

CENTER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH
GRANT NUMBER: 76-J6-47-FC01

EVALUATION REPORT



The Florida Department of Administration Division of State Planning

526026

NCJRS

NOV 22 1978

ACQUISITION

CENTER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH
GRANT NUMBER: 76-J6-47-FC01

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|-----------------------|----|
| Summary | i |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Methodology | 1 |
| Background Data | 5 |
| Findings | 8 |
| Recommendations | 14 |

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This is the first evaluation by the Florida SPA of the Center for Children and Youth which became operational in September, 1976, with Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act funds.

The Center for Children and Youth was created to organize concerned citizens and professionals through the state into a network of advocates for children and youth. The Center for Children and Youth is in a unique position to speak for the total child and for all youth in Florida. They remind the community, state agencies, and the legislature of the presence of special problems and needs of youth.

The Center's activities include: publishing and disseminating bi-monthly newsletters; development of multi-county child and youth advocacy structures and development of a clearinghouse capability to assist state and local agencies in planning, developing/publishing legislative information, and training volunteers in advocacy strategies.

The Center began operation with Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act funds in the amount of \$59,000. Present operation of the Center is being funded with Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act funds in the amount of \$81,420.

FINDINGS

Analysis of the data indicates that the Center has, in its short period of operation progressed in mobilizing citizen involvement in matters relating to children and youth. Data also reveals that the Center has had a positive impact on increasing public and professional knowledge about children and youth and the provision of services. The project appears to have successfully met its objectives.

Respondents to the questionnaire indicated that the Center's efforts towards facilitating increased cooperation/coordination of services for youth were very good. Fifty-two percent (52%) felt that coordination of services was the most beneficial aspect of the Center. However, for the period of time that this evaluation was conducted, the Center seemed to be devoting most of its efforts to statewide problems and not taking a proactive role in local community mobilization. This was due in part to the great number of state needs to be addressed and the minimum number of staff of the Center. A

"Community Organization Specialist" was hired in August, 1977, to focus on local communities. In addition, this was the first year of the Center's operation and much time and effort had to be spent on organizational and administrative matters. Further, the Center has considerably increased public and professional awareness of problems and issues related to children and youth through its newsletters, staff's participation in workshops and seminars and through its statewide conference.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A systematic reporting procedure should be developed to gather information regarding technical assistance requested and provided.
2. The Center should work to clarify the specific responsibilities of the clusters⁽¹⁾ in relation to the Board. Clarification should assure that the Board's role is policy-making and the cluster's role is one of advising the Board on specific issues.
3. It is recommended that the Center standardize the procedures for the coordination and recruitment of youth advocates into advocacy alliances at the local level. A procedural manual specifying the ways to identify and mobilize the advocates in particular areas should be developed.
4. Establishment of a procedure by which the community organizer will carry out a pre- and post-assessment of the advocacy activities in any target area or community.
5. The Center should reconsider the composition of the Board of Directors in order to expand representation from business, industry and labor and elected officials. In the same respect, we recommend that qualified young people be included in all planning and implementation of programmatic policy decision.
6. More formalized information coordination should be established between the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Task Force and the Center with regard to specific issues or areas of mutual concern.

(1) Cluster - synonymous to committee or task force.

7. Organizational charts of the powerbrokers within each target area should be kept by the Center.
8. The Center should consider participation in radio or public television talk shows. Placement of articles in local or main state newspapers is also recommended.
9. The Center for Children and Youth should review budgets of agencies providing services to children and youth and should provide consultation to state officials on matters relating to the allocation of funds for services for children and youth.
10. Recognizing the need for a single state organization to serve as an advocate for youth in an effort to prevent delinquency, continued funding for the Center is recommended.

EVALUATION REPORT

Introduction

The reason for choosing the Center for Children and Youth as one of the state level projects to be evaluated is two-fold. First, the Center was one of the first programs funded with Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act funds with the potential to have much impact on the youth service delivery system in the state. This project is the only one of its kind which attempts to coordinate and assist in the implementation of youth advocacy structures with the end result being provision of better services for youth. The Center has not been evaluated or intensively monitored since its inception by any particular agency in the state. This evaluation was done on the first year of operation of the project.

Secondly, this project was chosen in order to gauge the progress of the Center in meeting its objectives and to assess to what degree the Center for Children and Youth can be expected to assist in remedying the problems confronting children and youth in the state.

It is hoped that this evaluation will help point out strong and weak aspects of the project and to determine to what degree the project is succeeding in meeting its goals and objectives. The major goal, however is to begin to determine which types of projects represent the most productive investment of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act monies.

The primary users of this report will be relevant staff of the Bureau of Criminal Justice, the project director, Board of Directors of the Center for Children and Youth, the Governor's Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Task Force, and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Methodology

Prior to setting the evaluation objectives, the Bureau staff undertook a variety of activities. Initially, a careful review was made of the project's grant application and any other available literature about the project. Discussion with the project director and other pertinent staff also took place. Opinions were sought from other SPA staff in the juvenile area; the Bureau of Criminal Justice Planning and Assistance Evaluation Coordinator and the Bureau of Criminal Justice Planning Administrator.

Objective 1: To determine the impact of this project in increasing public and professional knowledge regarding youth, their problems, and their needs.

Measurement: In order to measure this objective the following took place:

A questionnaire was developed to assess individuals' opinions about the Center and its services and to assess the quality of the services provided by it. (See Appendix #1)

An attempt was made to contact all the board members (37) and all chairpersons of the clusters (6). A total of 23 persons were interviewed. Four of the 23 were chairpersons of the cluster established by the Center and board members. Seventeen were regular board members, of these seventeen, one is a member of a local advocacy group. One questionnaire was administered to an agency out of the state with which the Center has had contact. These questionnaires were administered over the telephone, with an explanation given regarding the nature of the evaluation and our interest in obtaining their participation.

The Center's grant files in the Bureau were carefully reviewed for any data pertaining to information disseminated and collected. The project director was interviewed with regard to procedures utilized for disseminating the information.

Information submitted to the Bureau with quarterly reports, was also reviewed with regard to any workshops, conferences and/or seminars sponsored by the Center. Each of the Center's publications, to date, were also reviewed.

In trying to assess the level of involvement in the provision of technical assistance and the types of technical assistance requested and provided, the SPA staff reviewed files at the Center which contained information regarding technical assistance. To facilitate the gathering of this information, a form which categorized the technical assistance was developed and used. (See Appendix #2)

Objective 2: The internal effectiveness of this project in meeting its program objectives.

Measurement: The second evaluation objective was measured by reviewing all publications regularly disseminated by the Center. These include: the Center's Newsletter, and the Legislative Updates. In addition, position papers developed by the Center, to date, were carefully reviewed.

Objective 3: The ability of this project to facilitate increased public support for services for youth.

Measurement: The Director of the project was asked to provide the most current list of members of the Board of Directors with their titles and agencies or sector they represent. A list of all 6 clusters was also obtained. Background information regarding the information and composition of these clusters was obtained from the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Director's Executive Committee.

Information regarding the goals and work of each cluster was obtained by reading minutes of cluster meetings, clusters' progress reports, grant's quarterly reports and any written documents developed by the clusters.

Further, SPA staff requested a list of representatives of local youth advocacy structures with which the Center has been directly involved.

In order to determine what the extent and nature of the above entities, activities and the minutes of cluster meetings were reviewed.

A brief assessment of the extent of youth involvement in any of the efforts or activities of the clusters or advocacy groups was obtained from the questionnaire administered to cluster chairpersons or to those involved in local advocacy structures.

Objective 4: The ability of this project to facilitate increased cooperation/coordination of services for youth.

Measurement: The final evaluation objective was measured in a manner similar to that used for objectives one and three. (By reviewing composition of board of directors, clusters, local advocacy structures and any materials on file providing information with regard to the efforts of these structures.)

To further measure this objective, information regarding participation in any workshops, seminars or conferences sponsored by the Center was reviewed. Most of this information was obtained from reports provided with the quarterly progress reports or provided by the Center's staff upon request.

Much valuable and relevant information with regard to the Center's involvement was obtained circuitously, while reviewing the project's progress reports; talking to staff at the Center; and conducting the inquiries about the Center through the aforementioned questionnaire.

Some limitations or qualifications were identified either prior to the evaluation's inception or during the course of this evaluation. The first limitation experienced in this evaluation was the realization that "advocacy" is a concept that can take a number of forms, all difficult to measure in regard to their impact. This made the determination of the evaluation objective a difficult task. One aspect that assisted this process, however, was the specificity of the grant objectives. Another positive advantage, was the Center's staff willingness to cooperate in the process.

One drawback that was encountered during the gathering and review of the data was the absence of any explanation concerning the process that was followed to accomplish major tasks; for example, the project's file contained a number of position statements prepared by the Center or cluster but there was no information as to how and who had prepared the

documents and with what intent. However, project staff were verbally able to provide detailed descriptions of the process.

Among the limitations, and one of the major drawbacks in this writer's opinion, has been the absence of enough time to devote to this effort. Time was limited to enable staff to revisit certain data, attend meetings of the Center, and conduct more on-site observation of the Center's operation. Another major limitation was that of not pretesting the questionnaire.

Background Data

In 1976, the Center for Children and Youth began operation when the Governor's Commission on Criminal Justice approved the recommendation of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Task Force to fund the Center with part of the 1975 Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act funds allocated to the state. Funds for matching requirements were provided by various private groups/organizations in the state.

The idea of a center for children and youth was not a new one; for many years many interested persons had been working towards the development of such an entity with statewide responsibility, which could act as a leader and advocate on behalf of children and youth.

The 1976 session of the Florida Legislature considered legislation that would have created the Florida Commission on Children and Youth. Although the bills failed, the responsibilities that such Commission would have carried are now responsibilities of the Center for Children and Youth.

The Center has been funded to develop and coordinate a statewide advocacy system for children and youth. Specifically, the objectives of the Center are:

Objective 1: To form a statewide board of child and youth advocates that consists of representatives from child health care and nutrition, child mental health, mental retardation and/or developmental disabilities, law enforcement, primary and secondary education, judiciary, child abuse, neglect, and status offenders, early childhood education, youth employment, legislature, citizens, and youth.

- Objective 2: To hold at least three meetings of the Board per annum.
- Objective 3: To publish and disseminate statewide a bi-monthly newsletter directed toward bringing about inter-disciplinary communication, including abstracts of current literature in various youth-serving professions, bibliographies, and sources of relevant literature. The Center will also develop a resource information center which will be a support to agencies needing information.
- Objective 4: Develop six clusters to gather information, identify current needs, and develop problem-solving strategies. Areas in which the clusters will address themselves include the following: delinquency prevention and juvenile justice; early childhood, primary and secondary education; health and nutrition; neglected and dependent children; children with special needs program funding. In addition, clusters will have ad hoc committees within their composition to focus on specific issues.
- Objective 5: To assist in the development and coordination of twelve county or multi-county child and youth advocacy structures that bring together all agencies and groups concerned about children.
- Objective 6: To assist the clusters in preparing at least one position statement each on youth-related matters deemed as high priority issues by the Board to be disseminated to state and local agencies, interested individuals, and the local youth advocacy structures.
- Objective 7: To assist the clusters to review the capability of existing delivery systems to meet identified needs. The results of these reviews will be disseminated statewide.
- Objective 8: To assist state and local agencies in the planning of the improvement of existing services and the development of new services when such assistance is requested.

- Objective 9: To conduct one conference with statewide participation featuring information dissemination and discussion of problems facing Florida's children and youth.
- Objective 10: To conduct at least five seminars and workshops on the local level focusing on training of staff and volunteers in various advocacy strategies.
- Objective 11: To assist in conducting an assessment of Florida's capability, on both the state and local level, of providing services to status offenders, violent offenders, and the diversion and prevention efforts.
- Objective 12: To discover and disseminate techniques for working with families of youth who have various problems and needs.

The Center actually began its operation on September 1, 1976, with a \$59,000 award from the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act funds. Funding of the Center was continued in 1977 with a \$81,420 award. The Center is also scheduled to receive \$108,000 1978 Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act funds.

The original staff of the Center consisted of an Executive Director, Planner/Researcher and 1 Secretary. Due to the voluminous workload, a position was added. Adjustments in the grant's budget allowed for the hiring of the typist.

At present, the staff consist of the three original positions; the additional typist, one full time volunteer who provides assistance in staffing the clusters, and one community organizer - made possible with increased funding in the Center's continuation grant.

The Center was originally housed at the Barnett Bank Building but moved to the Chambers of Commerce Building because of space requirements.

During the first three months of the project, efforts were devoted to planning and administrative details: establishing a steering committee to develop a statewide board; identifying national, state, and local groups, persons, and agencies with which the Center would work; and initiating the collection of relevant data and materials.

The first Board of Directors meeting was held on December 3, 1976 in Orlando, Florida. This was basically an organizational meeting in which the goals of the Center were set and the Center's directions were established.

At this first meeting, six clusters were developed in the areas of: 1) abuse and neglect and dependent children; 2) delinquency prevention and juvenile justice; 3) health and nutrition; 4) children with special needs; 5) early childhood, primary and secondary education; and 6) program funding. Persons to chair these groups were appointed. Goals and responsibilities of each cluster were also established.

Other staff activities during the first 9 months of the project included: the development and bi-monthly distribution of a newsletter, called the Newsline and the development of a legislative update document containing 1977 legislative information relating to children and youth.

Staff was also involved in assisting state and local organizations in their efforts towards advocacy for children. A number of seminars were held to train volunteers and staff in advocacy strategies and the legislative process. The staff was further involved in providing requested assistance from various state agencies in the planning of the improvement of existing services for children and youth.

A statewide conference and a 2 day seminar with local advocacy group representatives were also held during this initial period of the Center.

FINDINGS

Evaluation Objectives

Objective 1: To determine the impact of this project in increasing public and professional knowledge regarding youth, their problems and their needs.

One means of assessing the progress of the Center in increasing the public and professional knowledge about the needs confronting children and youth was a review of the quantity and subject content of the information disseminated by the Center. A total of 5 bi-monthly newsletters have been published and disseminated to date. The newsletter contains general information about the Center; information on programs available throughout the state which provides services for children and youth, bibliographies and sources of information; and articles written on subjects relating to problems being experienced by Florida's children. The newsletter also provides information regarding the availability of funds and information regarding the impact of legislation. Approximately 2,000 persons are presently receiving this publication. In reviewing Center's correspondence

file, a significant number of letters to the Center were noted which favorably referred to the newsletter.

The Center also published 6 issues of its Legislative Update. This publication contains information regarding current legislative issues. Prior to the legislative session, 3 legislative updates were published, which provided a compilation of all pre-filed bills on issues relating to children and youth. The information is arranged by the same subject areas as the clusters. While the Legislature was in session, the legislative update provided periodic reports on the progress and status of bills. Two of these issues were provided. One issue was published after the session was over, providing final actions taken on each of the bills monitored by the Center. This document is the only one of its kind produced in the state. Approximately 250 persons in Florida received the Legislative Updates. Based on the total number of recipients and total number of publications issued, it can be assumed that both the Newsline and Legislative Updates have had a positive impact on increasing public and professional knowledge about children and youth and the provision of services.

In addition, one major question in the questionnaire, question #7, was designed to measure the impact of this project in increasing public and professional knowledge. This question was answered by all 23 respondents. Responses to Section A in question 7 - "Have you or your agency/organization been informed of this service?" - overwhelmingly indicated that the recipients of the questionnaire were informed about the services provided by the Center. Recipients of the questionnaire rated the services from excellent to good.

In addition to the regular Board of Directors and Cluster meetings, the Center has coordinated and held one statewide conference, one statewide advocacy seminar and two training seminars on the legislative process. The statewide conference was held during the first year of operation. Approximately 200 individuals from throughout the state attended this conference. An evaluation of the conference performed by the Center revealed that the great majority (67%) of those attending were professionals. The rest of the participants were categorized as "students" and "concerned citizens." Participants were solicited in a number of ways including announcement in the Center's Newsline, and personal and telephone contacts. The local advocacy seminar was sponsored in Tallahassee, in which representatives from local advocacy structures participated. Ten of 12 target geographic areas were represented at this meeting. The two workshops on training in the legislative process were held. One such workshop was held at the request of a local group. Both, these workshops were well planned and organized and geared towards instructing participants on the "how to's" in the

legislative process. One of the workshops was conducted by a Board member and experienced lobbyist. The other was conducted by the Center's staff.

One of the major activities with which the Center is involved, is the provision of technical assistance. Various Center's files and responses to the questionnaires were reviewed in an attempt to assess how well the Center was meeting its objective of providing technical assistance. With regard to the questionnaire, all of the respondents indicated an awareness that technical assistance by the Center was provided in a number of subject areas. All 23 respondents indicated that they knew of the availability of technical assistance from the Center with regard to legislative information, service delivery coordination and the sponsoring of an annual conference. Of the total 23 respondents, only one was not aware of services provided in the areas of community organization, provision of information with regard to funds, and service delivery information.

Three persons, (13%), reported not knowing that the Center provided information regarding training opportunities. This was not surprising, since the Center has not, to date, devoted much time to this effort. Two persons, (8.6%), were not aware of the availability of evaluation and research findings made possible by the Center. The majority of the respondents indicated that they had utilized these services. Surprisingly, the least reported service utilized was assistance in community organization, with 11 respondents, (47.8%), having utilized it and 10, (43.5%), not having utilized it. This might be due to the fact that a full time community organizer staff was not hired until the second year of operation. The most used service was the Newsletter, with a reported 100% utilization of this service. The rating of these services were mostly "excellent" and "good," with 3 persons (13%), offering no opinion to 3 of the services. The service receiving the most ratings of "excellent" was the provision of legislative information. Eighteen persons, (78%), rated this service as "excellent" and 3, (13%) as "good." Eleven persons, (47.8%), rated the assistance in community organization as "excellent," 8, (35%), as "good," and 2, (8.7%), offered no opinion. Nine persons (39%), felt that information provided by the Center on the availability of funding sources was "excellent" and 11 persons (47.8%), indicated these services were "good."

According to the Center's files, requests for technical assistance were received from a variety of sources. Most of the requests came from citizens. These individuals might have been connected with some agency or group but the nature of the correspondence did not allow for such identification. The types of technical assistance requested also varied. Due to the numerous information available, a sample of the requests for technical assistance was randomly selected. A total of 43 documents were reviewed.

The most requested type of technical assistance was for information about the Center. (This did not seem unusual for the first year operation of a project.) The second most requested technical assistance area was for publications by the Center.

The most used modes of responding to the request were by letter or submission of requested information available at the Center (e.g., documents, position papers, etc.) The Center appeared to have been very prompt in responding to any request.

Review of all materials indicated a lack of systematic recording for technical assistance requests. In addition, only in a few cases was information provided with regard to the types of technical assistance actually provided.

Objective 2: To determine the internal effectiveness of this project to meet its program objectives (i.e., providing research information, providing technical assistance, information collection and dissemination, and advocacy).

According to the review of the project's quarterly reports and monitoring reports performed by the SPA, the project seems to have successfully met its objectives.

- A statewide Board consisting of child and youth advocates from a variety of fields was formed early in the grant period.
- A total of 5 meetings were held by the Board. This was the number of meetings originally expected.
- The Center published and disseminated a bi-monthly newsletter (5 in total) around the state.
- A total of 6 clusters were formed to gather information, identify current needs, and develop problem-solving strategies.
- Technical assistance has been provided to a number of localities in the development and coordination of local advocacy structures. However, the extent and type of technical assistance provided was not identified in any of the information reviewed.
- Staff provided clusters with assistance in the development of position statements and also has assisted the cluster in the identification of existing service delivery systems and needs.

- The staff has assisted state and local agencies in planning efforts when requested. The Bureau of Criminal Justice has been a recipient of these services.
- The project's objective to hold at least one statewide conference during its first year was successfully met.
- Seminars have been held around the state on training in advocacy. Available information revealed that only 3 of 5 expected seminars of this nature were conducted.
- Collection of information and materials is a continuous process. To date, the Center has been able to obtain all necessary information as it relates to the needs of the clusters for developing position statements.

Programmatic and Fiscal Monitoring Data: Review of all on-site monitoring reports done by SPA staff and all fiscal information available, seem to indicate that the project has been efficient in its internal operations.

Objective 3: To determine the ability of this project to facilitate increased public support for services to youth.

It is difficult to assess increased public support. It is hypothesized that when an agency/organization utilizes the services of the Center, then public support may be assumed to be increasing through the spread of services provided by the Center.

As stated previously in this evaluation, the Center's Newslines has a mailing list of approximately 2,000 persons around the state and Legislative Updates were received by approximately 250 persons. It can be deduced that public support is wide-spread by the number of recipients that wrote favorable letters to the Center. This conclusion is also supported by the number of state-wide private organizations which presently provide the financial support to meet the matching fund requirements of this project.

One of the questions in the survey attempted to assess public and private sector cooperation and support for the Center. Two questions addressed the perception of the respondent about the Center's ability to increase coordination of services. All of the respondents felt that the Center's efforts would help increase coordination among youth service providers. Four, (17.3%), of the respondents felt that the Center was somewhat removed from local communities and that its impact would probably be more effective on a statewide basis.

Composition of the Board of Directors was also reviewed in order to assess the possible effect that it could have towards the coordination of services. The Board's composition is broad, comprising representatives from local and state, private and (public) agencies and organizations. Citizen and legislative representation has also been included. (See Appendix 3)

Composition of the clusters was also reviewed. It appears that the six clusters and the Board of Directors are representative of a wide variety of expertise, agencies, and organizations.

The bringing together of such an array of people to work on the same issues, indicates that coordination of services can potentially be improved.

The above mentioned structures have been actively involved in efforts relating to the improvement of services for children.

The major efforts of the clusters, originally, consisted of reviewing all pertinent legislation and making recommendations to identify major problems and work toward comprehensive solutions.

Efforts have also been devoted to the development of 6 position statements relating to certain issues or problems presently existing. Three of the six position statements were specifically developed by the Clusters. (See Appendixes 4-9). Clusters have also identified their goals and objectives (see attached). Review of quarterly reports and other pertinent information available, indicate that the clusters are working and making progress towards achievement of the objectives set.

One question of the survey administered to the cluster chairpersons was intended to assess the types of activities in which the group/cluster was mostly involved. Four of the six cluster chairpersons responded to the survey. Three of the four respondents indicated involvement in legislation, service delivery coordination efforts, and delivery of public information relating to children and youth. One of the respondents also indicated involvement in monitoring of local youth programs.

Another question was geared towards determining the extent to which youth are involved in the clusters' efforts. Of the respondents, offering an opinion, 1 answered positively and 2 negatively. Even though the number of respondents is low, the results could be an indication of the lack of youth participation in many efforts of the Center.

Based on the review of the available information, and an interview with Center's staff it is believed that there is a high possibility that the Center has had positive impact on, and has been able to facilitate, increased support for services for youth.

Objective 4: To determine the ability of this project to facilitate increased cooperation/coordination of services for youth.

Three questions of the survey addressed themselves to the assessment of the ability of this project to increase cooperation and coordination among service providers. Earlier in this report, results of the survey regarding how respondents perceived the Center's efforts towards increasing coordination were discussed. The responses indicated that those interviewed viewed the Center's efforts very favorably.

One question addressed itself to gauging what respondents saw as the most beneficial aspect of this project. Twelve persons, (52%), felt that coordination of services was the most beneficial aspect. This somewhat contradicts with the earlier findings in the technical assistance area. Three people, (13%), felt needs assessment was the most beneficial; 3 (13%) said that it is assisting government in increasing its consciousness on the part of policy makers; and 2 (8.6%) felt that the Center was most helpful in the area of legislation.

When asked if there were any other services/efforts which the Center should offer, respondents indicated the following: six (26%) felt that the Center should provide other services and 17 (74%) respondents felt that the "Center's hands were full" and that under present funding it could not be expected to offer more services.

Other major findings resulted from the analysis of evaluation data. First, the Center seems to be devoting most of its efforts to statewide problems rather than to helping local communities in coordination efforts.

It was also noted in the review of data for the first year of the project, that most of the local efforts were initiated by the recipient locality and not by the Center's efforts.

Recommendations

Recommendation #1: SYSTEMATIC REPORTING PROCEDURES SHOULD BE DEVELOPED TO GATHER INFORMATION REGARDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTED AND PROVIDED.

This will not only assist in gathering data for monitoring and evaluation efforts but can also be utilized by the project director as an effective planning tool in the process of allocating manpower and assessing project's operation.

Recommendation #2: A REPORTING MECHANISM SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AND MAINTAINED TO DOCUMENT THE OUTCOMES OF LEGISLATION SUPPORTED OR NOT SUPPORTED BY THE CENTER.

The above recommendation will facilitate further evaluations of the projects and will also facilitate staff in assessing the on-going progress of the project. This will also serve as a strength in the internal operations of the project.

Recommendation #3: IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE CENTER STANDARDIZE THE PROCEDURES FOR THE COORDINATION AND RECRUITMENT OF YOUTH ADVOCATES AT THE LOCAL LEVEL. A PROCEDURAL MANUAL SPELLING OUT THE WAYS TO GO ABOUT IDENTIFYING, BRINGING TOGETHER AND MOBILIZING THE ADVOCATES IN A PARTICULAR AREA SHOULD BE DEVELOPED.

To provide continuity in developing advocacy structures through time.

Recommendation #4: ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROCEDURE BY WHICH THE COMMUNITY ORGANIZER WILL CARRY OUT A PRE AND POST ASSESSMENT OF THE YOUTH ADVOCATES IN ANY TARGET AREA OR COMMUNITY.

This will assist project director and the community organizer in assessing the extent to which changes are being effected due to efforts devoted in each particular area.

Recommendation #5: ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS OF THE POWERBROKERS WITHIN EACH TARGET AREA SHOULD BE KEPT BY THE CENTER.

One of the most difficult problems for anyone organizing on behalf of children is determining who the participants will be. The above recommendation will facilitate the plans for action in any given area or areas of mutual concern.

Recommendation #6: THE CENTER SHOULD RECONSIDER THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN ORDER TO EXPAND REPRESENTATION FROM BUSINESS, INDUSTRY AND LABOR. IN THE SAME RESPECT, WE RECOMMEND THAT QUALIFIED YOUNG PEOPLE BE INCLUDED IN ALL PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMMATIC POLICY DECISIONS.

Many positive opportunities are possible for increasing participation of representatives of business, labor and youth from one-to-one advocacy to the development of legislation and programs.

Recommendation #7: INCREASED COORDINATION SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED BETWEEN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION TASK FORCE AND THE CENTER WITH REGARD TO SPECIFIC ISSUES OR AREAS OF MUTUAL CONCERN.

In addition to communicating, each individual and organization involved in delinquency prevention must become aware of its relationship with others involved in the same process. This interrelatedness can help reduce any duplication of efforts and strengthen efforts towards meeting needs of children and youth.

Recommendation #8: THE CENTER SHOULD CONSIDER PARTICIPATION IN RADIO OR PUBLIC TELEVISION TALK SHOWS. PLACEMENT OF ARTICLES IN LOCAL OR MAIN STATE NEWSPAPERS IS ALSO RECOMMENDED.

This will help maximize public knowledge about problems and needs facing Florida's children.

Recommendation #9: THE CENTER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH SHOULD SEEK REVIEW BUDGETS OF AGENCIES PROVIDING SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND YOUTH AND SHOULD PROVIDE CONSULTATION TO STATE BUDGET OFFICIALS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

This will help achieve greater coordination of existing resources on behalf of children and youth.

Recommendation #10: RECOGNIZING THE NEED FOR A SINGLE STATE ORGANIZATION TO SERVE AS AN ADVOCATE FOR YOUTH IN AN EFFORT TO PREVENT DELINQUENCY, CONTINUED FUNDING FOR THE CENTER IS RECOMMENDED.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I

1. How did you learn about the Center?

Newsletter _____ Center's Staff _____ Other (Explain) _____

Co-worker _____

2. Approximately how many of the following contacts have you or your agency/organization had with the Center

a. Telephone _____

b. Personal _____

c. Mail _____

3. In your opinion, what has the Center been most helpful to you or your organization in?

4. Do you feel that the Center's efforts will help to increase coordination among the youth service providers in your community?

Yes _____ No _____

If no, why not?

5. What would you say is the most beneficial aspect or service of the Center?

6. Are there any other services/efforts you feel the Center should offer? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, explain.

Have you, your agency/
organization been
informed of this service?

Have you, your agency/
organization utilized
these services/efforts/

How would you rate these services?

Yes No Yes No Excellent Good Average Fair Poor No Opinion

1. Cluster Meetings

2. Other Meetings

3. Legislative Infor-
mation

4. Newsletter

5. Assistance in
Community Organ-
ization

6. Service Delivery
Information

7. Service Delivery
Coordination

8. Information on
Availability of
Funds for Youth
Services

9. Information on
Training Oppor-
tunities

10. Information on
Evaluation/
Research
Findings

11. Conference

12. Other(s) (Specify)

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

| <u>TYPE OF REQUEST</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------|
| <u>Legislation</u> | |
| <u>Participation in Conf. or Workshops</u> | |
| <u>Publications by Project</u> | |
| <u>Publications by Topics</u> | |
| <u>About the Project</u> | |
| <u>Research Findings</u> | |
| <u>Specific Programs in Florida</u> | |
| <u>Programs Outside Florida</u> | |
| <u>About Other Organ./Group in the State</u> | |
| <u>Other</u> | |
| <u>DATE OF REQUEST</u> | |
| <u>BY WHOM</u> | |
| <u>National Organization</u> | |
| <u>Other States</u> | |
| <u>Local Private</u> | |
| <u>Local Public</u> | |
| <u>State Agency</u> | |
| <u>State Organization</u> | |
| <u>Citizen</u> | |
| <u>MODE OF REQUEST</u> | |
| <u>On-site TA</u> | |
| <u>Workshop Participation</u> | |
| <u>Letter</u> | |
| <u>Submission of Information</u> | |
| <u>No Response</u> | |
| <u>Telephone Response</u> | |
| <u>Other</u> | |
| <u>WHO PROVIDED</u> | |
| <u>Director</u> | |
| <u>Planner</u> | |
| <u>C.O.</u> | |
| <u>Secretary</u> | |
| <u>DATE OF REQUEST</u> | |