.39	3.61	.86
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.38	1.12	3.76	.88
Alienation	1	6	2.79	1.23	2.56	1.10

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 24)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	" +2" (%)	" +2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	84.6	91.7	15.4	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2
2. Skip classes or school?	46.2	62.5	30.8	20.8	7.7	8.3	15.4	8.3
3. Drink in a public place?	69.2	87.0	7.7	4.3	23.1	4.3	0.0	4.3
4. Damage or destroy property?	69.2	75.0	0.0	8.3	15.4	8.3	15.4	8.3
5. Steal or try to steal something?	69.2	91.7	23.1	0.0	0.0	8.3	7.7	0.0
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	61.5	66.7	0.0	16.7	7.7	8.3	30.8	8.3
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	30.8	58.3	61.5	20.8	7.7	8.3	0.0	12.5
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	61.5	75.0	7.7	16.7	15.4	8.3	15.4	0.0
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	84.6	83.3	0.0	4.2	7.7	8.3	7.7	4.2
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	76.9	95.8	0.0	0.0	23.1	4.2	0.0	0.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Ebony Horsewomen, Inc.
Urban Equine Violence

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The Ebony Horsewomen Center provides after-school, evening, and summer programs focusing on leadership training, mentoring, veterinary science, horsemanship training, life skills training, technology training, and earth science.

The Center is approximately 45,000 sq. ft. and includes the following:

- 3 classrooms
- 3 administrative offices
- 3 bathrooms
- Laundry room
- Library
- 14 stall barn with one tack room and one feed room
- Hayloft and storage area
- 6,000 sq. ft. heated indoor riding arena.

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
9:00 am 6:00 pm	9:00am- 7:00pm	9:00am- 7:00pm	9:00am-7:00pm	9:00am- 7:00pm	9:00am- 7:00pm	9:00am- 6:00pm

The Center has six FTEs working with the youth, one contracted staff member, and one part-time staff member.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of the Ebony Horsewomen Center youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of females participated in the evaluation (65.2%). Participating youth attended grades 6 through 12; most reported average grade point averages; most identified as Black/African American (56.5%); and most reported living with their mothers (78.3%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 56.5%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (40.9%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	15	65.2
Male	8	34.8
Total	23	100.0
Age	n	%
11	1	4.3
12	4	17.4
14	4	17.4
15	6	26.1
16	4	17.4
17	3	13.0
18	1	4.3
Total	23	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Black or African American	13	56.5
Latino/a or Hispanic	6	26.1
Native American	1	4.3
Multiracial	3	13.0
Total	23	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	18	78.3
Father	7	30.4
Mother's Partner	1	4.3
Father's Partner	0	0.0
Foster Mother	2	8.7
Foster Father	0	0.0
Grandmother	2	8.7
Grandfather	0	0.0
Uncle	0	0.0
Aunt	0	0.0
Siblings	9	39.1
Other foster children	0	0.0

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	13	56.5
No	10	43.5
Total	23	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	1	4.5
High school diploma	1	4.5
Non-degree training	1	4.5
College degree	9	40.9
Graduate degree	6	27.3
Don't know	4	18.2
Total	22	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	6	26.1
Mostly Bs	8	34.8
Mostly Cs	6	26.1
N/A	3	13.0
Total	23	100.0
Grade	n	%
6th	2	8.7
7th	3	13.0
8th	2	8.7
9th	5	21.7
10th	5	21.7
11th	4	17.4
12th	2	8.7
Total	23	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN EBONY HORSEWOMEN CENTER

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in Ebony Horsewomen Center as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in Ebony Horsewomen Center, (n = 23)

This table compares the average scores for Ebony Horsewomen Center with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Ebony Horsewomen Center who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for E.H. Center	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.22	6.19	4.3	0.0	0.0	4.3	13.0	13.0	65.2
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.39	6.10	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	4.3	30.4	60.9
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	6.22	6.06	0.0	4.3	0.0	8.7	8.7	13.0	65.2
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.09	6.17	4.3	0.0	0.0	13.0	4.3	17.4	60.9
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	6.26	5.93	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	21.7	60.9
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	6.13	6.13	4.3	0.0	0.0	8.7	8.7	17.4	60.9
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	6.30	6.07	4.3	0.0	0.0	4.3	4.3	21.7	65.2
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.55	5.53	4.3	0.0	0.0	30.4	4.3	13.0	43.5
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.95	5.73	4.3	4.3	0.0	4.3	13.0	13.0	56.5
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.59	5.62	4.3	4.3	0.0	13.0	13.0	21.7	39.1
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.36	5.34	8.7	4.3	0.0	8.7	21.7	13.0	39.1
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	4.55	4.91	17.4	4.3	4.3	17.4	17.4	4.3	30.4

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for Ebony Horsewomen Center with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Ebony Horsewomen Center who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for E.H. Center	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	4.73	4.89	17.4	0.0	4.3	21.7	13.0	4.3	34.8
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	6.32	5.78	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	13.0	65.2
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	5.74	5.92	0.0	8.7	0.0	8.7	17.4	21.7	43.5
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.65	5.75	13.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	13.0	17.4	52.2
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	5.96	6.15	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.0	21.7	13.0	56.5
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	6.26	6.01	0.0	4.3	0.0	4.3	8.7	21.7	60.9
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	5.86	6.08	4.3	0.0	0.0	13.0	17.4	8.7	52.2
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	6.05	5.99	4.3	0.0	0.0	4.3	21.7	8.7	56.5
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	5.65	5.94	8.7	4.3	0.0	4.3	17.4	13.0	52.2

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in Ebony Horsewomen Center: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 16)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 23)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	5.59	6.23
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	4.63	5.44
Supportive Environment	6.03	5.38	5.86

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* Ebony Horsewomen Center for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within Ebony Horsewomen Center are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in Ebony Horsewomen Center. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in Ebony Horsewomen Center. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Ebony Horsewomen Center: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 11) [§]	Boys (n = 5) [§]	Girls (n = 15)	Boys (n = 8)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.83	5.07	6.04	6.59
Challenge & Involvement	4.96	3.91	5.30	5.73
Supportive Environment	5.68	4.71	5.55	6.45

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Ebony Horsewomen Center: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 10)	16-18 (n = 6)	11-15 (n = 15)	16-18 (n = 8)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.06	4.81	6.14	6.39
Challenge & Involvement	4.83	4.31	5.19	5.86
Supportive Environment	5.76	4.69	5.85	5.89

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between Ebony Horsewomen Center and all other programs. That is, information from Ebony Horsewomen Center is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Ebony Horsewomen Center: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 11)	Others (n = 276)	Your Center (n = 5) [§]	Others (n = 352) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.83	6.03	5.07	5.79
Challenge & Involvement	4.96	5.33	3.91	4.97
Supportive Environment	5.68	5.88	4.71	5.68
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 15)	Others (n = 445)	Your Center (n = 8)	Others (n = 582)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.04	6.12	6.59	6.06
Challenge & Involvement	5.30	5.49	5.73	5.32
Supportive Environment	5.55	6.05	6.45	5.92

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Ebony Horsewomen Center: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 10)	Others (n = 425)	Your Center (n = 6)	Others (n = 211)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.06	5.79	4.81	6.06
Challenge & Involvement	4.83	5.01	4.31	5.35
Supportive Environment	5.78	5.65	4.69	5.96
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 15)	Others (n = 716)	Your Center (n = 8)	Other (n = 321)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	6.09	6.39	6.09
Challenge & Involvement	5.19	5.35	5.86	5.50
Supportive Environment	5.85	6.01	5.89	5.92

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN EBONY HORSEWOMEN CENTER

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within Ebony Horsewomen Center. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for Ebony Horsewomen Center for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 16)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 23)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	4.46	1.29	4.10	1.27
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.10	1.06	3.67	1.15
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.27	1.03	3.73	.95
Alienation	1	6	1.60	.57	2.47	1.41

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 16 in 2008, n = 23 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
In the last year, how many times did you...	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	" +2" (%)	" +2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	87.5	82.6	6.3	17.4	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Skip classes or school?	56.3	65.2	31.3	4.3	12.5	4.3	0.0	26.1
3. Drink in a public place?	93.8	90.9	6.3	4.5	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0
4. Damage or destroy property?	81.3	73.9	12.5	17.4	0.0	4.3	6.3	4.3
5. Steal or try to steal something?	75.0	100.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	68.8	82.6	25.0	8.7	0.0	4.3	6.3	4.3
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	53.3	56.5	33.3	21.7	6.7	8.7	6.7	13.0
8. Drink bear, wine, or any other liquor?	80.0	78.3	13.3	8.7	0.0	0.0	6.7	13.0
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	100.0	87.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

McGivney Community Center, Inc.
McGivney Teen Programming

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The McGivney Community Center provides educational after-school, evening, and summer programs.

The Center is approximately 10,000 sq. ft. and includes the following:

- Full-sized gymnasium, stocked with sports equipment donated by local schools and businesses.
- Two homework rooms, each with full libraries. Complete reference sets and reading materials have been donated by libraries, book drives conducted by schools in Westport, and families. The larger library also serves as Parent Club meeting space.
- Up-to-date computer room with 10 workstations donated by a local businessman.
- Arts and crafts room stocked with varied media.
- An industrial-sized kitchen with a 6-burner stove and two ovens.
- A dedicated music room with four sets of marimbas, a drum set, a keyboard, and various smaller instruments.

Youth use 100% of the facility.

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	2:30pm-9:00pm	2:30pm-9:00pm	2:30pm-9:00pm	2:30pm-9:00pm	2:30pm-5:30pm	Open for special events

During school vacations, the program is open from 10:00 AM to 3:00 PM. The program runs an abbreviated schedule during school vacations. During the summer, the program is open from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

The Center has 11 FTEs. Of these, ten spend 100% of their time administering youth programs and/or working with youth. The remaining FTE spends 50% of her time working with youth. During the summer, 25 FTEs are employed; 24 summer FTEs spend 100% of their time working with youth, one FTE spends 50%.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of the McGivney Community Center youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of females participated in the evaluation (55.0%). Participating youth attended grades 5 through 12; most reported relatively good grade point averages; most identified as Latino(a)/Hispanic (45.0%); and most reported living with their mothers (82.5%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 46.2%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (45.0%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	22	55.0
Male	18	45.0
Total	40	100.0
Age	n	%
11	8	20.0
12	8	20.0
13	11	27.5
14	6	15.0
15	3	7.5
16	2	5.0
17	2	5.0
Total	40	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	4	10.0
Black or African American	14	35.0
Latino/a or Hispanic	18	45.0
White	2	5.0
Multiracial	2	5.0
Total	40	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	33	82.5
Father	18	45.0
Mother's Partner	2	5.0
Father's Partner	0	0.0
Foster Mother	0	0.0
Foster Father	0	0.0
Grandmother	7	17.5
Grandfather	5	12.5
Uncle	3	7.5
Aunt	6	15.0
Siblings	21	52.5
Other foster children	0	0.0

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	18	46.2
No	21	53.8
Total	40	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	1	2.5
High school diploma	0	0.0
Non-degree training	1	2.5
College degree	18	45.0
Graduate degree	12	30.0
Don't know	8	20.0
Total	40	100.0
GPA	N	%
Mostly As	6	15.0
Mostly Bs	22	55.0
Mostly Cs	8	20.0
Mostly Ds	1	2.5
Mostly Fs	1	2.5
N/A	2	5.0
Total	40	100.0
Grade	N	%
5th	7	17.5
6th	7	17.5
7th	8	20.0
8th	9	22.5
9th	4	10.0
10th	1	2.5
11th	3	7.5
12th	1	2.5
Total	40	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN MCGIVNEY

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in McGivney as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in McGivney, (*n* = 40)

This table compares the average scores for McGivney with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from McGivney who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for McGivney	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.18	6.19	2.5	0.0	7.5	5.0	10.0	2.5	72.5
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.28	6.10	2.5	0.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	15.0	65.0
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	6.29	6.06	5.0	2.5	0.0	5.0	2.5	5.0	75.0
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.25	6.17	2.5	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	25.0	62.5
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	5.98	5.93	2.5	2.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	20.0	55.0
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	6.10	6.13	2.5	2.5	7.5	5.0	5.0	7.5	70.0
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	5.95	6.07	5.0	2.5	2.5	7.5	10.0	10.0	62.5
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.43	5.53	7.5	2.5	2.5	20.0	5.0	20.0	42.5
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.85	5.73	2.5	0.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	30.0	42.5
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.60	5.62	5.0	2.5	0.0	17.5	12.5	20.0	42.5
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	4.83	5.34	15.0	7.5	5.0	12.5	7.5	17.5	35.0
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	4.95	4.91	12.5	5.0	7.5	15.0	7.5	15.0	37.5

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for McGivney with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from McGivney who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for McGivney	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	4.97	4.89	10.0	5.0	2.5	20.0	17.5	7.5	35.0
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	5.63	5.78	5.0	0.0	10.0	7.5	10.0	25.0	42.5
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	5.79	5.92	0.0	5.0	7.5	12.5	7.5	10.0	55.0
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.87	5.75	0.0	5.0	2.5	12.5	10.0	17.5	50.0
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	6.13	6.15	2.5	2.5	2.5	5.0	7.5	17.5	60.0
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	5.90	6.01	0.0	5.0	7.5	10.0	7.5	7.5	60.0
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	5.97	6.08	2.5	2.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	17.5	55.0
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	5.92	5.99	0.0	2.5	10.0	7.5	7.5	15.0	55.0
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	5.90	5.94	2.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.5	17.5	55.0

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in McGivney: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 38)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 40)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	6.18	6.13
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	4.99	5.31
Supportive Environment	6.03	5.98	5.93

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* McGivney for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within McGivney are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in McGivney. Table 5 contrasts younger (11-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in McGivney. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in McGivney: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 12)	Boys (n = 26)	Girls (n = 22)	Boys (n = 18)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.23	6.15	6.08	6.19
Challenge & Involvement	4.98	5.00	5.04	5.65
Supportive Environment	5.99	5.97	5.82	6.05

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in McGivney: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009 [§]	
	11-15 (n = 33) [§]	16-18 (n = 5) [§]	11-15 (n = 36) [§]	16-18 (n = 4) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.15	6.37	6.22	5.32
Challenge & Involvement	4.99	5.00	5.37	4.82
Supportive Environment	5.97	6.03	5.98	5.46

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between McGivney and all other programs. That is, information from McGivney is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in McGivney: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 12)	Others (n = 275)	Your Center (n = 26)	Others (n = 331)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.23	6.01	6.15	5.75
Challenge & Involvement	4.98	5.33	5.00	4.95
Supportive Environment	5.99	5.86	5.97	5.64
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 22)	Others (n = 438)	Your Center (n = 18)	Others (n = 572)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.08	6.11	6.19	6.07
Challenge & Involvement	5.04	5.50	5.65	5.32
Supportive Environment	5.82	6.04	6.05	5.93

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in McGivney: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 33)	Others (n = 402)	Your Center (n = 5) [§]	Others (n = 212) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.15	5.76	6.37	6.02
Challenge & Involvement	4.99	5.01	5.00	5.33
Supportive Environment	5.97	5.63	6.03	5.92
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 36)	Others (n = 695)	Your Center (n = 4) [§]	Others (n = 325) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.22	6.09	5.32	6.11
Challenge & Involvement	5.37	5.35	4.82	5.51
Supportive Environment	5.98	6.00	5.46	5.93

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN MCGIVNEY

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within McGivney. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for McGivney for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 38)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 40)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	4.36	1.02	4.07	1.23
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.52	.88	3.52	1.11
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.76	.87	3.74	.95
Alienation	1	6	2.22	.77	2.44	1.22

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 38 in 2008, n = 40 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
In the last year, how many times did you...	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	" +2" (%)	" +2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	92.1	87.5	7.9	7.5	0.0	2.5	0.0	2.5
2. Skip classes or school?	60.5	82.5	10.5	7.5	10.5	5.0	18.4	5.0
3. Drink in a public place?	94.6	85.0	5.4	10.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	2.5
4. Damage or destroy property?	75.7	77.5	18.9	10.0	2.7	7.5	2.7	5.0
5. Steal or try to steal something?	71.1	69.2	15.8	10.3	2.6	15.4	10.5	5.1
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	68.4	77.5	5.3	7.5	13.2	2.5	13.2	12.5
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	60.5	55.0	23.7	22.5	2.6	5.0	13.2	17.5
8. Drink bear, wine, or any other liquor?	91.9	80.0	0.0	5.0	5.4	2.5	2.7	12.5
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	92.1	90.0	2.6	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	5.0
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	97.4	92.5	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	2.6	5.0

Original Works, Inc.
Youth Art Works

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The East End (Original Works) Center provides after-school, evening, and summer programs focusing on performing art classes, performance opportunities and art related activities and events.

The Center is approximately 4,750 sq. ft. and includes the following:

- Main studio used for film shoots, rehearsals, classes, and performances (used by youth)
- Kitchen used to feed students and staff (used by youth)
- Music room used for music classes, private music lessons, recordings and rehearsals (used by youth)
- Computer lab used for homework, surveys, and internet access for youth (used by youth)
- Editing suite used for editing films (98% used by staff)
- Storage room for costumes, props and make-up room
- Dance studio used for dance classes, rehearsals, and film shoots (used by youth)

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	3:00pm-8:00pm	3:00pm-8:00pm	3:00pm-8:00pm	3:00pm-8:00pm	12:00pm-8:00pm	9:00am-4:00pm

**During the summer the Center runs a four- to five-week summer camp open from 9:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M.*

The Center has two FTEs who administer the program and work with the youth 100% of the time.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of the East End (Original Works) Center who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A slightly greater percentage of females participated in the evaluation (53.7%). Participating youth attended grades 5 through 11; most reported average grade point averages; most identified as Black/African American (64.3%); and most reported living with their mothers (81.0%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 85.0%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (50.0%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	22	53.7
Male	19	46.3
Total	41	100.0
Age	n	%
11	6	14.3
12	11	26.2
13	6	14.3
14	4	9.5
15	6	14.3
16	9	21.4
Total	42	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	7	16.7
Black or African American	27	64.3
Latino/a or Hispanic	7	16.7
Multiracial	1	2.4
Total	42	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	34	81.0
Father	15	35.7
Mother's Partner	0	0.0
Father's Partner	0	0.0
Foster Mother	0	0.0
Foster Father	0	0.0
Grandmother	4	9.5
Grandfather	1	2.4
Uncle	3	7.1
Aunt	3	7.1
Siblings	16	38.1
Other foster children	0	0.0

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	34	85.0
No	6	15.0
Total	40	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	3	7.1
High school diploma	3	7.1
Non-degree training	1	2.4
College degree	21	50.0
Graduate degree	4	9.5
Don't know	10	23.8
Total	42	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	6	14.3
Mostly Bs	18	42.9
Mostly Cs	17	40.5
Mostly Ds	1	2.4
Total	42	100.0
Grade	n	%
5th	4	9.5
6th	6	14.3
7th	14	33.3
8th	4	9.5
9th	2	4.8
10th	8	19.0
11th	4	9.5
Total	42	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN EAST END CENTER

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in East End Center as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in East End Center, (n = 41)

This table compares the average scores for East End Center with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from East End Center who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Your Center	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.22	6.19	7.1	0.0	2.4	0.0	4.8	14.3	69.0
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	5.76	6.10	9.5	2.4	0.0	4.8	9.5	21.4	52.4
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	6.31	6.06	7.1	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	76.2
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.29	6.17	7.1	0.0	0.0	2.4	4.8	9.5	73.8
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	6.05	5.93	9.5	0.0	0.0	4.8	4.8	11.9	66.7
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	6.10	6.13	9.5	0.0	0.0	2.4	7.1	11.9	69.0
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	6.12	6.07	7.1	0.0	2.4	4.8	4.8	9.5	69.0
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	6.05	5.53	0.0	2.4	0.0	11.9	9.5	21.4	47.6
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	6.05	5.73	4.8	0.0	0.0	7.1	11.9	16.7	54.8
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.92	5.62	0.0	4.8	0.0	16.7	0.0	23.8	45.2
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.28	5.34	14.3	2.4	2.4	7.1	14.3	7.1	47.6
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	5.29	4.91	7.1	0.0	4.8	19.0	14.3	7.1	38.1

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for East End Center with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from East End Center who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Your Center	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	4.90	4.89	16.7	2.4	2.4	9.5	21.4	7.1	35.7
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	6.49	5.78	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.4	9.5	7.1	71.4
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	6.05	5.92	4.8	2.4	0.0	4.8	7.1	19.0	54.8
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.95	5.75	2.4	2.4	4.8	9.5	9.5	7.1	59.5
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	6.30	6.15	4.8	0.0	0.0	7.1	4.8	7.1	71.4
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	6.23	6.01	2.4	2.4	0.0	4.8	7.1	16.7	59.5
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	6.37	6.08	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	9.5	11.9	64.3
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	6.03	5.99	4.8	2.4	0.0	4.8	9.5	19.0	54.8
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	5.82	5.94	4.8	7.1	2.4	2.4	4.8	16.7	52.4

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in East End Center: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 19)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 41)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	6.19	6.17
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	5.51	5.76
Supportive Environment	6.03	6.13	6.13

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* East End Center for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within East End Center are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in East End Center. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in East End Center. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in East End Center: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 14) [§]	Boys (n = 5) [§]	Girls (n = 21)	Boys (n = 19)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.43	5.51	6.17	6.13
Challenge & Involvement	5.73	4.90	5.90	5.70
Supportive Environment	6.36	5.34	6.10	6.27

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in East End Center: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 15) [§]	16-18 (n = 4) [§]	11-15 (n = 32)	16-18 (n = 9)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.40	5.39	6.17	6.17
Challenge & Involvement	5.62	5.10	5.91	5.25
Supportive Environment	6.34	5.38	6.25	5.75

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between East End Center and all other programs. That is, information from East End Center is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in East End Center: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 14)	Others (n =273)	Your Center (n = 5) [§]	Others [§] (n = 352)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.43	6.00	5.51	5.78
Challenge & Involvement	5.73	5.29	4.90	4.95
Supportive Environment	6.36	5.84	5.34	5.67
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 21)	Others (n = 439)	Your Center (n = 19)	Others (n = 571)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.17	6.11	6.13	6.07
Challenge & Involvement	5.90	5.46	5.70	5.32
Supportive Environment	6.10	6.03	6.27	5.92

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in East End Center: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 15)	Others (n = 420)	Your Center (n = 4) [§]	Others (n = 213) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.40	5.77	5.39	6.04
Challenge & Involvement	5.62	4.98	5.10	5.32
Supportive Environment	6.34	5.63	5.38	5.93
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 32)	Others (n = 699)	Your Center (n = 9)	Others (n = 320)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.17	6.09	6.17	6.10
Challenge & Involvement	5.91*	5.33*	5.25	5.51
Supportive Environment	6.25	5.99	5.75	5.93

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN EAST END CENTER

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within East End Center. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for East End Center for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 19)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 41)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	4.58	1.28	4.38	1.42
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.89	.97	3.32	1.08
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.96	1.20	3.53	1.16
Alienation	1	6	2.47	1.30	2.17	1.02

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 19 in 2008, n = 42 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
In the last year, how many times did you...	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	" +2" (%)	" +2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	100.0	95.2	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Skip classes or school?	73.7	61.0	10.5	26.8	5.3	4.9	10.5	7.3
3. Drink in a public place?	94.7	88.1	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	5.3	4.8
4. Damage or destroy property?	66.7	80.5	22.2	14.6	5.6	2.4	5.6	2.4
5. Steal or try to steal something?	72.2	71.4	16.7	26.2	11.1	2.4	0.0	0.0
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	78.9	78.6	5.3	14.3	5.3	4.8	10.5	2.4
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	36.8	54.3	21.1	14.3	5.3	4.8	36.8	16.7
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	84.2	83.3	10.5	11.9	0.0	2.4	5.3	2.4
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	94.7	95.1	5.3	2.5	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Town of Enfield
Project Success

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The Enfield Center provides after-school and evening programs focusing on tutoring, mentoring, youth leadership, educational programs, youth government, sports, outdoor adventure, field trips, youth stipends, community involvement, parent support, and community service learning projects.

The Center includes the following:

- Two large conference rooms
- Mirrored dance room
- Gymnasium
- Limited kitchen facilities
- Outdoor swimming pool
- Locker rooms
- Two small conference rooms
- Homework/education room
- Large community room offering computers with internet access, printing capabilities, study desks, two pool tables, foosball, air hockey, Wii station, x-box, large flat screen TV with cable, dance-dance revolution, concessions, and arts and crafts tables.

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	2:00pm-8:00pm	2:00pm-8:00pm	2:00pm-8:00pm	2:00pm-8:00pm	2:00pm-10:00pm	Open for Special Events

The Center has .75 FTE Youth Services Coordinator and one FTE youth counselor from Youth Services who spends about 25% of time administering the youth programs within the center. The Center has six part-time staff who directly oversee the safety of youth and support all youth programs in the Center.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of the Enfield Center youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of males participated in the evaluation (64.3%). Participating youth attended grades 6 through 12; most relatively good grade point averages; most identified as White (44.6%); and most reported living with their mothers (76.8%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 50.0%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (53.6%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	20	35.7
Male	36	64.3
Total	56	100.0
Age	n	%
12	11	19.6
13	12	21.4
14	8	14.3
15	7	12.5
16	11	19.6
17	5	8.9
18	2	3.6
Total	56	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	7	12.5
Black or African American	15	26.8
Latino/a or Hispanic	7	12.5
Asian American	1	1.8
White	25	44.6
Multiracial	1	1.8
Total	56	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	43	76.8
Father	30	53.6
Mother's Partner	2	3.6
Father's Partner	2	3.6
Foster Mother	4	7.1
Foster Father	2	3.6
Grandmother	6	10.7
Grandfather	4	7.1
Uncle	2	3.6
Aunt	2	3.6
Siblings	25	44.6
Other foster children	1	1.8

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	28	50.0
No	28	50.0
Total	56	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	1	1.8
High school diploma	6	10.7
Non-degree training	1	1.8
College degree	30	53.6
Graduate degree	7	12.5
Don't know	11	19.6
Total	56	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	6	10.7
Mostly Bs	26	46.4
Mostly Cs	20	35.7
Mostly Ds	3	5.4
Mostly Fs	1	1.8
Total	58	100.0
Grade	n	%
6th	1	1.8
7th	14	25.0
8th	12	21.4
9th	14	25.0
10th	7	12.5
11th	4	7.1
12th	4	7.1
Total	56	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN ENFIELD CENTER

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in Enfield Center as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in Enfield Center, (*n* = 48)

This table compares the average scores for Enfield Center with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Enfield Center who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Enfield Center	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.17	6.19	2.1	2.1	0.0	4.2	6.3	35.4	50.0
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.02	6.10	2.1	0.0	2.1	6.3	10.4	37.5	41.7
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	5.81	6.06	4.2	2.1	2.1	12.5	8.3	18.8	50.0
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.13	6.17	2.1	0.0	4.2	6.3	4.2	25.0	52.1
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	5.63	5.93	2.1	4.2	0.0	12.5	16.7	27.1	33.3
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	5.94	6.13	4.2	0.0	2.1	6.3	10.4	31.3	43.8
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	5.83	6.07	2.1	4.2	2.1	8.3	10.4	25.0	43.8
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.38	5.53	6.3	0.0	4.2	12.5	16.7	27.1	27.1
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.57	5.73	8.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	20.8	20.8	37.5
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.63	5.62	0.0	0.0	6.3	12.5	14.6	39.6	22.9
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.36	5.34	4.2	2.1	2.1	10.4	25.0	25.0	22.9
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	4.54	4.91	12.5	6.3	4.2	20.8	14.6	20.8	16.7

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for Enfield Center with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Enfield Center who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Enfield Center	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	4.52	4.89	14.6	10.4	0.0	12.5	20.8	18.8	18.8
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	5.59	5.78	4.2	2.1	2.1	8.3	20.8	25.0	33.3
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	5.72	5.92	0.0	0.0	4.2	16.7	18.8	20.8	37.5
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.66	5.75	2.1	2.1	4.2	16.7	10.4	20.8	41.7
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	6.15	6.15	0.0	0.0	2.1	8.3	8.3	31.3	45.8
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	5.81	6.01	0.0	0.0	4.2	14.6	16.7	22.9	39.6
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	6.04	6.08	0.0	0.0	2.1	14.6	4.2	29.2	43.8
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	5.68	5.99	0.0	6.3	0.0	12.5	12.5	35.4	31.3
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	5.79	5.94	0.0	2.1	4.2	14.6	10.4	27.1	39.6

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in Enfield Center: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 10)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 47)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	5.09	5.94
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	4.43	5.22
Supportive Environment	6.03	5.26	5.84

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* Enfield Center for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within Enfield Center are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in Enfield Center. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in Enfield Center. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Enfield Center: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 3) [§]	Boys (n = 7) [§]	Girls (n = 18)	Boys (n = 29)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.05	4.67	6.10	5.85
Challenge & Involvement	5.33	4.04	5.21	5.22
Supportive Environment	6.38	4.78	6.01	5.72

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Enfield Center: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 10) [§]	16-18 (n = 0) [§]	11-15 (n = 29)	16-18 (n = 18)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.09	--	6.10	5.68
Challenge & Involvement	4.43	--	5.18	5.28
Supportive Environment	5.26	--	5.91	5.71

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between Enfield Center and all other programs. That is, information from Enfield Center is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Enfield Center: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 3) [§]	Others (n = 284) [§]	Your Center (n = 7)	Others (n = 350)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.05	6.02	4.67*	5.80*
Challenge & Involvement	5.33	5.32	4.04	4.97
Supportive Environment	6.38	5.86	4.78	5.68
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 18)	Others (n = 442)	Your Center (n = 29)	Others (n = 561)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.10	6.11	5.85	6.08
Challenge & Involvement	5.21	5.49	5.22	5.33
Supportive Environment	6.01	6.03	5.72	5.94

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Enfield Center: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 10)	Others (n = 425)	Your Center (n = 0) [§]	Others (n = 217) [§]
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.09	5.81	--	--
Challenge & Involvement	4.43	5.02	--	--
Supportive Environment	5.26	5.67	--	--
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 29)	Others (n = 702)	Your Center (n = 18)	Others (n = 311)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.10	6.09	5.68	6.12
Challenge & Involvement	5.18	5.36	5.28	5.52
Supportive Environment	5.91	6.00	5.71	5.93

*Statistically significant differences. [§]Tests of statistical significance were not conducted.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN ENFIELD CENTER

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within Enfield Center. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for Enfield Center for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 9)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 56)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	3.73	1.20	4.19	1.19
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	2.89	.99	3.13	1.13
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.18	1.04	3.49	1.07
Alienation	1	6	2.62	1.07	2.66	1.29

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 10 in 2008, n = 56 in 2009)

Question: In the last year, how many times did you...	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	" +2" (%)	" +2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	70.0	78.6	10.0	14.3	20.0	3.6	0.0	3.6
2. Skip classes or school?	70.0	73.2	10.0	7.1	10.0	7.1	10.0	12.5
3. Drink in a public place?	77.8	80.0	22.2	7.3	0.0	1.8	0.0	10.9
4. Damage or destroy property?	90.0	71.4	10.0	14.3	0.0	5.4	0.0	8.9
5. Steal or try to steal something?	88.9	85.2	11.1	7.4	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.7
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	50.0	69.6	20.0	12.5	0.0	7.1	30.0	10.7
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	20.0	58.2	30.0	12.7	30.0	7.3	20.0	21.8
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	70.0	78.6	0.0	5.4	0.0	3.6	30.0	12.5
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	90.0	87.5	0.0	1.8	0.0	1.8	10.0	8.9
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	90.0	92.7	0.0	1.8	0.0	3.6	10.0	1.8

Town of Manchester
Manchester Teen Center Enhancement

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The Manchester Youth Service Bureau provides after-school and summer programs focusing on positive youth development, employment, and life skills activities.

The Center is approximately 2,560 sq. ft. and includes the following:

- Reception area
- Staff working area
- Director's office
- Conference room
- Bathroom
- Teen Center (100% used by youth)
- Chelsea Room (the programming room-100% used by youth)

The Center will be moving into a new building that is approximately 8,000 sq. ft. and will include the following:

- Computer room (100% used by youth)
- Teen Center (100% used by youth)
- Kitchen
- Conference room
- 3 offices
- 2 programming rooms (100% used by youth)

Teen Center Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	2:30pm- 6:30pm	2:30pm- 6:30pm	2:30pm-6:30pm	2:30pm- 6:30pm	2:30pm- 6:30pm	Open for special events

**During the summer, the Center is open from 12:30 pm to 5:30 pm, Monday-Thursday. During school vacation, regular hours apply. The YSB will stay open later for special events or programs such as the Strengthening Families program which is once a week for seven weeks when they are in session and runs from 5:30-8:30pm. Regular hours for the YSB are 8:00am-4:30pm, Monday through Friday.*

The Center has 8.5 FTEs, and 6.5 FTE staff work directly with youth. About 4.5 FTE staff spend time running programs or working directly with youth; however, two of the Coordinators spend the remainder of their time planning and organizing those programs (thus 6.5 FTEs work directly with youth and/or plan programs that they then run with youth).

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of the Manchester Youth Service Bureau (YSB) youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of males participated in the evaluation (57.8%). Participating youth attended grades 6 through 12; most reported relatively good grade point

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

averages; most identified as Black/African American (66.7%); and most reported living with their mothers (86.7%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 88.4%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (61.4%).

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	19	42.2
Male	26	57.8
Total	45	100.0
Age	n	%
12	1	2.2
13	2	4.4
14	6	13.3
15	12	26.7
16	8	17.8
17	10	22.2
18	6	13.3
Total	45	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	2	4.4
Black or African American	30	66.7
Latino/a or Hispanic	7	15.6
White	3	6.7
Multiracial	3	6.7
Total	45	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	39	86.7
Father	10	22.2
Mother's Partner	2	4.4
Father's Partner	1	2.2
Foster Mother	0	0.0
Foster Father	0	0.0
Grandmother	5	11.1
Grandfather	0	0.0
Uncle	1	2.2
Aunt	1	2.2
Siblings	26	57.8
Other foster children	1	2.2

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	38	88.4
No	5	11.6
Total	43	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	5	11.4
High school diploma	4	9.1
College degree	27	61.4
Graduate degree	5	11.4
Don't know	3	6.8
Total	44	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	4	10.8
Mostly Bs	11	29.7
Mostly Cs	19	51.4
Mostly Ds	1	2.7
Mostly Fs	2	5.4
Total	37	100.0
Grade	n	%
6th	1	2.2
7th	2	4.4
8th	3	6.7
9th	5	11.1
10th	16	35.6
11th	9	20.0
12th	6	13.3
Not in school	3	6.7
Total	45	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN MANCHESTER YSB

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in Manchester YSB as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in Manchester YSB, (*n* = 45)

This table compares the average scores for Manchester YSB with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Manchester YSB who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for YSB	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.09	6.19	2.2	0.0	2.2	8.9	8.9	24.4	53.3
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.07	6.10	2.2	0.0	2.2	8.9	11.1	22.2	53.3
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	6.09	6.06	4.4	0.0	0.0	8.9	6.7	22.2	55.6
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.36	6.17	2.2	0.0	0.0	6.7	4.4	22.2	64.4
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	5.84	5.93	4.4	0.0	2.2	13.3	8.9	22.2	48.9
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	6.18	6.13	2.2	0.0	0.0	8.9	8.9	24.4	55.6
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	6.09	6.07	2.2	0.0	0.0	8.9	11.1	26.7	48.9
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.42	5.53	4.4	2.2	6.7	13.3	15.6	22.2	35.6
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.49	5.73	2.2	2.2	4.4	13.3	20.0	28.9	28.9
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.64	5.62	2.2	0.0	4.4	17.8	15.6	17.8	40.0
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.36	5.34	0.0	2.2	8.9	8.9	33.3	20.0	24.4
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	4.74	4.91	6.7	6.7	4.4	22.2	24.4	8.9	22.2

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for Manchester YSB with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Manchester YSB who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for YSB	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	4.70	4.89	8.9	8.9	8.9	17.8	13.3	11.1	28.9
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	5.82	5.78	0.0	2.2	0.0	17.8	13.3	26.7	40.0
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	5.93	5.92	2.2	2.2	0.0	11.1	11.1	26.7	46.7
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.66	5.75	4.4	0.0	4.4	4.4	22.2	28.9	33.3
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	6.23	6.15	0.0	2.2	0.0	6.7	11.1	20.0	55.6
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	6.05	6.01	4.4	0.0	0.0	4.4	13.3	26.7	48.9
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	6.09	6.08	0.0	0.0	2.2	11.1	13.3	22.2	51.1
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	6.07	5.99	2.2	2.2	0.0	4.4	17.8	20.0	53.3
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	5.82	5.94	2.2	0.0	2.2	17.8	6.7	28.9	42.2

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in Manchester YSB: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 25)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 45)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	6.42	6.10
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	5.44	5.32
Supportive Environment	6.03	6.48	5.99

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* Manchester YSB for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within Manchester YSB are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in Manchester YSB. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in Manchester YSB. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Manchester YSB: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 12)	Boys (n = 13)	Girls (n = 19)	Boys (n = 26)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.76	6.10	5.99	6.17
Challenge & Involvement	6.14*	4.79*	5.29	5.35
Supportive Environment	6.66	6.31	5.99	5.98

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Manchester YSB: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 6)	16-18 (n = 19)	11-15 (n = 21)	16-18 (n = 24)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.55	6.38	5.69*	6.46*
Challenge & Involvement	5.49	5.42	4.91*	5.67*
Supportive Environment	6.26	6.54	5.55*	6.35*

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between Manchester YSB and all other programs. That is, information from Manchester YSB is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Manchester YSB: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 12)	Others (n =275)	Your Center (n = 13)	Others (n = 344)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.76*	5.99*	6.10	5.76
Challenge & Involvement	6.14*	5.28*	4.79	4.96
Supportive Environment	6.66*	5.83*	6.31*	5.64*
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 19)	Others (n = 441)	Your Center (n = 26)	Others (n = 564)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.99	6.12	6.17	6.07
Challenge & Involvement	5.29	5.49	5.35	5.32
Supportive Environment	5.99	6.03	5.98	5.93

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Manchester YSB: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 6)	Others (n = 429)	Your Center (n = 19)	Others (n = 198)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.55	5.78	6.38	6.00
Challenge & Involvement	5.49	5.00	5.42	5.31
Supportive Environment	6.26	5.65	6.55*	5.86*
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 21)	Others (n = 710)	Your Center (n = 24)	Others (n = 305)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.69	6.10	6.46	6.07
Challenge & Involvement	4.91	5.36	5.67	5.49
Supportive Environment	5.55	6.02	6.35*	5.89*

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN MANCHESTER YSB

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within Manchester YSB. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for Manchester YSB for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 25)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 45)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	4.05	1.09	4.34	1.27
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.43	.97	3.44	1.08
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	3.80	.70	3.62	1.07
Alienation	1	6	2.26	1.04	2.35	1.16

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 45)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
In the last year, how many times did you...	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	" +2" (%)	" +2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	72.0	91.1	20.0	2.2	4.0	4.4	4.0	2.2
2. Skip classes or school?	16.0	44.4	16.0	11.1	4.0	17.8	64.0	26.7
3. Drink in a public place?	72.0	86.7	16.0	2.2	0.0	6.7	12.0	4.4
4. Damage or destroy property?	52.0	75.0	16.0	11.4	8.0	11.4	24.0	2.3
5. Steal or try to steal something?	48.0	77.8	16.0	8.9	16.0	6.7	20.0	6.7
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	68.0	60.0	12.0	15.6	8.0	11.1	12.0	13.3
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	32.0	43.2	20.0	25.0	12.0	13.6	36.0	18.2
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	60.0	71.1	4.0	4.4	8.0	13.3	28.0	11.1
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	52.0	80.0	16.0	2.2	0.0	11.1	32.0	6.7
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	95.8	95.3	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0

Urban League of Greater Hartford, Inc.
Urban League Achievement Center

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The Urban League Achievement Center provides after-school and evening programs focusing on youth employment, academic, recreational, and artistic activities.

The program is held at Weaver High School largely in one classroom (1093) dedicated entirely to the youth. Other programs such as martial arts, performing arts, Project Ready, Women's group, and Robotics club are held in various classrooms throughout Weaver High School.

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	2:09pm-7:00pm	2:09pm-5:00pm	2:09pm-7:00pm	2:09pm-7:00pm	2:09pm-5:00pm	Open for special events

**The program runs an abbreviated schedule during school vacations. During standard holidays the program is closed, but open for special events. For example, during spring break the program hosted a clean-up day, a roller skating trip, and a college tour.*

The Center has three FTEs, and 85% of their time is spent working directly with youth.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of the Urban League Achievement Center youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of females participated in the evaluation (62.6%). Participating youth attended grades 9 through 12; most reported relatively good grade point averages; most identified as Black/African American (87.6%); and most reported living with their mothers (78.0%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 89.9%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (44.9%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	57	62.6
Male	34	37.4
Total	91	100.0
Age	n	%
14	8	8.8
15	18	19.8
16	29	31.9
17	27	29.7
18	9	9.9
Total	91	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Other	6	6.7
Black or African American	78	87.6
Latino/a or Hispanic	1	1.1
Asian American	2	2.2
Multiracial	2	2.2
Total	89	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	71	78.0
Father	33	36.3
Mother's Partner	9	9.9
Father's Partner	3	3.3
Foster Mother	1	1.1
Foster Father	0	0.0
Grandmother	10	11.0
Grandfather	4	4.4
Uncle	6	6.6
Aunt	11	12.1
Siblings	50	54.9
Other foster children	2	2.2

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	80	89.9
No	9	10.1
Total	89	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
GED	2	2.2
High school diploma	10	11.2
Non-degree training	3	3.4
College degree	40	44.9
Graduate degree	26	29.2
Don't know	8	9.0
Total	89	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	20	22.7
Mostly Bs	41	46.6
Mostly Cs	25	28.4
Mostly Ds	2	2.3
Total	88	100.0
Grade	n	%
9th	14	15.4
10th	18	30.8
11th	22	24.2
12th	27	29.7
Total	91	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN URBAN LEAGUE

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in Urban League as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in Urban League, (*n* = 91)

This table compares the average scores for Urban League with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Urban League who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Urban League	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.37	6.19	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	5.5	35.2	52.7
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.26	6.10	0.0	0.0	2.2	3.3	5.5	44.0	44.0
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	6.21	6.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.6	12.1	33.0	46.2
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.27	6.17	0.0	0.0	1.1	5.5	7.7	36.3	48.4
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	6.09	5.93	0.0	1.1	0.0	4.4	15.4	38.5	37.4
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	6.33	6.13	0.0	1.1	0.0	3.3	11.0	27.5	53.8
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	6.24	6.07	0.0	0.0	2.2	2.2	8.8	39.6	42.9
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	5.67	5.53	0.0	1.1	2.2	19.8	16.5	22.0	35.2
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	5.70	5.73	0.0	1.1	1.1	15.4	16.5	36.3	26.4
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	5.70	5.62	1.1	0.0	1.1	17.6	12.1	35.2	27.5
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	5.37	5.34	1.1	2.2	3.3	15.4	26.4	26.4	20.9
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	4.76	4.91	3.3	7.7	3.3	30.8	12.1	26.4	12.1

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for Urban League with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from Urban League who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for Urban League	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	4.58	4.89	5.5	11.0	4.4	24.2	18.7	18.7	14.3
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	5.93	5.78	0.0	0.0	1.1	8.8	18.7	36.3	33.0
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	6.04	5.92	2.2	0.0	3.3	6.6	7.7	31.9	46.2
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	5.65	5.75	0.0	1.1	3.3	15.4	17.6	31.9	28.6
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	6.23	6.15	1.1	0.0	2.2	6.6	7.7	24.2	54.9
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	6.10	6.01	0.0	0.0	3.3	6.6	9.9	33.0	42.9
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	6.26	6.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	11.0	33.0	47.3
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	6.28	5.99	0.0	0.0	1.1	5.5	7.7	34.1	49.5
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	5.97	5.94	1.1	0.0	2.2	12.1	8.8	31.9	41.8

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in Urban League: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 40)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 89)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	6.15	6.25
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	5.36	5.38
Supportive Environment	6.03	5.96	6.07

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* Urban League for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within Urban League are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in Urban League. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in Urban League. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Urban League: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 22)	Boys (n = 17)	Girls (n = 56)	Boys (n = 33)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.36	5.86	6.31	6.13
Challenge & Involvement	5.66*	4.88*	5.49	5.20
Supportive Environment	6.10	5.73	6.20	5.86

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in Urban League: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 12)	16-18 (n = 28)	11-15 (n = 25)	16-18 (n = 64)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.38	6.06	6.54*	6.13*
Challenge & Involvement	5.29	5.39	5.38	5.38
Supportive Environment	6.10	5.90	6.36*	5.96*

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between Urban League and all other programs. That is, information from Urban League is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Urban League: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 22)	Others (n = 265)	Your Center (n = 17)	Others (n = 340)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.36	5.99	5.86	5.77
Challenge & Involvement	5.66	5.29	4.88	4.96
Supportive Environment	6.10	5.85	5.73	5.66
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 56)	Others (n = 404)	Your Center (n = 33)	Others (n = 557)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.31*	6.09*	6.13	6.07
Challenge & Involvement	5.49	5.48	5.20	5.33
Supportive Environment	6.20	6.01	5.86	5.93

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in Urban League: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 12)	Others (n = 423)	Your Center (n = 28)	Others (n = 189)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.38*	5.78*	6.06	6.03
Challenge & Involvement	5.29	5.00	5.39	5.31
Supportive Environment	6.10	5.64	5.90	5.93
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 25)	Others (n = 706)	Your Center (n = 64)	Others (n = 265)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.54*	6.08*	6.13	6.09
Challenge & Involvement	5.38	5.35	5.38	5.54
Supportive Environment	6.36*	5.99*	5.96	5.91

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN URBAN LEAGUE

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within Urban League. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for Urban League for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 40)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 86)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	4.20	1.23	4.18	1.25
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	3.96	.82	3.59	.85
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	4.22	.68	3.77	.80
Alienation	1	6	2.30	1.15	2.45	1.15

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 41 in 2008, n = 86 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
In the last year, how many times did you...	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	" +2" (%)	" +2" (%)
1. Run away from home?	92.7	89.9	4.9	6.8	0.0	2.3	2.4	1.1
2. Skip classes or school?	53.7	46.5	12.2	22.1	12.2	14.0	22.0	17.4
3. Drink in a public place?	76.9	80.7	5.1	9.1	5.1	5.7	12.8	4.5
4. Damage or destroy property?	75.0	77.5	17.5	14.6	2.5	1.1	5.0	6.7
5. Steal or try to steal something?	73.2	78.7	17.1	11.2	7.3	7.9	2.4	2.2
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	80.5	71.6	12.2	18.2	0.0	4.5	7.3	5.7
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	53.7	65.2	26.8	13.5	4.9	14.6	14.6	6.7
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	73.2	70.8	4.9	15.7	4.9	5.6	17.1	7.9
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	80.5	86.5	7.3	6.7	0.0	3.4	12.2	3.4
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	97.6	95.5	0.0	2.3	0.0	1.1	2.4	1.1

Waterbury Youth Service System, Inc.
Silence the Violence Program

CENTER DESCRIPTION

The Waterbury Youth Services Center provides after-school, evening, and summer programs focusing on social, cultural, educational and recreational activities with a variety of projects, special events, and an emphasis on empowering our neighborhood youth.

The Center is approximately 16,000 sq. ft. and includes the following:

- 4 offices
- Kitchen
- Multi purpose room
- Activity room that can be used as a reading room
- Lounge or meeting room
- Computer classroom with 15 computer stations
- Big back grassy yard
- Parking lot with a capacity for 50 cars

Youth use 90% of the building.

Weekly Program Schedule

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Closed	3:00pm-8:30pm	3:00pm-8:30pm	3:00pm-8:30pm	3:00pm-8:30pm	3:00pm-8:30pm	9:00am-6:00pm

**During the school and summer vacations the Center is open from 8:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.*

The Center has one FTE ,and 90% of his time is applied in administering youth programs.

PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 presents information on social background characteristics of the Waterbury Youth Services Center (WOW) youth who participated in the 2008-09 process evaluation. A greater percentage of males participated in the evaluation (50.7%). Participating youth attended grades 5 through 12; most reported average grade point averages; most identified as Latino(a)/Hispanic (55.1%); and most reported living with their mothers (89.7%). The percentage of youth who reported being eligible for reduced cost lunch was 85.9%. Most youth stated that their educational goals were to procure a college degree (53.3%).

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Table 1—Youth's background information

Gender	n	%
Female	36	49.3
Male	37	50.7
Total	73	100.0
Age	n	%
11	1	1.3
12	6	7.7
13	8	10.3
14	13	16.7
15	21	26.9
16	13	16.7
17	10	12.8
18	6	7.7
Total	78	100.0
Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Black or African American	34	43.6
Latino/a or Hispanic	43	55.1
Multiracial	1	1.3
Total	78	100.0
Household Members	n	%
Mother	70	89.7
Father	10	12.8
Mother's Partner	6	7.7
Father's Partner	0	0.0
Foster Mother	0	0.0
Foster Father	0	0.0
Grandmother	4	5.1
Grandfather	2	2.6
Uncle	3	3.8
Aunt	3	3.8
Siblings	15	19.2
Other foster children	0	0.0

Reduced Meals	n	%
Yes	54	85.9
No	9	14.3
Total	63	100.0
Educational Goals	n	%
High school diploma	3	4.0
Non-degree training	22	29.3
College degree	40	53.3
Graduate degree	7	9.3
Don't know	3	4.0
Total	75	100.0
GPA	n	%
Mostly As	8	10.5
Mostly Bs	16	21.1
Mostly Cs	50	65.8
Mostly Ds	2	2.6
Total	76	100.0
Grade	n	%
5th	1	1.3
6th	2	2.6
7th	4	5.2
8th	16	20.8
9th	23	29.9
10th	13	16.9
11th	10	13.0
12th	8	10.4
Total	77	100.0

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

YOUTH'S EXPERIENCES IN WOW

Tables 2 and 3 present information about youth's perceptions of their experiences in WOW as measured by the Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD). Table 2 presents scores for each YDAD question for the second wave of data collection (that is, 2009). Table 3 presents changes in the average scores on the YDAD subdomains from Wave 1 (2008) to Wave 2 (2009).

Table 2—Youth's experiences in WOW, (*n* = 78)

This table compares the average scores for WOW with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from WOW who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for WOW	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
EMOTIONAL SAFETY & WELL-BEING									
1. The Center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	6.50	6.19	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	32.1	64.1
2. The Center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	6.54	6.10	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	28.2	67.9
3. The staff at the Center believe in me.	6.49	6.06	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	33.3	62.8
4. The staff goes out of their way to make sure the Center is a safe place to go.	6.51	6.17	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	30.8	65.4
5. The things that I accomplish at the Center make me feel good about myself.	6.54	5.93	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.8	66.7
6. The staff at the Center make me feel welcome.	6.53	6.13	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	29.5	66.7
7. The Center is a place where I feel comfortable.	6.54	6.07	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	26.9	69.2
CHALLENGE & INVOLVEMENT									
8. I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the Center.	6.46	5.53	2.6	0.0	0.0	2.6	1.3	28.2	65.4
9. Going to the Center and participating in activities there makes me feel part of my community.	6.54	5.73	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	25.6	69.2
10. At the Center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	6.54	5.62	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.6	21.8	71.8
11. I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities	6.47	5.34	3.8	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	24.4	70.5
12. At the Center, I participate in making the rules.	6.29	4.91	3.8	1.3	0.0	3.8	3.8	21.8	65.4

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

This table compares the average scores for WOW with average scores for all youth (Population Average). It also shows the percentage (%) of youth from WOW who chose each of the 7 response options.	Average for WOW	Population Average	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
13. I often work with staff to plan activities and projects.	6.42	4.89	3.8	1.3	0.0	1.3	1.3	21.8	70.5
14. I am encouraged to learn new things when I am at the Center.	6.62	5.78	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.1	74.4
SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT									
15. The Center is a place where I feel respected.	6.56	5.92	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	25.6	70.5
16. I like to go to the Center because I feel like I am part of a group.	6.54	5.75	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	26.9	69.2
17. The staff at the Center are good at working with kids.	6.50	6.15	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.4	21.8	69.2
18. The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	6.47	6.01	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	29.5	64.1
19. The staff at the Center help me do what's right.	6.50	6.08	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.3	28.2	66.7
20. The staff provide me with useful information.	6.47	5.99	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.6	28.2	65.4
21. I am able to be creative at the Center.	6.54	5.94	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.3	24.4	70.5

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 3—Changes in youth's perceptions of their experiences in WOW: Contrasting youth scores from 2008 and 2009

	Population Average	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 63)	Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 78)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.14	6.14	6.52
Challenge & Involvement	5.43	5.94	6.48
Supportive Environment	6.03	5.96	6.51

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

WITHIN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 4 and 5 present information about youth's perceptions of the supports and opportunities present *within* WOW for each wave of data collection (that is, for 2008 and for 2009). Comparisons of youth within WOW are made based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 4 contrasts girls' and boys' perceptions of their experiences in WOW. Table 5 contrasts younger (12-15) and older (16-18) youth's perceptions of their experiences in WOW. Both tables contain information for each of the two waves of data collection.

Table 4—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in WOW: Breakdown by year and gender

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	Girls (n = 41)	Boys (n = 20)	Girls (n = 36)	Boys (n = 37)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.15	6.15	6.54	6.50
Challenge & Involvement	5.85	6.12	6.32	6.59
Supportive Environment	5.88	6.13	6.47	6.51

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 5—Youth's perceptions of their experiences in WOW: Breakdown by year and age

	Wave 1 - 2008		Wave 2 - 2009	
	11-15 (n = 46)	16-18 (n = 17)	11-15 (n = 49)	16-18 (n = 29)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.96*	6.60*	6.57	6.43
Challenge & Involvement	5.75*	6.46*	6.52	6.40
Supportive Environment	5.87	6.19	6.59	6.38

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

BETWEEN-PROGRAM CONTRASTS

Tables 6 and 7 present comparisons between WOW and all other programs. That is, information from WOW is contrasted with the information from all other programs. Comparisons are based on subgroups of youth that are based on gender (girls vs. boys) and age (younger vs. older).

Table 6—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in WOW: Breakdown by year and gender

2008	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 41)	Others (n = 246)	Your Center (n = 20)	Others (n = 337)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.15	6.00	6.15	5.76
Challenge & Involvement	5.85*	5.22*	6.12*	4.88*
Supportive Environment	5.88	5.87	6.13	5.64
2009	Girls		Boys	
	Your Center (n = 36)	Others (n = 424)	Your Center (n = 37)	Others (n = 553)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.54*	6.08*	6.50*	6.04*
Challenge & Involvement	6.32*	5.41*	6.59*	5.24*
Supportive Environment	6.47*	5.99*	6.51*	5.89*

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

Table 7—Youth’s perceptions of their experiences in WOW: Breakdown by year and age

2008	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 46)	Others (n = 389)	Your Center (n = 17)	Others (n = 200)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	5.96	5.77	6.60*	5.98*
Challenge & Involvement	5.75*	4.92*	6.46*	5.22*
Supportive Environment	5.87	5.63	6.19	5.90
2009	11-15		16-18	
	Your Center (n = 49)	Others (n = 682)	Your Center (n = 29)	Others (n = 300)
Emotional Safety & Well-being	6.57*	6.06*	6.43	6.06
Challenge & Involvement	6.52*	5.27*	6.40*	5.42*
Supportive Environment	6.59*	5.96*	6.38*	5.88*

*Statistically significant differences.

Note: Scores range from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF YOUTH IN WOW

Tables 8 and 9 show information about the social and psychological adjustment of youth within WOW. Table 8 presents information about three measures of adjustment: General Well-being, Ethnic Identity, and Alienation. For each measure, presented are the minimum possible score, the maximum possible score, and the average score for WOW for each of the two waves of data collection. Table 9 presents information about youth's involvement in delinquent activities.

The **General Well-being** questionnaire measures a sense of psychological Well-being. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel cheerful and in good spirits" and "I wake up feeling fresh and rested." The **Ethnic Identity** questionnaire measures 2 aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Examples of questions include "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" and "I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group." The **Alienation** questionnaire measures youth's sense of alienation from the broader social system. Examples of questions on this measure include "I feel that there is not much purpose in life" and "It is all right to break the law as long as you don't get caught." The **Delinquency** questionnaire inquires about youth's involvement in anti-social or delinquent activities during the previous year.

Table 8—Youth's social and psychological adjustment

	Min	Max	Wave 1 - 2008 (n = 62)		Wave 2 - 2009 (n = 79)	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General Well-being	1	6	4.58	1.04	4.37	.83
Ethnic Identity: Exploration	1	5	4.10	.80	4.22	.68
Ethnic Identity: Commitment	1	5	4.13	.91	4.28	.67
Alienation	1	6	2.11	.63	1.64	.47

Table 9—Youth's involvement in delinquent activities, (n = 62 in 2008, n = 79 in 2009)

Question:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
In the last year, how many times did you...	"0" (%)	"0" (%)	"1" (%)	"1" (%)	"2" (%)	"2" (%)	"+" (%)	"+" (%)
1. Run away from home?	98.4	96.2	0.0	3.8	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Skip classes or school?	79.4	93.6	12.7	2.6	6.3	3.8	1.6	0.0
3. Drink in a public place?	96.8	96.2	1.6	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.3
4. Damage or destroy property?	96.8	92.3	3.2	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
5. Steal or try to steal something?	90.2	92.2	9.8	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
6. Go home from school for bad behavior?	81.0	93.6	11.1	3.8	7.9	0.0	0.0	2.6
7. Hit, slap, or shove other kids?	87.3	85.9	4.8	9.0	6.3	1.3	1.6	3.8
8. Drink beer, wine, or any other liquor?	85.5	94.9	8.1	2.6	4.8	1.3	1.6	1.3
9. Smoke marijuana, weed, pot, etc.?	90.5	98.7	9.5	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Use cocaine, crack, or any other drugs?	100.0	98.7	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Section V Summary

Federal, state, local, and private funding is flowing more rapidly than ever before into after-school programs, spurred in part by heightened expectations that effective programming offered during the after-school hours can have a long-term impact on participants' life choices and success. States across the nation are taking steps to enhance program quality and coordinate after-school programming to meet the well-documented needs of young people. Commitment to the idea that time spent outside of school in after-school programs, such as the youth programs that participated in this evaluation, should have an impact on the developmental competencies of youth means that youth programs must take serious steps to ensure program quality. This will entail tailoring services, supports, and opportunities to specific age groups as well as developing and continually training staff to increase their knowledge about child and adolescent development and their familiarity with effective strategies for working with youth. In this context, program evaluations can serve as a means of assisting both funders and programmers with their efforts to provide programming that achieves quality and tangible results.

To date, few process evaluations designed to elicit information useful to program planners have been conducted. This is surprising considering the growing emphasis within the youth development movement to conduct such evaluations. Thus, this evaluation not only contributes to the existing literature on positive youth development but also expands upon this literature by examining youth's experiences in youth development programs and by using the data to implement programmatic changes. This "information-processing program evaluation model" is warranted, given the fact that relatively little is known about how youth experience youth programs, as well as the limited knowledge about whether programs designed around youth development principles are in fact meeting their programming objectives.

It must be acknowledged that contrasting data from Wave 1 (March 2008) to Wave 2 (March 2009) can be questioned because it is very likely that there were different youth respondents across the two waves of data. However, the overarching goal of this study was to capture the effect that plans of action had on program process indicators. As such, the value of this contrast is in the fact that it was the program, rather than the youth themselves, that changed as a result of the interactive nature of this evaluation project. The operation of the program was evaluated using youth perceptions, and then, based on the results of the process evaluation, improvements to program operations were implemented. Programs, not individual youth, were the unit of analysis. Thus, although it is a limitation of this evaluation that a matched sample could not be attained, this limitation should not compromise the overall utility of the information provided to youth programs that participated in this study, as the focal point was on changes in programming based on youth perceptions.

In sum, it appears that the staff and directors of the Connecticut youth programs derived information of value from their participation in this process evaluation. The process of collecting and interpreting the data and working on implementation plans in consultation with the staff from the YDTRC and youth teams from within the programs enabled them to effect changes in program planning and activities. Other organizations committed to promoting youth development should be encouraged from these findings to adopt this "information processing" approach to the evaluation and refinement of the programs offered within their youth programs.

References

- Barton, W. H., Watkins, M., & Jarjoura, R. (1997). Youths and communities: Toward comprehensive strategies for youth development. *Social Work, 42*, 483-493.
- Catalano, R. F., Berglund, M. F., Ryan, J. A. M., Lonczak, H. S., & Hawkins, J. D. (2002). Positive youth development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of positive youth development programs. *Prevention and Treatment, 5*(15), 1-111.
- Catalano, R. F., Hawkins, J. D., Berglund, L., Pollard, J. A., & Arthur, M. W. (2002). Prevention science and positive youth development: Competitive or cooperative frameworks? *Journal of Adolescent Health, 31*(6), 230-239.
- Connell, J. P., Gambone, M. A., & Smith, T. J. (2000). Youth development in community settings: Challenges to our field and our approach. In P. L. Benson & K. J. Pittman (Eds.), *Trends in youth development* (pp. 291 – 301). Boston: Kluwer Academic.
- Dehar, M., Casswell, S., & Duignan, P. (1993). Formative and process evaluation of health promotion and disease prevention programs. *Evaluation Review, 17*, 204-220.
- Durlak, J. A., & Wells, A. M. (1997). Primary prevention mental health programs for children and adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 25*, 115-152.
- Durlak, J. A., & Wells, A. M. (1998). Evaluation of indicated preventive intervention (secondary prevention) mental health programs for children and adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 26*, 775-802.
- Eccles, J., & Gootman, J. (Eds.) (2002). *Community programs to promote youth development*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Gambone, M. A., Klem, A., & Connell, J. P. (2003). *Finding out what matters for youth: Testing key links in a community action framework*. Philadelphia, PA: Youth Development Strategies and Institute for Research and Reform in Education.
- Judd, C. M. (1987). Combining process and outcome evaluation. In M. M. Mark & R. L. Shotland (Eds.), *New directions for program evaluation: Vol. 35. Multiple methods in program evaluation* (pp. 23-41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kahne, J., Nagaoka, J., Brown, A., O'Brien, J., Quinn, T., & Thiede, K. (2001). Assessing after-school programs as contexts for youth development. *Youth & Society, 32* (4), 421-446.
- Larson, R. W. (2000). Toward a psychology of positive youth development. *American Psychologist, 55*, 170-183.
- Lerner, R. M., Fisher, C. B., & Weinberg, R. A. (2000). Toward a science for and of the people: Promoting civil society through the application of developmental science. *Child Development, 71*, 11–20.
- Masten, A. S. (1994). Resilience in individual development. In M. C. Wang & E. W. Gordon (Eds.), *Educational resilience in inner-city America* (pp. 3-26). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Posner, J. K., & Vandell, D. (1994). Low-income children's after-school care: Are there beneficial effects of after-school programs? *Child Development, 65*, 440-456.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

- Pruett, M., Davidson, L., McMahon, T., Ward, N., & Griffith, E. (2000). Comprehensive services for at-risk urban youth: Applying lessons from the community mental health movement. *Children's Services: Social Policy, Research, and Practice*, 3, 63-83.
- Reynolds, C. R., & Richmond, B. O. (1978). What I think and feel: A revised measure of children's manifest anxiety. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 6, 271-280.
- Reynolds, C. R., & Richmond, B. O. (1985). *Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS) manual*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Robinson, S. A., & Cox, P. (1998). Process evaluation: The Nepal Health Development Project. In E. T. Jackson & Y. Karsam (Eds.), *Knowledge shared: Participatory evaluation in development cooperatives* (pp. 122-149). West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Roth, J. L., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2000). What do adolescents need for healthy development? Implications for youth policy. *Social Research on Child Development*, 14, 3-19.
- Roth, J., Brooks-Gunn, J., Murray, L., & Foster, W. (1998). Promoting healthy adolescents: Synthesis of youth development program evaluations. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 8(4), 423-459.
- Sabatelli, R. M., Anderson, S. A., Kosutic, I., Sanderson, J., & Rubinfeld, S. (2009). A validation study of the Youth Development Assessment Device. *Family Relations*, 58, 361-372.
- Sabatelli, R. M., Anderson, S. A., & LaMotte, V. A. (2005). *Assessing outcomes in child and youth programs: A practical handbook* (rev. ed.). Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut Center for Applied Research. Retrieved October 12, 2006 from <http://www.familystudies.uconn.edu/Centers/Centers/appliedresearch/Handbook2005.pdf>
- Sabatelli, R., Anderson, S., & LaMotte, V. (2001). *Assessing outcomes in youth programs: A practical handbook*. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut Center for Applied Research.
- Scheirer, M. A. (1994). Designing and using process evaluation. In J. S. Wholey, H. P. Hatry, & K. E. Newcomer (Eds.), *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (pp. 40-68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stark, K. D., & Laurent, J. (2001). Joint factor analysis of the Children's Depression Inventory and the Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 30(4), 552-567.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. & Shinkfield, A. J. (1985). *Systematic evaluation: A self-instructional guide to theory and practice*. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Walker, J., Marczak, M., Blyth, D., & Borden, L. (2005). Designing youth development programs: Toward a theory of developmental intentionality. In J. L. Mahoney, R. W. Larson, & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Organized activities as contexts of development* (pp. 399-418). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (2001). *Journeys from childhood to midlife: Risk, resilience and recovery*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Yohalem, N., Pittman, K., & Wilson-Ahlstrom, A. (2004, Spring). Getting inside the "black box" to measure program quality. *The Evaluation Exchange*, 10, 6-7.

GOVERNOR'S URBAN YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM
2007-09 PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Appendix

Youth Development Assessment Device

Directions. The purpose of this questionnaire is to understand how you experience the different aspects of the Center. For the following questions, circle the response that best represents the way you feel.		Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree						
1.	The center is a safe place for kids my age to hang out.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	The center provides a structure that makes me feel safe.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	The staff at the center believe in me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	The staff go out of their way to make sure the center is a safe place.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	The things that I accomplish at the center make me feel good about myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	The staff at the center make me feel welcomed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	The center is a place where I feel comfortable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	I am encouraged to help design the programs that exist at the center.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	Going to the center and participating in activities makes me feel part of my community.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	At the center, I feel like my ideas are heard and understood.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	I often work with other kids to accomplish challenging activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	At the center, I participate in making the rules.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	I often work with the staff to plan activities and projects.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	I am encouraged to do new things when I am at the center.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	The center is a place where I feel respected.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	I like to go to the center because I feel like I am a part of a group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	The staff at the center are good at working with kids.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18.	The staff have answers when I have a question or a problem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	The staff at the center help me do what is right.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20.	The staff provide me with useful information.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21.	I am able to be creative at the center.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7