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ABSTRACT

In evaluation practice, Evaluability Assessment (EA) is recognized as an effective tool to determine if a plausible program logic exists before the effort is made to evaluate impact. Applying EA in the Cooperative Extension System, if programs lacked plausibility, the process was used as a design tool.

Following the steps recommended in this process, a representative work group of Extension agents, specialists and administrators:

1. identified and developed an educational effects matrix for each of five target audiences of the 4-H program - 4-H youth, other youth, family members, leaders and policy makers;

2. abstracted themes emerging from telephone interviews of 95 stakeholders; and

3. developed a program logic model comprised of seven main events, namely, Assess Needs, Define Extension’s Role and Nature of Commitment, Assess Resources and Develop Program, Acquire And/Or Train Staff, Initiate Networks and Coalitions, Create Awareness and Promote Program, and Provide Educational Experiences, the underlying activities and indicators for each event and the possible barriers and barrier reductions impeding the flow of the model’s events to ultimate consequences.
Based on the above, the work group concluded that:

1. The Louisiana 4-H program has a positive image.
2. The Louisiana 4-H program should expand its audience and subject matter.
3. Administrative approval of and a commitment to accept the model with its implications were critical to its implementation.

The following recommendations were made by the researcher to follow up the study from a programming viewpoint as well as in consideration of the EA process.

1. A strategy needs to be developed to adequately explain the EA process to administrators.
2. The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service should actively pursue the hiring of personnel from non-traditional academic backgrounds.
3. Additional research should be conducted to determine methods of increasing the use of evaluability assessment in the Cooperative Extension System while decreasing some of its limitations.
4. The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service needs to fully implement the developed program logic model with all its underpinnings.
5. Louisiana 4-H agents should be made aware of the positive image of 4-H and Extension personnel across the state.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The Cooperative Extension Service is the largest informal educational organization in the world. It was created in 1914 with the passage of the Smith-Lever Act to take knowledge directly to the people of rural America. The program has since broadened its audience to include virtually any family regardless of its place of residence (Smith, 1989).

4-H Program

4-H, the youth phase of extension programming, falls under the national priority Building Human Resources, which includes programs promoting self-esteem, improving literacy, encouraging educational attainment, preparing for careers, developing leadership skills and promoting volunteerism of both youth and adults (Verma, 1990).

According to the 1989 Louisiana Mission and Goals Statement the mission of Louisiana 4-H is two-fold; first, to assist youth and volunteers in acquiring research-based knowledge in agriculture, home economics and related subjects that contribute to human development; and secondly, to aid youth in developing positive life skills and forming attitudes that will enable them to become self-directing, productive and contributing members of society. This mission is carried out through the involvement of volunteer leaders, school administrators and parents who
help organize and conduct the 4-H program primarily through school 4-H clubs (Louisiana 4-H Mission Statement, 1989).

An effective 4-H program to fulfill this mission includes the following elements (Louisiana Mission Statement, 1989).

1. Program and Resource Development
2. Relationships with School and Community Officials
3. Volunteer Leader and Parent Programs
4. Four-H Club Meetings
5. Flexible Methods of Reaching 4-H Members
6. Team Effort By All Extension Agents

The total number of youth participating in Louisiana 4-H in 1991-92 was 62,967 in 1,558 4-H units. The majority (73.8%) of the enrollment was twelve years of age and younger, with 14.6% of the enrollment between the ages of 13 and 14, and the remaining 11.6% fifteen years of age or older. Racially, the breakdown was 67.8% White, 29.3% Black and 2.9% Other. By place of residence, 67.9% reside on farms or towns under 10,000 and rural non-farm areas, 16.6% in towns and cities of 10,000 to 50,000 and 15.51% in suburbs of cities over 50,000 or central cities of over 50,000.

A total of 11,482 volunteers (adult and youth) participated in the program in 1991-92. The racial breakdown of this group was 73.3% White, 26.1% Black and .6% Other (1991 Annual 4-H Enrollment Report).
**Program Development**

Boyle (1981) defines program development as the art of designing and implementing a course of action to achieve an effective educational program. Wiles and Bondi (1989) define program development as a basic cycle of analysis, design, implementation and analysis and further state that the promotion of quality educational programs requires organization.

The term program is often equated with curriculum in education circles. However, in the Extension context, it means the product resulting from all the programming activities in which the professional educator and learner are involved (Boyle 1981).

Program design was developed in the Cooperative Extension Service in response to a recognized need to have a more disciplined way of developing programs (Mayeske, 1991).

**Program Evaluation**

In 1969 the Urban Institute completed an extensive review of the federal government's evaluation activities and concluded: "The most impressive finding about the evaluation of social programs in the federal government is that substantial work in the field is almost non-existent" (Rutman, 1980). Since that time the field of program evaluation has been growing in popularity due mainly to an increasing concern with accountability.
Patton defines program evaluation as the systematic collection of information about the activities, characteristics and outcomes of programs for use by specific people to reduce uncertainties, improve effectiveness, and make decisions with regard to what those programs are doing and affecting (Patton, 1986).

Program evaluation is generally expected to measure the extent to which program goals are attained.

There are many different types of evaluations which can be used in evaluating programs. Patton (1981) identified 132 different types of evaluations. One type of evaluation which has been gaining credence in extension evaluation circles is evaluability assessment.

**Evaluability Assessment**

Smith defines evaluability assessment as a diagnostic and prescriptive tool for improving programs and making evaluations more useful. It is a systematic process for describing the structure of a program, i.e., the objectives, logic, activities and indicators of successful performance; and for analyzing the plausibility and feasibility for achieving objectives, their suitability for in-depth evaluation and their acceptability to program managers, policy makers and program operators (Smith, 1989).

Evaluability assessment is designed to be used in advance of exploratory and formative studies. Through the
analysis of documents and the conducting of interviews, evaluability assessment can sort out those aspects of a program for which evaluation can be conducted from other aspects which require special attention to enhance their "evaluability" (Rutman, 1980).

The evaluability assessment process has grown into an evaluation tool in its own right; as a way of determining stakeholder awareness and interest in a program and for determining what needs to be done in a program to make it more likely to produce results. It has also evolved into a program development tool; as a way to plan a plausible, evaluable program and to determine resource requirements and availability (Smith, 1989).

**Definition of Evaluability Assessment Concepts (Mayeske, 1991)**

**Barriers**: events or conditions that can perturb the causal relationships between sequential main events, between main events and target audiences and between target audiences that program staff might be able to influence.

**Barrier Reductions**: actions that program staff can initiate which might help surmount, overcome or avoid barriers.

**Intervening Events**: conditions or occurrences which can perturb the causal relationship(s). These events are subsequent to the educational effects and are usually beyond the influence of the program staff.

**Main Events**: major categories of program activities, effects and consequences which form the program logic model.

**Matrix of Educational Effects**: Knowledge, Attitudes, Skills, Aspirations and Behavior/practice changes that clientele experience by virtue of their participation in the program.
**Model Verification**: a process to determine the extent to which the program logic model developed by the work group can be used to describe the way other program providers can or do carry out the program.

**Program**: a set of logically and sequentially related events, with their supporting activities, resources and indicators of accomplishments which can be judged likely to lead to intended goals.

**Program Logic Model**: a set of causally and sequentially related main events that define the program and its consequences and conform to an "if-then" relationship (for any event to occur all those preceding it must have occurred first).

**Spin-offs**: unplanned effects of carrying out the program (can be positive or negative; and known or unknown to those who provide the program).

**Stakeholder**: an individual who has a special interest in or influence over the program and who can provide information that will be useful for the design, development, implementation and evaluation of the program.

**Target Audience(s)**: intended recipients of the program.

**Work Group**: the persons assigned the task of conducting the exercises together.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study was to apply the evaluability assessment process in examining the 4-H youth program of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service.

**Objectives**

1. Determine stakeholder perceptions of the Louisiana 4-H program.

2. Develop a program logic model for the Louisiana 4-H program.
3. Make recommendations to the administrators of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service based on the findings of the Evaluability Assessment.

4. Observe the functioning of the Evaluability Assessment work group.
The review of literature relevant to this study is presented in four sections; overview of the 4-H program, including a brief historical perspective and current situation; program development; program evaluation; evaluability assessment as a program development and program evaluation tool.

Overview of 4-H

4-H is, and will continue to be, a significant force in the lives of youth and their families. The 4-H program’s values and objectives play an important educational role by complementing the formal education system (North Dakota Cooperative Extension Service, 1986). Although the legislation creating Cooperative Extension did not specifically mention youth work, it was interpreted to mean that a large share of the money would be for expansion of the youth work that was started by rural school superintendents, land grant college scientists and United States Department of Agriculture officials. Later legislation and amendments to the Smith-Lever Act did, in fact, broaden Extension’s mission and audience to include youth and urban residents (Ladewig and Thomas, 1986).

The team which delivers the extension service’s youth program is made up of the land-grant college specialist—who is many times a researcher and teacher—and county
staff located in communities where people live and day-to-day problems exist. They are joined by thousands of volunteer leaders who assist with program implementation, and by local advisory boards/committees which help identify problems and set priorities.

The character of the Cooperative Extension Service permits the development of new programs as new needs and problems are identified. This means that identification of current needs/problems is a constant requirement. These problems are made known to research faculty who provide content for the curricula aimed at the problems and, if the content is not known, develop research to answer the questions.

Program plans are largely developed at the county level by Extension faculty and advisory committees and are then implemented by county staff with the assistance of state specialists and volunteers.

The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service (LCES) operates as part of the land-grant university system through Louisiana State University (LSU) in conjunction with the 1890 institution, Southern University. The state is divided into seven administrative districts; six comprised of nine parishes (counties) and one with ten parishes. These districts are supervised by district agents who in turn are responsible to the Director of LCES.
The 4-H program is coordinated on the state level by a staff of 4-H program specialists.

According to the 1989 Louisiana Mission and Goals statement the goals of the Louisiana 4-H program are to:

* Strengthen young people's skills and competence in building a positive self-image to help them develop to their full potential.

* Teach youth effective decision-making skills to prepare them for problems they face now as well as for a productive adulthood.

* Provide a wide range of project and personal skill experiences to prepare youth for a world of work.

* Provide a broad spectrum of educational experiences using the land-grant university research and subject-matter base to strengthen 4-H youth programs.

* Improve the capacity of youth to effectively interact with peers and members of their families.

* Develop a strong awareness in youth regarding environmental and community concerns to acquaint them with opportunities for involvement.

* Provide youth and adult volunteers opportunities for constructive activity and continued growth.

* Recruit, train and utilize more adult volunteers to support youth education programs (Louisiana Mission and Goals Statement, 1989).
The Louisiana 4-H program is conducted by LCES in all sixty-four parishes of the state. The program is conducted almost in its entirety, within the school system, having been declared co-curricular by the state Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) in 1985. Local clubs are organized through the schools, with 4-H club meetings being held during school hours, at schools, with teachers serving as leaders for the club. Parish youth agents present educational programs at each monthly club meeting.

Youth between the ages of nine to nineteen are eligible to enroll in the 4-H program. These youth may enroll in a number of different projects depending on their age and interest. Eligible club members of any age may enroll in one, or more, of the livestock production projects (beef, dairy, swine, sheep, horse, poultry).

The 4-H program is carried out by Extension professionals employed for that purpose. The LCES currently requires that applicants for 4-H agent positions have a Bachelor's degree in either agriculture or home economics. Experience with the 4-H program is preferred but not required. Parish 4-H agents are expected to coordinate all aspects of the parish 4-H program, including enrollment of club members, recruitment of volunteer leaders, conducting educational programs at club meetings, conducting educational programs outside of club meetings
and conducting all contests and activities associated with the 4-H program.

A report by the 4-H Youth Development Subcommittee of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy suggests five major areas which should be included in a youth professional's academic background;
1. Youth development
2. Communications
3. Educational design
4. Volunteer development
5. Program management (Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, 1989).

Agents are assisted in carrying out the program by volunteer leaders who serve in different capacities within the program. Hammatt (1983) defines these leader roles as follows: organizational leaders are those responsible for the general operation and coordination of the local 4-H club; project leaders have the responsibility of teaching skills and subject matter in given project areas; and activity leaders accept responsibility for specific activities the local club may be involved in.

The Louisiana 4-H program has traditionally not involved volunteer project or activity leaders to a large degree other than in the livestock projects.
The Louisiana 4-H program is part of the national Extension youth program, and as such depends upon the national leadership to provide programming direction.

A 1991 National Strategic Action Planning meeting for 4-H Youth Development mentioned the following concerns:

* There is a need to reaffirm leadership roles in youth development education
* There is a need for training of parents and volunteers
* Four-H programs must develop life skills in youth
* The 4-H curriculum must incorporate science and technology
* There is a need to help youth develop career awareness and preparedness
* Extension must access the entire Land-Grant University system to bring resources to bear upon youth issues
* Private sector support to Extension must be expanded (Cummings & Helt, 1991).

**Program Development**

Program development is defined as a series of actions and decisions through which representatives of the people affected by the potential program are involved with a programmer to:
* Develop an organizational structure for analyzing, interpreting, and making decisions about problems or situations that can be changed or improved
* Identify desired outcomes to be attained through the program with people and communities
* Identify resources and support for effective promotion and implementation of the program
* Implement a plan of action that is designed to provide appropriate learning opportunities
* Develop appropriate accountability approaches so as to make effective judgements about the value of the program.

(Boyle, 1981)

In essence, program development is designing an educational program that will contribute to improving the well-being of people and their community. The knowledge, attitudes and skills that people need in order to change these situations must be specified in the program (Boyle, 1981).

Planning fulfills several important functions for the organization. First, a plan defines activities and direction of activities for those in the organization. A plan tells workers where the agency is going and often when it is going to get there. Second, a good plan establishes criteria that the manager can use to make decisions. Third, a well-constructed plan permits evaluation and fourth, planning limits the quantity and quality of the
control information that is gathered (Sylvia, Meirer, & Gunn, 1985).

The understanding a person has of the essential concepts inherent in program development establishes the basis for selecting and following appropriate procedures.

The effectiveness of institutional programs is generally evaluated by the extent to which the learner(s) has/have mastered the content of the program. Because of this emphasis the continuity, sequence and integration of learning opportunities is important (Boyle 1981).

Events identified by Boyle (1981) as being essential in developing an institutional program are:

1. Defining target clientele
2. Determining specific content areas
3. Identifying the instructional approach. What activities and events will the learners participate in?
4. Providing the instruction
5. Evaluating the program. What the learners have achieved.

Program Evaluation

Nay and Kay (1982) define evaluation as a methodological approach to improve the quality of information about a program and to structure the information so that decision makers can use it while the program is still in operation. In this view, evaluation is part of purposeful management behavior.
Smith (1989) writes that program evaluation is a process for examining a program to assess its operations and/or effects (intended or unintended), relative to the objectives it set out to reach. Decision areas of concern are ascertained and data collected, analyzed and put in a form useful to decision makers in selecting among alternatives.

Program evaluation is generally expected to measure the extent to which program goals are attained. Goals are the outcomes which a program claims to pursue and for which it can be held accountable. In addition, there are usually important unintended effects, positive and negative, that a program produces. Effects are those outcomes which are by-products of a program rather than the ends toward which the program is deliberately managed.

Evaluation is usually conducted to assist decision makers in allocating resources, exercising accountability, formulating policy and improving programs. Program evaluation must therefore be relevant to the information needs of decision makers. Since the usability of the findings is a primary concern, the users of the evaluation must be identified and addressed by the evaluation studies (Patton, 1986).

In the public domain, Wholey (1979) states that program evaluation should:
1. clarify government programs
2. measure program performance
3. identify feasible evaluation/management options (ways to improve program performance)
4. help program managers and policy makers to redirect program activities or objectives to achieve demonstrably effective programs; and
5. document the extent to which evaluations are used to meet program managers' and policy makers' information needs and to improve program performance.

Too often, evaluations examine only program outcomes, making it impossible to determine the type of intervention that produced the measured results. Program evaluation should aim to measure and link program processes to the outcomes. Studies that collect process and outcome data can guide managers in making program improvements (Rutman, 1980).

Evaluations are conducted for a variety of reasons. A major reason for evaluating policies and programs is to make sure that what we want to have happen actually happens (Wholey, 1979). Rutman (1980) indicates seven explicit reasons for conducting program evaluations:
1- Guide resource allocation decisions
2- Provide the basis for making program modifications that would presumably increase cost-effectiveness
3- Provide an understanding for reaching decisions about launching major policies or large-scale programs
4- Provide a "political" assessment of contentious programs
5- Test theories underlying programs
6- Serve as a medium of accountability
7- Develop evaluation research methodology

Research has shown that evaluation is likely to be useful in improving program performance only if three standards are met:

* **Program objectives are well-defined** i.e. those in charge of the program have defined program objectives in terms of specific measures of program performance, and data on those measures are obtainable at a reasonable cost.

* **Program assumptions/objectives are plausible**, i.e., there is evidence that program activities have some likelihood of causing progress toward program objectives.

* **Intended uses of evaluation information are well-defined**, i.e., those in charge of the program have defined the intended uses of evaluation information (Patton, 1986).

There are several types of program evaluation. One type, formative, is conducted while a program is ongoing; its purpose is program improvement. A second type, summative, is conducted after a program is stable and expected to have achieved intended effects; its purpose is to gather data on the results of a program (Patton, 1986).

An evaluation may also serve several unstated or covert purposes, including:
1- Meet the requirements imposed on a program that an evaluation be conducted

2- Whitewash or purposefully destroy a program, using the evaluation as an excuse

3- Postpone needed action by insisting on an evaluation

There are many different types of evaluations which can be used in evaluating programs. Patton (1981) identified 132 different types of evaluations. We will examine one of those types, Evaluability Assessment.

Evaluability Assessment

Evaluability Assessment began in the Program Evaluation Group at the Urban Institute during 1970-73. The group, directed by Joseph Wholey and Deputy Director Garth Buchanan, had completed a survey of evaluation across the federal government and found some startling discrepancies between rhetoric and reality. Each new policy issue that developed seemed to create a battleground between the policy analysts and the people who did actual field work, measurement and detailed examination of program operations (Nay and Kay, 1982).

Wholey (1979) saw evaluability assessment as one evaluation tool in a four-step process he called "Sequential Purchase of Information". Wholey described evaluability assessment as a process which tests the extent to which managers and policy-makers have defined measurable
program objectives and defined specific uses for information on program performance.

According to Mayeske (1991) in the early years of evaluation at the federal level (late 1960's and early 1970's) many program evaluations were designed on the basis of high level managers' conceptions of what the program was. Detailed examinations of these programs showed that their evaluations were inconclusive because the programs were not being carried out in the way the managers thought or because there were not any programs. Consequently, the information collected was irrelevant.

Mayeske further states that Wholey's technique (Evaluability Assessment) was used to determine if there was a "program". If a program was found an evaluability assessment would help to determine what kinds of evaluation might be useful. If there was no program evaluability assessment would help to determine how a "program" might be developed (Mayeske, 1991).

Schmidt's definition of evaluability assessment is a descriptive and analytic process intended to produce a reasoned basis for proceeding with an evaluation of use to both management and policy makers. In other words, the description permits the program to be measured with some reasonable assurance that the evaluation can be done and that predetermined expectations can be realized (Schmidt, 1979).
Wholey writes that evaluability assessment explores the objectives, expectations, and information needs of program managers and policy makers; explores program reality; assesses the likelihood that program activities will achieve measurable progress toward program objectives; and assesses the extent to which evaluation information is likely to be used by program management (Wholey, 1979).

The process of evaluability assessment was initially developed to weed out candidates for evaluation that could not reasonably be expected to achieve their objectives—that is, evaluability assessment is a process carried out between the time when an activity becomes a candidate for evaluation and the time when an evaluation is finally designed. The original and primary purpose of conducting an evaluability assessment is to increase the probability that the eventual design and performance of an evaluation will produce usable, used results. A secondary and possibly even more useful purpose has emerged over time. The process itself has proved to be an excellent management tool in that the information produced through an evaluability assessment process is often enough to tell those in charge what they need to know about their program in order to take effective remedial action.

In essence the process of evaluability assessment is a systematic way of answering the most basic questions first: What was to be done? What activities are in place and
functioning? What can be determined, in what sequence and at what cost (Nay and Kay, 1982)?

Schmidt (1979) sees the process as being made up of four steps: (1) describe the program; (2) validate and analyze the program description to determine the extent to which the program can be evaluated; (3) construct alternatives wherever necessary; and (4) implement management decisions.

Rutman (1980) writes that we must always remember that the aim of an evaluability assessment is not to determine whether or not the whole program is evaluable. Rather the intent is to identify particular program components and specific goals/effects that meet the preconditions of evaluability.

The evaluability assessment process has grown into an evaluation tool in its own right— as a way of determining stakeholder awareness and interest in a program and for determining what needs to be done in a program to make it likely to produce results. It has also evolved into a program development tool— as a way to plan a plausible, evaluable program and to determine resource requirements and availability.

Smith (1989) is of the opinion that evaluability assessment is a comprehensive and complex undertaking. She suggests a series of ten implementation steps and used these steps in her study of evaluability assessments
conducted in the Cooperative Extension System. The process involved in each step is reviewed.

1. Determine purpose, secure commitment and identify work group members.

The first general concern of the evaluability assessment, according to Rutman (1980), is to determine the extent to which a program is structured to make it amenable to an evaluation of its effectiveness. The aim is to identify those program components and goals/effects that should be considered for inclusion in an evaluation. The following questions are central: Is the program (or its components) clearly defined and capable of being implemented in a prescribed manner? Are the goals and effects clearly specified? Can the program realistically achieve the specified goals or produce the anticipated effects?

A group of individuals made up of program implementation staff and other task specific persons must be identified. This group of individuals is identified as the work group. Mayeske (1990) writes that it is important to have a preponderance of program providers who impact directly on clientele in the work group for they are the "reality flirters" as to what is or might be "doable". Some administrative staff and specialists should be included in order to "round out" different aspects of program concern.
According to Smith (1989), the work group is absolutely critical to the success of the evaluability assessment. The team participates actively in identifying stakeholders, localizing the interview questions, defining the initial version of the program model, analyzing stakeholder interviews, drawing conclusions and making recommendations, making plans for utilization of results and deciding how best to disseminate findings to constituencies to further the utilization process.

Factors internal to the core team itself affect success. Personal commitment to evaluability assessment by the work team member is just as important, if not more, than commitment from the administrators. Turnover in team membership and absences have a negative effect, particularly on study bounding and program theory. The availability of an outside facilitator for the evaluability assessment is of critical importance. This outside evaluator brings evaluation expertise, extensive experience with the evaluability assessment process and also has the ability to raise questions of central importance in a non-threatening way (CT, 1989). The optimum size for intensive, interactive task-focused group is 7-9 members.

Characteristics of individual members are also important. Ideally, the work group should be composed of individuals from as broad a range of levels and types of
the program as is appropriate without enlarging the team
unnecessarily.

The first task of the work group is to identify and
list all the program components and goals/effects. Program
components are those activities or sets of activities that
directly impact on the clients or social problems and are
expected to produce the stated goals/effects. Program
evaluation is generally concerned with whether variations
in the methods of delivering services to the public affect
the outcome. Relevant questions are: Does the program
produce outcomes that differ from not having the program at
all? Does the program produce better results than
alternative programs? How do differences in the manner of
implementing the program affect the outcomes (Smith, 1989).

2. Define boundaries of the program to be studied.

Rutman describes this step as an analysis which
identifies those aspects of the program that can
appropriately and reasonably be measured in an effective
evaluation. In addition, there is an identification of:
* Poorly defined programs that require elaboration to
  facilitate their implementation in the field
* The failure to implement programs in the prescribed or
  intended manner
* Vague goals that provide little basis for accountability
  and insufficient direction for management of the program
* Unrealistic goals which managers do not attempt to achieve and for which they should not be held accountable
* Unintended effects, positive or negative, that the program is likely to produce
* Varying perceptions among managers and practitioners about the meaning and priority of goals
* Competing or conflicting goals
* Constraints that must be addressed to ensure the availability of data and the implementation of the most rigorous research designs and data collection procedures (Rutman, 1980).

3. Identify and analyze program documents

Smith suggests that the review of documents starts before stakeholder interviews (Smith, 1989). Examples of documents suggested for review by Wholey (1979) are authorizing legislation, regulations and guidelines, research, evaluation and audit reports, program memoranda, documents describing agency organization and staffing and reports from the field. At the start of the evaluability assessment, documents should be read to get a general feel for the intent of the program.

4. Develop/clarify program theory.

The suggested methodology for explaining the theory of a program is simple, straight-forward, and practical. The intent is to identify the assumptions on which program staff act to achieve program goals, i.e., how a program is
supposed to work and why, and to identify any gaps in means-ends connections.

The questions asked to clarify program theory are questions about what program staff believe affects expected program outcomes, i.e., in what ways do activities, events, and other forces cause or effect changes in the target population?

Cause and effect relationships— for example, teaching methods used by Cooperative Extension Service educators to present information to clients affect their reactions which in turn affect the methods teachers will use the next time.

The description should include all important steps identified to bring about the desired change and show the causal linkages, regardless of any preliminary assessment of program plausibility. Included are the identification of key components (sometimes expressed as intermediate objectives) that precede main goals, the activities and resources needed to bring about each component, and indicators of successful performance. The intent is to arrange these objectives, activities, and performance indicators into a causal, hierarchical, or time flow (Smith, 1989).

5. Identify and interview stakeholders.

The next step is to conduct interviews with persons whose understanding of the program is considered important for the development of the evaluation design. (Rutman, 1980)
These individuals are identified as stakeholders. Stakeholders are those persons or groups who impact a program in very significant ways or who are similarly affected by the actions of a program. They are persons with vested interest in a program whose decisions can affect the program's future in very important ways (Smith, 1989). Covey (1991) writes that the best way to identify stakeholders is to ask, "Who will suffer if the enterprise fails?"

Stakeholder interviews, as perceived by Wholey (1979), involve the conducting of on-site interviews by the evaluation team. Mayeske and Smith, in their initial evaluability assessments conducted in the Cooperative Extension System, found that the funds were not enough to put a team of observers in the field to interview local agents and to see how a program was being carried out. On the other hand it was possible to pull together, in a central location, a number of local agents who themselves carry out the program and impact directly on clientele, if the state would cover the travel costs.

Under such conditions the evaluator becomes the facilitator of a group process wherein the members of the group work cooperatively through a series of steps to develop a number of products. No one is threatened by the evaluator since he/she is merely facilitating the process. Group members are not appalled by the evaluator's lack of
program content expertise since he/she is not expected to have such. There may be differences of opinion and viewpoint among the group members but these are not seen as being provoked by the evaluator. Mayeske calls this a staff-centered approach to evaluability assessment (Mayeske in Smith, 1989).

When stakeholders are contacted the interviewer should make clear to the stakeholders that the purpose of the interview is to secure information from them—NOT to provide them with information. They are being asked their perceptions and can give no wrong answers. The intent is to find out from them what they believe (Smith, 1989).

Rutman writes that the evaluator must first explain the purpose of the evaluability assessment and the reason for the interview. The point to be emphasized is that the interview is not for the purpose of carrying out an evaluation. The interview is being conducted to help conceptualize the program (Rutman, 1980).

This means that persons selected for interviews should be aware of the program, have some knowledge about it, and have the potential for using data collected about program performance. They should not be sent information about the program prior to the interview. It means they are asked questions they are qualified to answer. It also means that the interviewer(s) are selected for their interviewing capability—NOT for their knowledge of the program under
review. They should be attentive listeners and competent probers (Smith, 1989).

Once stakeholders are identified, the list should be prioritized. Pearsol (1987) suggested the following criteria to be helpful in prioritization. Stakeholders should be persons:

* who have a stake in a major versus minor program component
* who affect more versus fewer people
* in a position for concrete action-oriented use of information about the program
* from whom follow-through on actual use is more likely
* who can reduce uncertainty.

The selection and number of people interviewed would depend on how comprehensive an understanding the evaluator wishes to develop about the program and the expected usefulness in interviewing particular people (Rutman, 1980).

In Texas, the aquaculture evaluability assessment stakeholders list was initially 106. This was reduced to 32 by prioritizing on two criteria:

1. How much the team thought an individual stakeholder knew and cared about the CES aquaculture program and
2. How much influence they were perceived to have on the program (Verma & Mayeske, 1990).
The questions to be asked stakeholders should be specific. They should provide information to achieve one of the two primary outcomes of an evaluability assessment: identification of stakeholder awareness of, and interest in a program (Smith, 1989).

Open-ended questions are better than those that provide simple answer alternatives. For example, yes-no questions are almost never appropriate unless additional probing is planned.

Questions are based on gaps revealed in the review of written materials and/or from data needs generated as the interviews progress. Smith (1989) offers the following suggestions to reduce error in interviewee response:
* Think of the respondent when wording the questions. The language and complexity should reflect the capability of the respondent to understand and provide meaningful responses.
* Make the questions as simple, direct, and precise as the situation requires.

The issue of number of interviewers is important. There are advantages of having one person conduct all interviews, if that person is skillful, because the same prejudices and biases should occur in all interviews. The disadvantage is that only one person's perspective of the stakeholders is captured and more time is required for conducting and analyzing the interviews.
Steps to increase data credibility suggested by Smith (1989) included:

* Secure the commitment of adequate time for an unhurried interview
* Conduct interview one-on-one and in private
* Be prepared for the interview
* Ensure that the respondent is comfortable with the procedure adopted.

6. Describe stakeholder perceptions of the program.

Interviews are analyzed to determine stakeholder views and to identify other concerns/issues that emerge in the course of the interviews. This process involves identifying categories and summarizing these by interviewer group (Smith, 1989).

Patton (1980) noted that analyzing qualitative data is a creative process and may be approached in different ways by different people. It is based more on the researcher's experience and knowledge of a particular subject than on tried and true analytical methods. Most reports of qualitative studies describe the results without explaining the analytical process.

Mayeske (1990) found that the work of the group and its comprehension of the results can be greatly enhanced if a good deal of analysis is done prior to the second session of the work group. Most of the analytical work can be done on a computer using a content analysis program. The
results are usually organized by question and by category of stakeholder. Mayeske suggests the following steps in analyzing stakeholder statements:

* Divide the interview results among the work group so that at least two members of the group will read all results of a single category of stakeholder, discuss their observations with each other and reach agreement on what they have read.

* Once the teams have been identified they are given time (1 1/2 - 3 1/2 hours) to read the results, discuss them and arrive at cryptic, summary statements.

* The group is reconvened and a spokesperson for each group and stakeholder category narrates the group's observations to the facilitator who records the information on a two dimensional matrix, featuring stakeholders on one dimension and questions on the other.

Lawrence & Cook (1982) write that the purpose of stakeholder information analysis, however accomplished, is to interpret stakeholder perceptions into useful guidance in shaping evaluation design, both directly and indirectly.
7. **Identify stakeholder needs, concerns and differences in perceptions.**

The purpose of this step is to identify both common understandings and major differences among stakeholders in their perceptions about what a program is trying to accomplish and how it is being implemented (Smith, 1989).

8. **Determine plausibility of the program model.**

Expectations are plausible when there is evidence that the program activity will achieve the results expected (Schmidt et al., 1979).

The creation of various models is an important part of the evaluability assessment process. A basic model contains two parts: (1) a sequence of program logic with a supporting flow of (2) activities/functions, resources, and indicators of successful performance (Smith, 1989).

Nay and Kay (1982) list the following as the four cornerstones of evaluability assessment:

1. The construction of two families of models - that is, testable models based on information derived from descriptions and equivalency models based on information derived from observation.

2. Comparisons and reconciliations within and between the two families to produce an evaluable model, often the basis for immediate action and always the basis for evaluation design.
3. The construction and use of functional models to display the relevant structure and flow of both the described and observed activities of interest.

4. A phased approach to the entire investigation that permits those in charge to make sequential purchases of information.

Wholey (in Bickham, 1987) maintains that an important part of the evaluability assessment process is the construction of models that clarify the assumed relationships among program resources, program activities and expected outcomes from the point of view of key policy makers, managers and interest groups. In constructing these models, evaluators get clues about the theories underlying the program from both relevant documents and from a series of interactions with those who have the greatest influence over the program.

Diamond (1989) suggests that using a specific, effective model for course or curriculum design provides the following important advantages:

1. The model identifies the key factors that should be considered in a sequential order.

2. The model serves as a procedural guide for those directing the project.

3. The model allows those involved to understand where they are in the process and their role in it.
4. The model improves efficiency by reducing duplication of effort and ensuring that critical questions are asked and alternative solutions explored.

Smith defined three types of models which may be used in the evaluability assessment process.

**Logic models** present simple if/then sequences and are helpful in communicating the nature and purpose of a program. They are particularly good as a means of orienting the evaluation team and for making broad-brush presentations. They are less useful for analytical purposes since they cannot be systematically used to analyze cause and effect.

**Functional models** are the basic working models. These models, composed of traces and functions, graphically describe the interrelationships within the organization and its environment and preserve cause-and-effect relationships, feedback loops, and significant patterns. They are the bedrock of the analytic effort.

**Measurement models** are anchored to the functional models and identify the measurement that can - or should-be taken in order to supply those in charge with the information they need to direct the activities of the purposeful organization (Smith, 1989).

9. **Draw conclusions and make recommendations.**

Smith (1989) lists the following as guidelines for conclusions and recommendations:
* Do make them.
* Involve the evaluability assessment work team and other potential users where feasible.
* Present conclusions with the best reasons possible as to why a situation was read the way it was. Give reasons for recommending a course of action over others. Strive for fairness among competing perspectives.
* Keep personal biases and values out of conclusions as much as possible.
* Draw conclusions based on evidence from the study; make recommendations based on the study and knowledge of the implementation scene.
* Consider the organization’s ability/willingness to make changes. Recommendations that are impossible to implement are useless, and they cast doubt on the other aspects of the study.

10. Plan specific steps for the utilization of evaluability assessment data.

Planning for utilization begins as soon as the evaluability assessment is initiated, i.e., when the purpose of the evaluability assessment is determined and continues as each step is implemented.

There are at least five alternatives for follow up to an evaluability assessment, depending on the purpose of the evaluability assessment:
1. Decide to evaluate the program (or some parts)
2. Decide to change the program
3. Decide to take no further action
4. Decide to stop the program
5. Do not decide, ignore the evaluability assessment (Smith, 1989).

After a program has been developed with input from the different program levels, it should be validated with experience from local implementation sites. Validation may take place by visits to selected sites for individual input or in open forums where several sites/persons at a time may participate. The latter procedure can provide input in a short period of time. In addition, when several people are present, individuals seem more willing to point out weaknesses and inconsistencies in the initial conceptualization of the program. Needed changes are made to the description after each session to prevent the waste of time of several people identifying the same weaknesses/omissions.

Careful analyses should be made during this step to determine if one model is appropriate or if more than one is needed. Very large differences should not occur among staff carrying out the same program even though they are at different sites. Each one will verbalize essentially the same goals and objectives and have planned about the same overall events and activities but no two will be exactly
alike. While this makes management and evaluation difficult to perform and accountability elusive, it is a condition that should be expected in agencies where programs are locally based and controlled. The model is not an exact replica of every aspect of the program. However it should accurately reflect the major assumptions undergirding the program, and the critical activities that are going on in different places in which it is being implemented.

There are no criteria for how much similarity is enough. However, where substantial variations are found to exist, when implementation integrity becomes an issue, it is not for the evaluator or evaluability assessment team to decide alone. It is a question for policy makers and program managers to debate. They must decide how much difference between real and ideal will be tolerated.

Deciding how many persons (sites) to involve in the validation may take some careful consideration. The number required depends partially on how much variation is expected from one locale to the next and how many levels of a program are being checked. The process may begin with sites which represent extremes in the program. If differences are few and/or minor, no other sites may need to be contacted. If differences are significant two or three other sites should be involved. This involvement should continue until there is a degree of satisfaction
that the program described is or is not the one operating in the field. Key decision makers may need to assist with the latter assessment (Smith, 1989).

Smith makes the following observations about the process which are significant to the success of the evaluability assessment:

1. The importance of high-level administrator involvement
2. The necessity for careful attention to the selection and interviewing of non-program-staff stakeholders. Interviewing inappropriate persons and/or asking inappropriate questions can result in negative program impacts.
3. The importance of focusing on substance rather than form.
4. The importance of completing all the steps in the evaluability assessment process.

As indicated earlier, an evaluability assessment is a complex process. Mayeske (1989) gives a summary of the time involved in conducting an evaluability assessment.

Usually a workshop is conducted in a series of two-day sessions. So as to allow participants time to travel to and from their home base, the sessions usually run from noon of one day to noon of the third day. The first meeting is held with the primary stakeholder(s) of the evaluability assessment. The goals for this meeting are to: (1) explain the evaluability assessment process; (2)
clarify purpose(s) of the evaluability assessment; (3) receive administrative support for the evaluability assessment to be implemented, and (4) identify other persons to have input and/or to implement the tasks.

Usually a period of 2-3 months is required between sessions to allow adequate time for scheduling, conducting and transcribing the interviews and doing some preliminary analyses of the results. This period may vary from a low of six weeks to a high of four months depending upon the need for the results or the interference from other events. If a longer period of time elapses there is risk of losing the interest of the group.

Sometimes a third (or even fourth) one-to-two day session is needed to finish up and/or conduct a model verification exercise. A model verification exercise is one in which program providers who have not been a part of the work group are brought in to criticize the model as to how reflective it is of their own experience and suggest appropriate modifications. Usually a verification session requires only a half a day (Mayeske, 1989).

The products of evaluability assessment are: (1) a set of agreed on program objectives, important side-effects, and performance indicators on which the program can realistically be held accountable; and (2) a set of evaluation/management options which represent ways in which management can change program activities, objectives, or
uses of information in ways likely to improve program performance (Wholey, 1979).

The most visible products of an evaluability assessment are finished when the program theory models are completed and the stakeholder interviews summarized. However, if the hard questions, about plausibility are not answered, the evaluability assessment will not be complete but more importantly, it will not have resulted in one of its most critical outcomes. (Smith, 1989)

Smith also indicates a very important side effect of the evaluability assessment process for those individuals involved in the workgroup. Smith indicates that these individuals benefitted the most from defining program theory. The staff learned not only about the workings of their programs, but also a new way of thinking about program development. Persons working together on models actually create a new language among themselves that expresses the knowledge they have all acquired. This creates an enormous amount of energy that translates directly to the organization in two ways. First, staff become more committed to the program and the organization—there is a camaraderie and a feeling of "belongingness" that develops among team members as they reveal assumptions and agree on common goals. The actual model in each one of the CES evaluability assessments was a source of staff pride. Second, the program is improved.
This thinking is in line with Boyle (1982) who wrote that involvement in program development is a learning experience.

Smith lists the following as the major benefits of the evaluability assessment process:
* Clarification of program theory, not only in identifying the theory of an ongoing program (looking backward) but also in developing theory for the future (looking forward).
* Increases the effectiveness and efficiency of program staff and thus the probability of the program’s success. Information and conceptual gaps may be revealed when delineating the underlying assumptions in a program’s theory of action. When these gaps are filled and staff are clear about intended outcomes and the strategies to accomplish them, they are much more likely to be effective. The logically described program provides a basis for proactive decision making and action.
* Results in immediate implementation of program improvement actions.
* Helps distinguish between program failure and evaluation failure and between theory failure and implementation failure.

Evaluability Assessment in the Cooperative Extension System.

In 1984, a project was initiated to define the evaluability assessment process in a practical,
methodological sense and to encourage adoption in the Cooperative Extension System.

During the first two studies in Illinois and California, it became apparent to all involved that evaluability assessment could be a powerful tool for program improvement both before and after implementation: first, as a process for planning a plausible program and second, as a way of examining an existing program to determine plausibility.

Mayeske, in Smith (1989) writes that for evaluability assessment to really become useful in Extension, mechanisms need to be fostered to first, institutionalize such skills and later, support and reinforce them. Evaluability assessment skills are not something an uninitiated person can take directly from a workshop and apply. Rather, the development of evaluability assessment skills needs careful and direct nurturing through the close working together, in actual situations, of those with more experience with those less experienced. When a sufficient critical mass of such collaborative efforts has been attained then the other supporting and reinforcing mechanisms such as networking, workshops, training sessions and symposia can be brought into play. (Smith, 1989)
4-H Evaluability Assessments

Evaluability Assessments of 4-H programs have been conducted in three states; Maryland, 1986; Pennsylvania, 1988; and Connecticut, 1989.

These EAs followed the basic process described by Smith (1989), i.e. define the program, identify and interview stakeholders, develop the program model, draw conclusions and make recommendations.

Forty-three stakeholders were interviewed in Maryland, 47 in Pennsylvania and 34 in Connecticut with the following similar conclusions being drawn by the three work groups:

* 4-H was highly regarded by the majority of persons interviewed.
* Urban and suburban programming needs to be strengthened.
* The agents role in carrying out the program should be clarified.
* Training materials for use with volunteers should be developed.

Recommendations resulting from stakeholder interviews were developed by Maryland and Pennsylvania; the Connecticut EA did not list any specific recommendations. Recommendations were:

* Strengthen urban and suburban programming.
* Establish a basis for recruiting and selecting volunteers.
* Create and promote a realistic image of 4-H.
* Define the job of the 4-H county faculty and set reasonable expectations for performance.

The program logic models developed in each study were quite different. The Maryland model dealt strictly with volunteer recruitment and management, while the Connecticut and Pennsylvania models included some acknowledgement of the need for curriculum development and a marketing plan for the 4-H program (Etling & Tutle, 1988, Russel, 1989, Smith, 1989).

**Summary**

The materials presented in this review of literature have emphasized the use of evaluability assessment in helping program planners determine whether or not their programs are evaluable and, in the event they are not, to use evaluability assessment in designing a program that can be evaluated.

The Louisiana 4-H program does not currently have a systematic way of determining whether or not its program activities are producing the desired effect. It is the intent of this study to use the evaluability assessment process to examine the Louisiana 4-H program and design a program development tool for use with the program.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

The methodology for this study was based on the evaluability assessment process described by Smith (1989) and a final verification of the process suggested by Mayeske (1991).

Determine purpose, secure commitment and identify work group members.

This researcher initiated the process following discussions with his graduate advisor, Dr. Satish Verma, regarding the research utility of the study and the proposed evaluability assessment methodology, and with Dr. Norma Roberts, who provides statewide leadership of the 4-H program, regarding the need for the study from a programming standpoint. Having secured the commitment of these two individuals, the researcher met with Dr. Denver T. Loupe, Director of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service (LCES), to secure LCES support of agent time and expense for the project. Once this support was secured the work group was selected.

The work group was a purposive sample of the population of 4-H youth agents, specialists and administrators in the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. The work group was comprised of thirteen members. There were seven youth agents, one from each of the seven Extension administrative districts into which the state is
divided; three subject-matter specialists, one from 4-H, one from home economics and one from agriculture; one administrator, a district agent; one representative of the 1890 institution and one volunteer leader.

Nominations to the work group were made by the researcher in consultation with the state 4-H leader and the researcher’s graduate advisor. Final selection and approval of work group membership was done by the Director.

The outside evaluator involved with the study was Dr. George Mayeske, Program Evaluation Specialist, Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Develop/clarify program theory.

The first meeting of the work group was held October 9-11, 1991. The first task of the work group was the development of a matrix of educational effects of the 4-H program using the Knowledge, Aspirations, Skills, Attitudes, Behaviors/Practices Change (KASAB) model (Bennett, 1979) and the changes intended in these behavior components for target audiences.

The work group was asked to identify target audiences for the 4-H program. Once these audiences were identified a matrix similar to that in Figure 1 was developed.

Identify and interview stakeholders.

The work group identified categories of stakeholders for the purpose of gathering information regarding the 4-H
program. Stakeholders are individuals who have a special interest in or influence over a topical program (such as 4-H) and who can provide information that would be useful for the design, development, implementation and evaluation of that program.

Work group members with parish 4-H responsibilities were asked to submit names and addresses for the required number of individuals in each category. Questions were developed for current 4-H members, former 4-H members (dropouts) and all other categories. Upon completion of these tasks the first meeting of the work group was adjourned.

Upon receiving the list of potential interviewees from the work group members, the researcher selected the individuals to be interviewed keeping in mind a proper representation of race, gender, and other demographic criteria.

A letter was sent from the Director of Extension, explaining the study and requesting the stakeholders input. Information was also sent to the parents of 4-H members selected. All 4-H agents were made aware of the intent of the interviews and the possibility that someone from their parish might be interviewed. Samples of letters sent may be found in Appendix A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KASAB model components</th>
<th>Target Audience A</th>
<th>Target Audience B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge: I, the participant, am now aware of conditions and have acquired factual information that I didn’t have before the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes: I, the participant, believe that these conditions can be changed whereas before the program I believed the opposite or had no particular belief at all with regard to the topic(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills: I, the participant, am now able to do certain kinds of activities and/or perform certain kinds of functions that I was not able to do before the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations: I, the participant, now want to change certain conditions related to the topic whereas before the program I had no such desire or even had negative feelings about the topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors/Practices: I, the participant (or former participant) actually do certain activities or perform certain functions that I didn’t do before the program or perform functions differently as a result of the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 Generic Educational Effects Matrix.
The data from these questionnaires were collected, as is conventional with an evaluability assessment, by a neutral third party interviewer. A graduate student in the department of sociology at Louisiana State University, who had experience in telephone interviewing conducted the interviews.

The interviewer was instructed to make three attempts to contact individual stakeholders. All interviews were audiotape recorded, with the interviewee's knowledge. The tapes were then transcribed and grouped by stakeholder category. All interviews and transcriptions were completed prior to the second meeting of the work group, February 19-22, 1992.

Describe stakeholder perceptions of the program.

The stakeholder responses were analyzed using a method similar to that suggested by Mayeske in Smith (1989).

The interview results were divided among members of the work group so that at least two members of the group read all responses in a stakeholder category, discussed their observations and reached consensus on the meaning of what they had read.

The total group was reconvened and a spokesperson for each group and stakeholder category narrated their observations to the facilitator who put them into a matrix identifying stakeholder needs, concerns and differences in perceptions.
Identify stakeholder needs, concerns and differences in perceptions.

Thematic observations were drawn by the group from the matrix developed in step four.

Develop the program model.

The matrix of educational effects developed in the first meeting was reviewed and an initial program logic model was developed. This model contained the sequence of main events which must occur for the educational effects to take place. Presented in an "If-then" format, with each event being numbered, the basic rationale underlying the model is that for each event to occur, all preceding events must have occurred.

The time between the second and third meeting of the work group was spent by the researcher preparing the matrix of stakeholder responses.

The third and final meeting of the work group was held April 29 - May 1, 1992. The work group completed the program model identifying activities for each main event as well as indicators of accomplishment for each activity. The group then identified barriers between main events and steps which might be taken to reduce those barriers. The group also identified barriers and barrier reductions in providing educational experiences to the identified target audiences, as well as barriers and barrier reductions between target audiences. Spinoffs, or unplanned
occurrences, both positive and negative, which might occur with the completion of a main event were also identified. Figure 2 illustrates a generic program logic model with all its components.
Figure 2 Generic Program Logic Model
Draw conclusions and make recommendations.

Conclusions and recommendations were drawn by the work group. A presentation was made to members of the state 4-H staff and the Assistant Director of LCES regarding the evaluability assessment process and the conclusions and recommendations reached by the work group as a result of stakeholder interviews and analysis.

Plan specific steps for the utilization of evaluability assessment data.

This researcher and two other members of the work group met with the Administrative Council of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service on June 15 to discuss implementation of the recommendations developed by the work group.

Verification of the program design.

The final step in the EA process involves determining the plausibility of the program designed by the work group.

A verification group of six 4-H agents, representing six of the seven administrative districts of the state, one district agent, and one member of the state 4-H staff met on July 27, 1992. Dr. George Mayeske, Program Evaluation Specialist, ES/USDA served as facilitator for the verification group. Changes to the program logic model were noted by the researcher and are included in the findings of the study.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

The findings of this study flow from the deliberations of the work group as it conducted the evaluability assessment, and are essentially represented in the several products that emerged as a result. Presentation of the findings will be made in the sequence in which the evaluability assessment process was discussed in Chapter 3.

Determine purpose, secure commitment and identify work group members.

Work group members were selected on the basis of their knowledge of the 4-H program in Louisiana. Selection was done by the researcher in consultation with his graduate advisor and the state 4-H leader, final approval being given by the Director of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. The names of staff members chosen, administrative or programmatic affiliations and titles are shown in Table 1.

Develop/clarify program theory.

The first meeting of the work group was held October 9-11, 1991. The first task of the work group was the determination of whether or not the Louisiana 4-H program was plausible. A plausible program, as defined by Mayeske (1991), is a set of logically and sequentially related events with supporting activities, resources and indicators.
of accomplishments which could be judged likely to lead to intended goals.

Using this definition, the work group felt that the current Louisiana 4-H program was not a plausible program and therefore not worthy of the evaluation effort, or, in evaluability assessment terminology, not evaluable. As such the work group decided to use the evaluability assessment process as a design tool.

The work group then initiated the development of a matrix of educational effects of the Louisiana 4-H program. This matrix is a two-dimensional chart of educational effects (behavior changes) intended to be brought about in designated target audiences of the 4-H program. Educational effects included changes in the behavior components of knowledge, attitudes, skills, aspirations and behaviors/practices.

Five target audiences were identified.
1. Youth, defined as age-eligible school youth enrolled in the 4-H program.
2. Other youth, defined as school-age youth not enrolled in 4-H, but potential recipients of subject-matter.
3. Family members included parents, grandparents, siblings, uncles, etc.
4. Leaders included volunteers who work with the 4-H program as organizational leaders, project leaders and activity leaders.
Table 1
Work Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michele Abington-Cooper</td>
<td>Area 7</td>
<td>Home Economist (4-H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Bellon</td>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>Associate County Agent (4-H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adell Brown</td>
<td>1890 Institution</td>
<td>Specialist (Agriculture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Bridges *</td>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>Assistant County Agent (4-H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Dardeau</td>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>District Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clint Depew</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Specialist (Animal Science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Frey</td>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>Home Economist (4-H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloise Futrell</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>Specialist (Family Life)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Gauthier</td>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>Home Economist (4-H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Guidry</td>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>Associate County Agent (4-H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Kennedy *</td>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>Assistant County Agent (4-H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan McCrory</td>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>Specialist (4-H) Program Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Pilcher</td>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>Associate Home Economist (4-H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Trahan</td>
<td>Volunteer Leaders</td>
<td>Volunteer Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Gary Kennedy, representing Area 5, resigned from the Cooperative Extension Service on December 31, 1991. Robin Bridges replaced Mr. Kennedy on the work group.

5. Policy makers included those individuals who provide support for the 4-H program, including donors, elected officials and school administrators.
Educational Effects in 4-H Youth. 4-H youth were identified as those youth who were enrolled in a 4-H club program. The work group felt that through participation in the program, 4-H youth are expected to gain knowledge and skills in agriculture and home economics subject matter as well as in leadership, citizenship, decision-making etc. They are also expected to use the knowledge and skills to aspire to and become productive members of society and/or community leaders. The educational effects matrix as it relates to 4-H youth is presented in Table 2.

Educational Effects in Other Youth. Other youth were defined as those youth who may be exposed to Extension Service programming, but are not enrolled as 4-H club members. These youth would be exposed to the 4-H program in school enrichment and special interest meetings. Educational efforts with this group would be restricted to educational presentations on a limited basis primarily by having the extension professional as a guest speaker during one or two class periods. Other youth's contact with the 4-H program would allow them to gain subject matter information but they would not have the opportunity to participate in meetings, contests, trips and other peripheral elements of the 4-H program.
Table 2
4-H Educational Effects Matrix, 4-H Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Components</th>
<th>Desired or Intended Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Subject matter (e.g. agriculture, home economics and related subjects, leadership, citizenship, decision making, peer pressure, personal development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td>Belief that knowledge gained can be used in specific ways. Belief that one can influence one’s own development, and others’ development, in positive ways. Belief that I can be successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td>Subject matter (e.g. agriculture, home economics and related subjects, leadership, citizenship, decision making, peer pressure, personal development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspirations</strong></td>
<td>Desire to use knowledge and skills. Desire to be a productive, contributing member of society. Desire to become a community leader. Motivation to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviors/Practices</strong></td>
<td>Set and work towards goals. Become an active participant in community affairs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through their contact with the 4-H program other youth are expected to gain in subject matter information and use that information to improve their lives. Because of the limited exposure this group would have to other aspects of the 4-H program no changes in behaviors or practices relative to participation in community affairs would be expected. The educational effects matrix as it relates to Other Youth is presented in Table 3.
Table 3
4-H Educational Effects Matrix, Other Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Component</th>
<th>Desired or Intended Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Subject matter (e.g. agriculture, home economics and related subjects, leadership, citizenship, decision making, peer pressure, personal development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Belief that knowledge can be used in specific ways. Belief that one can influence one’s own development, and others’ development, in positive ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Subject matter (e.g. agriculture, home economics and related subjects, leadership, citizenship, decision making, peer pressure, personal development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations</td>
<td>Desire to use knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior/Practices</td>
<td>Use knowledge and skills to improve their lives (e.g. nutrition)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Effects in Family Members. Family members were identified as individuals who are related to youth in the program (parents, siblings, grandparents, uncles, etc.). The main educational effect visualized for this group was their support of youth involved in the 4-H program. Increased knowledge of the goals of the 4-H program and subject matter and interpersonal skills in working with children could result in increased support on the part of the family, but not necessarily improve overall parenting skills. Family members are expected to have a positive outlook towards the program and gain a desire to assist their children in the program through the knowledge and skills gained. An increased involvement with youth in the
program's activities and support for those activities are the behaviors/practices changes desired. The educational effects matrix for family members is presented in Table 4.

Table 4
4-H Educational Effects Matrix, Family Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Component</th>
<th>Desired or Intended Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Awareness of opportunities that the 4-H program offers their children. Importance of parental involvement/support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Positive outlook and supportive attitudes towards the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Subject matter skills for working with children (i.e. different project topics). Skills for working with children (i.e. positive reinforcement, goal setting, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations</td>
<td>Desire to assist their children in the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors/Practices</td>
<td>Involvement with youth in program activities and support for those activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Effects in Leaders. Leaders were identified as individuals participating in the 4-H program as organizational, project or activity leaders. The main educational effects desired for leaders were an understanding of their role in the 4-H program, subject matter expertise, and organizational and leadership skills. Leaders were also viewed as assisting 4-H professionals to promote parental involvement. The desired use of the knowledge and skills acquired is the understanding that parental involvement is a key to success in the 4-H
program. It is also desired that leaders understand the positive influence they can have on youth by conducting an exemplary program. An accurate understanding of their role in the organization will allow leaders to appropriately carry out their responsibilities within the organization. The educational effects matrix for leaders is presented in Table 5.

**Educational Effects in Policy Makers.** Policy makers were identified as those individuals who provide support for the 4-H program such as donors, elected officials and school administrators. Desired educational effects for this audience were continuing support of the 4-H program through awareness and understanding of the program and its value to the school system and community. The work group did not identify any skills for this target audience as it was felt that this group provided support to the program and did not have any direct involvement in the transfer of educational information. Table 6 contains the educational effects matrix for policy makers.
### Table 5
4-H Educational Effects Matrix, Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Component</th>
<th>Desired or Intended Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Leader roles and responsibilities in the 4-H organization. Awareness of the opportunities in 4-H. Subject matter expertise, including leadership and organization. Importance of parental involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td>Positive outlook and supportive attitude towards the program. Belief they can influence youth in positive ways. Sense of being a co-worker in the organization. Importance of parental involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td>Subject matter expertise, including leadership and organization. Skills for working with youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspirations</strong></td>
<td>Desire to involve parents. Desire to influence children in positive ways. Desire to have an exemplary program (i.e. children want to belong; a vital part of the school and/or community) that others would want to emulate. Desire to share leader skills/knowledge with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviors/Practices</strong></td>
<td>Carry out responsibilities in the organization. Share leader knowledge and skills with others. Get parents involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
4-H Educational Effects Matrix, Policy Makers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Component</th>
<th>Desired or Intended Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Awareness and understanding of the opportunities and benefits available through the 4-H program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Belief that the 4-H program can make a difference. Recognition that 4-H is an important part of the school system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>(None specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations</td>
<td>Desire to provide continuing support for the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior/Practices</td>
<td>Provide the support needed for the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicators of Educational Effects.** The work group identified methods which could be used to indicate if the educational effects desired for each target audience were achieved. The group developed a two-dimensional matrix of target audiences and behaviors showing the methods and/or indicators whereby evidence on achievement of educational effects could be determined (Table 7).
Table 7
Methods/Indicators of Educational Effects in Target Audiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>ASPIRATION</th>
<th>BEHAVIOR CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-H YOUTH</td>
<td>P, Os, PC</td>
<td>P, Os, R, SI</td>
<td>PC, LA, P, Os</td>
<td>P, Os, SI, CI</td>
<td>Os, CI, R, SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER YOUTH</td>
<td>P, OS, OF, OO, CI</td>
<td>P, OS, OF, OO, CI</td>
<td>P, OS, OF, OO, CI</td>
<td>P, OS, OF, OO, CI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY MEMBERS</td>
<td>Os, S</td>
<td>Os, S</td>
<td>Os, SI, CI, S</td>
<td>Os, S</td>
<td>Os, PC, SI, LA, CI, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERS</td>
<td>Os, S</td>
<td>Os, S</td>
<td>Os, S, LA</td>
<td>Os, SI, LA, CI, S</td>
<td>Os, SI, LA, CI, PC, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY MAKERS</td>
<td>S, SI, Os, IS</td>
<td>S, SI, Os, IS</td>
<td>S, SI, Os, IS</td>
<td>S, SI, Os, IS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Methods/Indicators:

CI = Community Involvement     I = Increased Support
LA = Level of Accomplishment (e.g. Record Books, Competition)
P = Pre-Post Assessment        PC = Project Completion
OF = Family Observations       OL = Leader Observations
OO = Others (Community Leaders, Peers) Observations
Os = All Observations (Family, Leader, Others, Staff)
OS = Staff Observations        R = Re-enrollment
SI = Sustained Involvement     S = Survey

Identify and interview stakeholders.

Stakeholders are those individuals who have a special interest in or influence over a program and who can provide information that can be useful for the design, development, implementation and evaluation of the program. The work group identified eight general categories of stakeholders to be interviewed: Current program participants, Former
participants, Leaders, Family members, School personnel, Extension staff, Donors, and Community leaders. The number of stakeholders identified for interviews, number selected and number actually interviewed is found in Table 8. The demographic data which was available to the researcher regarding stakeholders is found in Table 9.

Three different questionnaires were developed by the work group to be used with current 4-H club members, former 4-H members (dropouts), and all other categories of stakeholders. Questions followed the basic format set forth by Mayeske (1991) to enable stakeholders to give their views on the goals of the 4-H program, target group, primary benefits, secondary benefits, unmet needs, resources, and future perspective.

Samples of each questionnaire may be found in Appendix B.

Describe stakeholder perceptions of the program.

Information from the stakeholders interviewed in response to the open-ended questions was in narrative form. The interview results were divided among members of the work group so that at least two members of the group read all responses in a stakeholder category, discussed their observations and reached consensus on the meaning of what they had read. This information was summarized by the work group into a two dimensional matrix of stakeholder groups and questions. It is presented below by stakeholder group.
4-H Youth.  4-H youth indicated that they enjoyed the learning experiences provided by the 4-H program as well as the opportunities to meet new people. These youth felt that they had increased their skills in technical subject matter, leadership and teamwork. They also felt more self-confident. With regard to 4-H meetings, 4-H members indicated that they enjoyed the opportunity to share information and the opportunity to participate in leadership roles. A majority of the club members (52.4%) did not mention any particular item they disliked about club meetings. Club members indicated that most of their fellow students were not in 4-H and felt this was due to these individuals not being aware of the benefits 4-H offered as well as competition with other activities.

Most of the members indicated that they would re-join 4-H in the coming year. 4-H member perceptions are presented in Table 10.

Former 4-H Members (Dropouts). Former 4-H club members, those who had dropped out of the 4-H program, had very similar perceptions about the 4-H program as did club members still enrolled. Dropouts indicated that they enjoyed the trips and awards as well as some of the other aspects of the 4-H program. These youth felt that they had learned how to get along with people, community service and responsibility, and subject matter information in specific projects.
Table 8
Stakeholder Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder category</th>
<th>Number identified</th>
<th>Number selected</th>
<th>Number interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current program participants (4-H members)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former participants (4-H dropouts)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders - organizational</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders - project</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders - activity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School personnel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension staff - youth agents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension staff - administrators</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors - current</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors - former</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders - elected</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders - non-elected</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the former club members had a positive view of 4-H, but did indicate they wished they had taken advantage of more opportunities available.

Dropouts felt that they would use the information gained in technical subject matter areas as well as information about citizenship and responsibility.
Learning from the club meeting demonstrations and the opportunity to vote and express an opinion were mentioned as positive experiences from club meetings.

These youth, as did current club members, mentioned no specific dislikes about 4-H club meetings.

**Table 9**  
Available Demographic Data on Stakeholders by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Category</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current program participants (4-H members)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former participants</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders - Organizational</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders - project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders - activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School personnel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension staff - youth agents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension staff - administrators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors - current</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors - former</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders - elected</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders - non-elected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10  
Stakeholder Perceptions, 4-H Youth  (n = 21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are some things you like about being in 4-H ?</td>
<td>New learning experiences, recognition and achievement, meeting new people, leadership roles, livestock projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are some things you have learned about by being in 4-H ?</td>
<td>Personal development, sense of responsibility, self-confidence, increased subject matter skill, increased leadership skill, increased teamwork skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there some things you don’t like about being in 4-H ?</td>
<td>No specific items were mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there some other things you would like to do or learn in 4-H ?</td>
<td>No changes mentioned by most respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you think you will use what you learn in 4-H ?</td>
<td>Improve quality of life because of technical skills, improved social skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you like about 4-H club meetings ?</td>
<td>Opportunity to share information, opportunities for leadership roles, educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you dislike about 4-H meetings ?</td>
<td>No dislikes mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are most of the students in your grade in 4-H ?</td>
<td>Most respondents indicated fellow students were not in 4-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, why not ?</td>
<td>Not aware of program benefits. Competition with other activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who helps you with your project books ?</td>
<td>Parents and other family members, 4-H agents, leaders, other 4-H members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 continued
Stakeholder Perceptions, 4-H Youth (n = 21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think you will be in 4-H again next year?</td>
<td>Yes, if not graduating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dropouts felt that students did not join 4-H because of the image of 4-H as a "little kid" and "aggie" program. Most dropouts did not rejoin 4-H because of other competing activities. Table 11 presents perceptions of 4-H dropouts.

Alumni. 4-H alumni interviewed felt that the 4-H program teaches youth responsibility, self-confidence and independence and offers a broad selection of projects and activities to youth. They perceived 4-H program goals to include developing responsible citizens, promoting community involvement, increasing self-esteem and teaching leadership skills. More training sessions for club members, more work with the elderly and a need to change with the times were among the additional goals alumni felt should be included in the 4-H program. They also felt that youth, families and the community as a whole were being served by the 4-H program and indicated that more urban youth should be served.

Acquiring a sense of accomplishment and achievement, learning to get along with others and learning study habits, record keeping and parliamentary procedure were among the benefits that alumni felt 4-H members gained from
the program. Learning how to meet other people was mentioned as an additional benefit of the program.

It was felt that 4-H could do a better job of marketing the program as well as encouraging more parents to get involved. The alumni also desired to have more agents available to conduct the program.

Alumni felt that 4-H complements the school system by providing educational and motivational experiences to youth. Project books, as perceived by them, serve as additional subject matter resources for students.

Alumni desired that 4-H expand its programming effort to provide information to help youth obtain job skills and decision making skills. Increasing audiences to include more urban and older youth was also a desired goal. Additionally, alumni felt that more workshops, in project areas other than livestock, should be offered to 4-H club members.

Alumni felt adequately supported in their role in the 4-H program by 4-H agents, volunteer leaders, 4-H participant's family members and the Extension administration. The alumni did mention that they would like to see more 4-H clubs organized.

The alumni felt that the future of the 4-H program in Louisiana is very positive.
Table 11
Stakeholder Perceptions, 4-H Dropouts (n = 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are some things you liked about being in 4-H?</td>
<td>Trips, awards, shortcourse, learning, fun, friends, project work, camp, record books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are some things you have learned about by being in 4-H?</td>
<td>Public speaking, demonstrations, subject matter information, getting along with people, helping the community, responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there some things you didn't like about being in 4-H?</td>
<td>Most had a positive view of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there some other things you would have liked to have done or learned in 4-H?</td>
<td>Most had no comments. Wished they had taken advantage of more opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you think you will use what you learned in 4-H?</td>
<td>Career preparation, learned about citizenship/government, responsibility and maturity. Learned technical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did you like about 4-H club meetings?</td>
<td>Learning from demonstrations presented by 4-H agents. Opportunity to vote and express an opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did you dislike about 4-H meetings?</td>
<td>No specifics mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are most of the students in your grade in 4-H?</td>
<td>About half of the respondents indicated their fellow students were not; half indicated they were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, why not?</td>
<td>Too much work Teenagers have &quot;Kid's stuff&quot;, &quot;Aggie&quot; image of 4-H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who helped you with your project books?</td>
<td>Family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long were you in 4-H?</td>
<td>Average of four years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 continued
Stakeholder Perceptions, 4-H Dropouts (n = 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why did you not rejoin 4-H ?</td>
<td>Other competing activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They did indicate, however that there is a need to move away from the traditional methods of delivering the program as well as the types of projects offered to club members. Table 12 contains perceptions of the twelve alumni respondents.

Organizational Leaders. Seven 4-H organizational leaders were interviewed. The range of experience as an organizational leader within the group was from two to fifteen years.

This group of leaders felt that 4-H was a good program for mid-level achievers and that it worked best with the lower grades. Promoting community service, citizenship and youth development was also seen as a benefit of the program.

Organizational leaders felt that 4-H provides citizenship experiences to youth which help create a more reliable and active citizenry. The group also felt that 4-H teaches life skills to help youth build self-confidence.

The group identified youth in general and leaders as the groups which were currently being served by 4-H. Expanding the program to include more urban, high school,
and inner city youth was suggested. They also wanted programs on child safety, drug awareness, how to handle stress and peer pressure to be added to the 4-H program.

Organizational leaders felt that the main benefits youth derive from association with the 4-H program were personal development skills such as public speaking, organization and leadership. They felt that youth also gained a sense of belonging. Other benefits included scholarships, knowledge of parliamentary procedure, community awareness and general information in different subject matter areas. Increasing parental involvement and having minority role models in the state 4-H office were mentioned by organizational leaders to bring about some of these additional benefits.

Organizational leaders felt that 4-H operates well as an educational program in the school system. They did acknowledge that the relationship between the 4-H program and a particular school system depends on the organizational leader.

Additional needs identified by this group were information dealing with cultural diversity, career awareness and coping with peer pressure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has been your experience with the 4-H programs of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service?</td>
<td>Members of this group had been out of the 4-H program for as little as two years to as much as sixty years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are you overall views of the 4-H program?</td>
<td>All respondents had positive views. Felt that 4-H teaches responsibility, self-confidence and independence. Respondents indicated they thought 4-H offered a broad spectrum of projects and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the 4-H program is trying to accomplish?</td>
<td>Felt the program wants to develop responsible citizens, promote community involvement, teach self-confidence, increase self-esteem in youth and teach leadership skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things you think the program should be trying to accomplish?</td>
<td>Four respondents felt no changes were needed. Other comments included a need to change with the times, work more with the elderly, need new programs and ideas and conduct more training sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you think is being served by the 4-H program?</td>
<td>Youth, parents and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there others who you think should be served?</td>
<td>More urban youth. Five respondents felt that no one other than current audience needed to be served.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefits do you feel people receive from their participation in 4-H?</td>
<td>Youth obtain a sense of accomplishment and achievement. Youth learn to get along with others and how to help people. Youth learn study habits, record keeping, parliamentary procedure. Youth obtain information on career choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other benefits do you feel people receive from the 4-H program?</td>
<td>Youth learn how to meet other people. Competition benefits the community and agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things 4-H could do to bring about these benefits?</td>
<td>4-H could do a better job of marketing. Leaders need to be motivated. More parental involvement. More agents available to organize more clubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel that 4-H operates as an educational program in the schools?</td>
<td>4-H provides educational and motivational experiences. 4-H complements the school curriculum. Project books serve as a subject matter resource to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there needs of youth not being met that 4-H should be meeting?</td>
<td>Information is needed to help youth obtain job skills and decision making skills. Need to work more with older youth and urban youth. Need workshops in subjects other than livestock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your role in the 4-H program do you feel adequately supported?</td>
<td>All respondents indicated that they felt adequately supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how?</td>
<td>Support comes from 4-H agents, family members, volunteer leaders and Extension administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, what more do you feel is needed?</td>
<td>Respondents would like to see more 4-H clubs organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think is the future of 4-H in Louisiana?</td>
<td>Respondents felt that the future is very positive. However, did indicate that there is a need to include non-traditional projects and programming.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational leaders indicated they were adequately supported by Extension agents, other leaders, the Extension administration and school personnel in their role in the 4-H program. Additional support from other faculty members not directly affiliated with the 4-H program was mentioned as an area where more support may be needed. Table 13 contains the perceptions for organizational leaders.

Project Leaders. Four project leaders were interviewed. All four had been active 4-H club members and were currently serving as livestock project leaders. The overall view of the 4-H program by this group was that 4-H provides opportunity for youth to learn life skills and succeed in various endeavors. They also felt that 4-H provides excellent leadership opportunities for youth.

This group felt that 4-H teaches citizenship and responsibility and gives youth challenging activities to participate in. Reaching more children and making more children aware of the opportunities available in 4-H were additional goals that the project leaders envisioned for the 4-H program.

Project leaders felt that 4-H serves future leaders of the community and in recent years has begun serving more urban and suburban youth rather than only rural youth. They felt that 4-H should continue to try and increase participation in the program in the inner city, recognizing
that becoming a part of school systems not familiar with the 4-H program is difficult.

Project leaders felt that the main benefits of the 4-H program were that youth gain an education outside the classroom as well as learn how to meet people. An additional benefit mentioned was the family oriented activities offered by the 4-H program.

Increasing the number of agents delivering the program was one of the methods project leaders felt could be used to bring about the benefits mentioned. Project leaders felt that 4-H complements the school system by providing hands-on-experiences to youth. Respondents also indicated that they felt 4-H should be addressing other needs of youth such as AIDS and drug awareness.

Project leaders felt that they were well supported by 4-H agents and organizational leaders in their role in the 4-H program. Looking at the future, the group felt that the emphasis of the 4-H program would shift from rural to urban. Perceptions of project leaders may be found in Table 14.

Activity Leaders. Three activity leaders were interviewed. Tenure of activity leaders ranged from three to seven years.

The perception of this group as to the 4-H program was that 4-H teaches people leadership skills.
Table 13  
Stakeholder Perceptions, Organizational Leaders (n = 7)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has been your experience with the 4-H programs of the Louisiana</td>
<td>Respondents had served as organizational leaders ranging from two to fifteen years. At least half of the respondents were former 4-H club members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your overall views of the 4-H program ?</td>
<td>Respondents felt that 4-H was good for middle level achievers, promotes self-esteem, works well with schools, particularly in the lower grades. 4-H promotes community service, citizenship and youth development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the 4-H program is trying to accomplish ?</td>
<td>Provide citizenship experiences, create a more reliable and active citizenry. Teach life skills. Help youth build self-confidence in a fun way. Tries to bring out the best in the individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things you think the program should be trying to</td>
<td>Respondents felt a need for more urban and high school programming. Wanted a less diversified program. Respondents wanted programs on child safety, drug awareness, making life choices and how to handle stress and peer pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplish ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you think is being served by the 4-H program ?</td>
<td>A broad spectrum of youth as well as leaders. Some respondents mentioned rural youth as the group being served.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there others who you think should be served ?</td>
<td>Felt the program should be expanded to include more urban and inner city youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefits do you feel people receive from their participation in</td>
<td>Personal development e.g. organizational skills, public speaking skills, sense of belonging, increased self-confidence, leadership skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 continued
Stakeholder Perceptions, Organizational Leaders (n = 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What other benefits do you feel people receive from the 4-H program ?</td>
<td>Scholarship, skills in parliamentary procedure, community awareness. General information in different subject matter areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things 4-H could do to bring about these benefits ?</td>
<td>More parental involvement. Minority role models in the state 4-H office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel that 4-H operates as an educational program in the schools ?</td>
<td>Provides good supplement to classroom instruction. Did indicate that much of the positive aspects of 4-H in the schools depends on the organizational leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there needs of youth not being met that 4-H should be meeting ?</td>
<td>Indicated a need for information on cultural diversity, career awareness and helping youth learn how to deal with peer pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your role in the 4-H program do you feel adequately supported ?</td>
<td>All respondents indicated that they were adequately supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how ?</td>
<td>Support comes from 4-H agents, other leaders, Extension administration and school personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, what more do you feel is needed ?</td>
<td>Additional support from other faculty members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think is the future of 4-H in Louisiana ?</td>
<td>Positive future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They also felt that 4-H helps youth become productive citizens and teaches them life skills and moral values.
The group indicated that 4-H needs to change its image to reflect the changes in society.

Activity leaders felt that all youth in the community who were eligible to participate in 4-H were being served. The only additional audience mentioned which needed to be reached was inner city youth.

Benefits from being enrolled in the program included youth learning to set goals, record keeping and money management. Youth acquiring self-esteem and helping improve the community were additional benefits mentioned. Respondents felt that increasing the number of leaders involved with the 4-H program would help bring about these benefits.

The group felt that 4-H is moving in the right direction and parish 4-H agents adequately supported them in their role in the program. Activity leaders also felt that the program was moving in a positive direction with regard to the future. Table 15 gives perceptions of activity leaders.

Family Members. Fourteen family members were interviewed. Seven had been involved in the 4-H program as club members.

Family members felt that the 4-H program was an excellent organization that provided opportunities for leadership and responsibility to youth. Goals of the program from the perspective of this group included
teaching leadership and responsibility as well as preparing youth for their future. Additional goals the group would like to see were more urban involvement and additional programs to retain high school club members. The group also felt that school personnel needed more information concerning the benefits of 4-H.

Enrolled youth and their families were the groups being served by the 4-H program. An additional group family members felt should be served was urban youth.

The benefits received by youth from their participation in the program were recognized by this group as improving self-esteem and learning leadership skills. The group also felt that parents having the opportunity to meet other parents was also a benefit of the program. Additional benefits mentioned were occupying youth time in a positive manner and community enrichment.

Family members felt that the 4-H program is a great combination of the school educator, as organizational leader, and the co-curricular subject matter.

Family members indicated they were well supported in their role in the program although they did not indicate from whom they received that support.

The group indicated that they thought the future of 4-H was bright and suggested that 4-H needs to focus on current needs and expand enrollment. Table 15 gives stakeholder perceptions of family members.
Table 14
Stakeholder Perceptions, Project Leaders (n = 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has been your experience with the 4-H programs of the Louisiana</td>
<td>All four respondents had been active 4-H members and were currently serving as livestock project leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are you overall views of the 4-H program ?</td>
<td>4-H provides opportunity for youth to succeed, learn life skills. 4-H also provides excellent leadership opportunities for youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the 4-H program is trying to accomplish ?</td>
<td>Teach citizenship and responsibility. Give kids a challenge. Keep kids out of trouble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things you think the program should be trying to</td>
<td>Reach more children. Let more children know about the opportunities in 4-H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplish ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you think is being served by the 4-H program ?</td>
<td>Future leaders. In the past mostly rural, but now also serving more urban and suburban areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there others who you think should be served ?</td>
<td>More inner city kids. Respondents felt that it was difficult for 4-H to get into inner city school systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefits do you feel people receive from their participation in</td>
<td>Youth are receiving an education outside the classroom. Youth are learning how to meet other people. Parents enjoy seeing their kids compete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other benefits do you feel people receive from the 4-H program ?</td>
<td>Family-oriented activity. Give adults a good image of kids.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 continued  
Stakeholder Perceptions, Project Leaders  (n = 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things 4-H could do to bring about these benefits?</td>
<td>Increase the number of agents delivering the program. Schedule events to reflect the increasing number of working mothers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel that 4-H operates as an educational program in the schools?</td>
<td>Provides hands-on experiences. Not enough school time provided to 4-H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there needs of youth not being met that 4-H should be meeting?</td>
<td>Respondents felt 4-H should be addressing drug awareness and AIDS awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your role in the 4-H program do you feel adequately supported?</td>
<td>Respondents indicated they felt very well supported in their positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how?</td>
<td>Agents and organizational leaders provided the support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, what more do you feel is needed?</td>
<td>Nothing specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think is the future of 4-H in Louisiana?</td>
<td>Felt that 4-H’s emphasis will change from rural to urban.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Personnel. Six school personnel were interviewed. School personnel, for the purposes of this study, were identified as school administrators at the local or parish level.

All respondents indicated that their experiences with the 4-H program had been positive. Three of the individuals interviewed had served as organizational leaders before becoming administrators.
The group felt that 4-H provides opportunities not otherwise available in schools, particularly in the areas of leadership and citizenship. The group felt that 4-H was attempting to provide learning experiences in leadership and citizenship and to enhance youth's self-esteem. The group acknowledged that expanding the program would be difficult because of time restraints, but identified youth-at-risk as a group that would benefit from involvement in 4-H.

School personnel felt that 4-H serves everyone but tends to attract the average and above-average student. Lower-than-average students as well as special education students were identified as audiences that 4-H could also serve. School personnel also felt that 4-H could strive to increase its enrollment at the junior and senior high levels.

Benefits derived from enrollment in the 4-H program were increased self-confidence and self-respect as well as youth gaining experiences to draw upon later in life. Youth learning to lead as well as follow was also mentioned. Additional benefits were the different types of activities and opportunities available to youth as well as youth improving their school performance.
Table 15
Stakeholder Perceptions, Activity Leaders (n = 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has been your experience with the 4-H programs of the Louisiana</td>
<td>Years of service ranged from three to seven years as activity leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your overall views of the 4-H program?</td>
<td>4-H teaches people leadership skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the 4-H program is trying to accomplish?</td>
<td>Develops youth into productive citizens. Teaches leadership skills, life skills and moral values. Teach youth to respect one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things you think the program should be trying to</td>
<td>Should change its image to reflect a changing society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplish?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you think is being served by the 4-H program?</td>
<td>All youth in the community between the ages of 9 - 19 were being served.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there others who you think should be served?</td>
<td>Inner city youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefits do you feel people receive from their participation in 4-H</td>
<td>Youth learn to set goals, obtain educational benefits, learn about record keeping and money management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other benefits do you feel people receive from the 4-H program?</td>
<td>Youth acquire self-esteem. Community is improved, school performance improves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things 4-H could do to bring about these benefits?</td>
<td>Increase the number of leaders working with youth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 continued  
Stakeholder Perceptions, Activity Leaders (n = 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel that 4-H operates as an educational program in the schools?</td>
<td>Excellently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there needs of youth not being met that 4-H should be meeting?</td>
<td>4-H was moving in the right direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your role in the 4-H program do you feel adequately supported?</td>
<td>All respondents indicated they were adequately supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how?</td>
<td>Parish 4-H agents provide support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, what more do you feel is needed?</td>
<td>None specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think is the future of 4-H in Louisiana?</td>
<td>The program is on the upswing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increasing the support obtained from businesses and parents as well as updating the image of the program were mentioned as steps which could help bring about these benefits.

School personnel felt that 4-H was an integral part of the school system. The group did identify non-traditional audiences (urban, minority, at-risk) needing to become involved in the 4-H program. The group also felt that parents should receive more information as to what their role is in the program.
School personnel felt that they were adequately supported in their role in the program by other school administrators, faculty and school staff as well as Extension personnel and parents.

The group felt that the future was positive but indicated that more people needed to be willing to take on volunteer leadership roles. Perceptions of school personnel are summarized in Table 17.

4-H Agents. Four Extension agents whose sole responsibility was youth work were interviewed. Years of service with LCES ranged from two and a half to fourteen years. All agents interviewed had a positive view of the 4-H program. They felt the program needed more public awareness and needs to be updated. 4-H agents felt that the 4-H program was trying to develop self-sufficient human beings and develop leaders. Other goals identified included reaching non-traditional audiences and reallocating agent time in order to be more productive.

4-H agents felt that the main audiences being served by the program were rural youth and their families. Additional audiences the group felt should be served were urban and at-risk youth. This increase in audiences could be better accomplished by recruiting more volunteer leaders in order to multiply the efforts of the agents.
Table 16  
Stakeholder Perceptions, Family Members  \((n = 14)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has been your experience with the 4-H programs of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service?</td>
<td>Seven of the fourteen respondents had been involved in the program as 4-H members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your overall views of the 4-H program?</td>
<td>4-H was an excellent organization that provides opportunities for leadership and responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the 4-H program is trying to accomplish?</td>
<td>Teach leadership and responsibility. Prepare kids for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things you think the program should be trying to accomplish?</td>
<td>More urban involvement. Programs to retain club members through high school. More education of school personnel about the benefits of 4-H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you think is being served by the 4-H program?</td>
<td>Youth enrolled and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there others who you think should be served?</td>
<td>More urban youth. 4-H needs to be in more schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefits do you feel people receive from their participation in 4-H?</td>
<td>Youth improve their self-esteem, learn leadership skills. Parents have the opportunity to meet other parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other benefits do you feel people receive from the 4-H program?</td>
<td>Youth time is occupied in a positive fashion. Community is enriched. Awards for achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things 4-H could do to bring about these benefits?</td>
<td>4-H needs to reach more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 continued
Stakeholder Perceptions, Family Members (n = 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel that 4-H operates as an educational program in the schools?</td>
<td>Great combination of the school educator and co-curricular subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there needs of youth not being met that 4-H should be meeting?</td>
<td>All needs of youth were being met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your role in the 4-H program do you feel adequately supported?</td>
<td>All respondents indicated they were well supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how?</td>
<td>Support was being given by Extension personnel and school staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, what more do you feel is needed?</td>
<td>Nothing mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think is the future of 4-H in Louisiana?</td>
<td>Future is bright. Focus on current needs and expand enrollment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits received through participation in the program were identified as youth gaining leadership skills, a sense of responsibility, self-confidence and self-esteem. Another benefit was that youth are given the opportunity to make choices while participating in the program. 4-H agents indicated that 4-H should strive to reach more urban youth and increase the emphasis on the junior leadership program in order to bring about the benefits identified.
Table 17
Stakeholder Perceptions, School Personnel (n = 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has been your experience with the 4-H programs of the Louisiana</td>
<td>All experiences have been positive. Three of the respondents had served as 4-H leaders before becoming school administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your overall views of the 4-H program?</td>
<td>4-H provides opportunities not otherwise available, particularly in the areas of leadership and citizenship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the 4-H program is trying to accomplish?</td>
<td>4-H provides learning experiences in leadership, citizenship. Enhances youth's self-esteem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things you think the program should be trying to</td>
<td>4-H could work with youth-at-risk. Because of time restraints expanding the program would be difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplish?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you think is being served by the 4-H program?</td>
<td>4-H serves everyone but attracts the average and above average students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there others who you think should be served?</td>
<td>Lower-than-average students, special education students. Increase enrollment in the junior and senior high levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefits do you feel people receive from their participation in</td>
<td>Experiences to draw on later in life. Self-confidence, self-respect. Youth learn to lead as well as to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other benefits do you feel people receive from the 4-H program?</td>
<td>Different types of activities and opportunities. Youth improve their school performance which allows 4-H and the school to look good together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things 4-H could do to bring about these benefits?</td>
<td>Increased support from businesses and parents. Update image of the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 continued
Stakeholder Perceptions, School Personnel (n = 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel that 4-H operates as an educational program in the schools?</td>
<td>Excellent, an integral part of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there needs of youth not being met that 4-H should be meeting?</td>
<td>Non-traditional audiences need to become involved. Inform parents as to what their role could be in the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your role in the 4-H program do you feel adequately supported?</td>
<td>All respondents indicated they were adequately supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how?</td>
<td>Support comes from school administrators, faculty, and staff; Extension personnel; Parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, what more do you feel is needed?</td>
<td>Nothing mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think is the future of 4-H in Louisiana?</td>
<td>Felt that the future was positive. Did indicate more people needed to be willing to take volunteer leadership roles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-H agents felt that 4-H offers non-formal and experiential learning experiences as its part of the school system. The agents also felt that the program was not meeting the needs of urban and at-risk youth.

4-H agents indicated that they felt adequately supported in their roles by other 4-H agents, state 4-H specialists, school personnel and policy makers. They also indicated the need for more support from Extension agents.
with agricultural or home economics responsibilities. Agents also felt that more flexibility was needed in 4-H programming.

An increased emphasis in working with urban youth, increasing the number of volunteer leaders and merging non-traditional programming with the traditional 4-H program were identified by the agents as part of the future of 4-H in Louisiana. Table 18 contains 4-H agent perceptions.

**Extension Administrators/Specialists.** All individuals interviewed in this group indicated that they were still actively involved in the 4-H program in their role as administrators and/or specialists.

The group felt that the 4-H program develops life skills and teaches responsibility, and provides many educational opportunities when aggressively carried out.

Program goals, as identified by this group, were to make youth better citizens and more responsible individuals. The program also attempts to teach life skills as well as technical subject matter. Additional goals for the program desired by this group were to update the methods of delivering information and offer non-traditional projects. More science-based programs were also listed as an additional goal.

Administrators and specialists felt that the 4-H audience was mostly rural, non-farm youth. The group felt that more minorities and urban youth should be involved
although they did indicate that expanding the program would be difficult without additional manpower.

Benefits gained from participating in the program were identified by this group as youth gaining life skills and technical skills. Learning leadership skills was also listed as a benefit. Additional benefits from the program were a better understanding on the part of adults as to the needs and desires of youth. The group also felt that involvement in 4-H encouraged youth to obtain higher education.

Allowing more opportunities for adults to become involved as well as involving more youth through school enrichment programs and community clubs were thought to be methods of obtaining these benefits. It was also felt that more subject matter specialists should become involved with the 4-H program.

This group felt that 4-H provides opportunities, on a regular basis, that are not a part of regular classroom instruction. The group also recognized that 4-H makes the Extension Service more visible in the school. The group emphasized that 4-H must become more aware of the school curriculum and its part in that curriculum.
Table 18
Stakeholder Perceptions, 4-H Agents (n = 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has been your experience with the 4-H programs of the Louisiana</td>
<td>Tenure as a 4-H agent ranged from 2.5 to 14 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your overall views of the 4-H program?</td>
<td>Positive view of program. Felt program needs more public awareness and needs to update. Program develops leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the 4-H program is trying to accomplish?</td>
<td>Develop self-sufficient human beings. Develop leaders. Increase the self-esteem of youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things you think the program should be trying to</td>
<td>Program needs to reach non-traditional clientele. Reallocate time to be more productive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplish?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you think is being served by the 4-H program?</td>
<td>Mostly rural youth and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there others who you think should be served?</td>
<td>More urban youth, more at-risk youth. Need to recruit and train leaders in order to multiply efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefits do you feel people receive from their participation in</td>
<td>Youth gain leadership, sense of responsibility, self-confidence and self-esteem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other benefits do you feel people receive from the 4-H program?</td>
<td>Youth are given opportunities to make choices, good or bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things 4-H could do to bring about these benefits?</td>
<td>Reach more youth. Attract more urban youth. Increase emphasis on junior leadership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 continued
Stakeholder Perceptions, 4-H Agents (n = 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel that 4-H operates as an educational program in the</td>
<td>Operates well. Provides non-formal and experiential learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there needs of youth not being met that 4-H should be meeting?</td>
<td>Needs of urban and at-risk youth are not being met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your role in the 4-H program do you feel adequately supported?</td>
<td>Respondents indicated they were adequately supported in some instances and not in others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how?</td>
<td>Adequate support comes from fellow 4-H agents, state 4-H specialists, school personnel and policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, what more do you feel is needed?</td>
<td>makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think is the future of 4-H in Louisiana?</td>
<td>Felt there exists a need to create a new focus away from the traditional program but not abandon the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traditional program. More emphasis on working with urban youth and increasing number of volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leaders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This group indicated that they received adequate support from other Extension administrators, but did feel that more support was needed in the form of subject matter training, in areas other than livestock, and in the reallocation of personnel. The group felt the future was
unlimited recognizing that the organization is only as good as the personnel hired and its program planning efforts. The group also felt that 4-H needs to stress school enrichment and 4-H curriculum development and keep policy makers informed as to the benefits of 4-H in order to secure that future.

Table 19 contains the perceptions of Extension administrators/specialists.

**Current Donors.** Current donors were identified as individuals who are currently providing financial support to the 4-H program. The three current donors interviewed indicated they had been involved with the 4-H program for many years and all had a positive view of the program. They felt the benefits derived from the program were obtained because of the efforts of Extension personnel who delivered the program.

The goal of the program, as perceived by this group, was to educate young people. The group did not mention any additional program goals. Two of the current donors felt that youth was the primary audience while one felt the entire community was being served by the program.

In terms of benefits, the current donors felt that the 4-H program prepares youth for life and teaches youth to deal with others. An additional benefit was that an increased number of youth may choose agricultural careers.
The group felt that 4-H, as part of the school system, motivates the club members to become better students.

Current donors felt that they received adequate support from Extension personnel and members of the community. The group also mentioned that they felt they received support from 4-H club members.

The current donors indicated that they felt the future of 4-H was positive. Table 20 contains the perceptions of current donors.

**Former Donors.** Former donors were defined as a group of individuals who had been financial supporters of the 4-H program at one time, but currently were not giving support to the program. The three former donors who were interviewed felt that the 4-H program was a positive program that was well conducted by Extension personnel. This group felt that the program was attempting to develop responsibility, self-esteem and citizenship in youth. The group did not mention any additional goals they felt the program should be trying to accomplish.

The former donors felt that the entire community was being served by the 4-H program. Continuing enrollment in the program past the high school level was mentioned as a means of serving more individuals.

The group felt that 4-H’s main benefit was to help prepare youth for the future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has been your experience with the 4-H programs of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service?</td>
<td>All respondents still actively involved in the 4-H program as Extension administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your overall views of the 4-H program?</td>
<td>4-H program develops life skills, teaches responsibility. Provides many opportunities when program is aggressively carried out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the 4-H program is trying to accomplish?</td>
<td>Make kids better citizens and more responsible individuals. Develop life skills. Teach technical subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things you think the program should be trying to accomplish?</td>
<td>Need to update methods of delivering information. Need to offer projects other than traditional projects. More science-based programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you think is being served by the 4-H program?</td>
<td>Mostly rural, non-farm youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there others who you think should be served?</td>
<td>More minorities and urban youth. Did indicate that expansion is difficult with current manpower available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefits do you feel people receive from their participation in 4-H?</td>
<td>Youth gain in like skills and technical skills. Youth also gain confidence and learn leadership skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other benefits do you feel people receive from the 4-H program?</td>
<td>Adults better understand the needs and desires of youth. 4-H encourages higher education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 continued  
Stakeholder Perceptions, Extension Administrators/Specialists  
(n = 7)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things 4-H could do to bring about these benefits ?</td>
<td>More opportunities for adults to become involved. More school enrichment programs, more community clubs. More Extension subject matter specialists involved with 4-H program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel that 4-H operates as an educational program in the schools ?</td>
<td>4-H provides opportunities, on a regular basis, that are not available in the classroom. 4-H makes Extension more visible in the schools and part of the educational system. 4-H needs to become more aware of the school curriculum. Extension needs to become more flexible in programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there needs of youth not being met that 4-H should be meeting ?</td>
<td>Not reaching some youth audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your role in the 4-H program do you feel adequately supported ?</td>
<td>Five respondents felt they were adequately supported. One indicated that, in some instances, support was adequate, but in others it was not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how ?</td>
<td>Adequate support from Extension administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, what more do you feel is needed ?</td>
<td>Some reallocation of personnel and funds is needed. More subject matter training, in programs other than livestock, for agents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think is the future of 4-H in Louisiana ?</td>
<td>Future is unlimited. Future is as good as personnel hired and program planning. Need to stress school enrichment, curriculum development. Need to keep policy makers informed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional benefits mentioned included increased family involvement and, in some cases, economic benefits, particularly in the livestock projects.

The group felt that it was not adequately supported in its role in the program. A desire to be a part of the entire program rather than only providing financial support was indicated. The group felt that continuing at an appropriate level of funding would be a critical part of 4-H's future. Perceptions of former donors are contained in Table 21.

**Elected Community Leaders.** Elected community leaders were defined as individuals who had been elected to a public policy making position.

This group felt that 4-H was an excellent program and was impressed with the curriculum. They felt that more adult support was needed.

Elected leaders felt that the 4-H program complements the formal school system and teaches citizenship and leadership. They felt that the group being served by the program was the average and above-average student.

Benefits of the program mentioned by this group were teaching youth to be productive citizens, meeting people and dealing with competition.
### Table 20
Stakeholder Perceptions, Current Donors  
(n = 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has been your experience with the 4-H programs of the Louisiana</td>
<td>Respondents had been involved with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service ?</td>
<td>the 4-H program for many years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your overall views of the 4-H program ?</td>
<td>Positive view of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felt the benefits were derived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>because of the efforts of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the 4-H program is trying to accomplish ?</td>
<td>Educate young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things you think the program should be trying to</td>
<td>None mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplish ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you think is being served by the 4-H program ?</td>
<td>Two respondents mentioned youth as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the primary audience. One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>respondent mentioned the entire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community as the group being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>served.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there others who you think should be served ?</td>
<td>None mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefits do you feel people receive from their participation in</td>
<td>Prepares youth for life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H ?</td>
<td>Community awareness. Youth learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>how to deal with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other benefits do you feel people receive from the 4-H program ?</td>
<td>An increased number of youth may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>choose agricultural careers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 continued
Stakeholder Perceptions, Current Donors  
(n = 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things 4-H could do to bring about these benefits ?</td>
<td>None mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel that 4-H operates as an educational program in the schools ?</td>
<td>Felt that the program motivates club members to become better students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there needs of youth not being met that 4-H should be meeting ?</td>
<td>None mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your role in the 4-H program do you feel adequately supported ?</td>
<td>All indicated adequate support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how ?</td>
<td>Support received from Extension personnel and community. Indicated that donors receive support from youth also.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, what more do you feel is needed ?</td>
<td>Nothing mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think is the future of 4-H in Louisiana ?</td>
<td>Felt future was positive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group felt that 4-H presents good educational programs but recognized that competition with the school schedule does present some problems in delivering those educational programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has been your experience with the 4-H programs of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service?</td>
<td>One respondent was a former 4-H member. Two respondents were parents of 4-H members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your overall views of the 4-H program?</td>
<td>Positive program, well conducted by Extension personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the 4-H program is trying to accomplish?</td>
<td>Program attempts to develop responsibility, self-esteem and citizenship in youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things you think the program should be trying to accomplish?</td>
<td>None mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you think is being served by the 4-H program?</td>
<td>Entire community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there others who you think should be served?</td>
<td>Enrollment in 4-H could continue past high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefits do you feel people receive from their participation in 4-H?</td>
<td>Helps youth prepare for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other benefits do you feel people receive from the 4-H program?</td>
<td>Family benefits through involvement. Some livestock projects may be economically beneficial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things 4-H could do to bring about these benefits?</td>
<td>None mentioned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 continued
Stakeholder Perceptions, Former Donors  (n = 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel that 4-H operates as an educational program in the schools?</td>
<td>Very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there needs of youth not being met that 4-H should be meeting?</td>
<td>None mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your role in the 4-H program do you feel adequately supported?</td>
<td>Did not feel adequately supported from a business point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how?</td>
<td>Indicated a desire to be a part of the programming process rather than just provide financial support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, what more do you feel is needed?</td>
<td>Indicated that continuing funding is a critical part of the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think is the future of 4-H in Louisiana?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elected leaders felt they were adequately supported in their role by the cooperation of adults, particularly Extension personnel. The group felt that the future of 4-H was positive, assuming continuing support of the community as well as business. Table 22 contains the perceptions of elected community leaders.

Non-Elected Community Leaders. Non-elected community leaders were identified as those individuals who had leadership positions within organizations, having been
elected to those positions by the membership, not the general public.

Three individuals were interviewed in this group and they indicated that they felt 4-H was an excellent program that has a positive effect on the 4-H members' future. The group felt the main goal of the program was to promote good citizenship.

Non-elected leaders felt the entire community was being served by the program and the benefits were that youth learn to be independent, creative thinkers and better citizens. The fact that some form of recognition was given to every child who participates in the program was also mentioned as a benefit of involvement. An additional benefit mentioned by this group was the community's involvement which leads to a better citizenry.

The group felt that 4-H operates well within the school system and has a good co-curricular design. The group felt adequately supported by Extension personnel and volunteer leaders and felt that the future of the 4-H program was positive. Table 23 contains the perceptions of non-elected community leaders.
Table 22
Stakeholder Perceptions, Elected Community Leaders (n = 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has been your experience with the 4-H programs of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One respondent was a former 4-H member. One respondent is a grandparent of a current club member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your overall views of the 4-H program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent program. Respondents were impressed with curriculum. Felt more adult support was needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the 4-H program is trying to accomplish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program complements the formal school system. Teaches citizenship and leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things you think the program should be trying to accomplish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you think is being served by the 4-H program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth being served are average and above-average students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there others who you think should be served?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefits do you feel people receive from their participation in 4-H?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth learn to be productive citizens, to deal with competition, how to meet people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other benefits do you feel people receive from the 4-H program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things 4-H could do to bring about these benefits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel that 4-H operates as an educational program in the schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there needs of youth not being met that 4-H should be meeting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your role in the 4-H program do you feel adequately supported?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, what more do you feel is needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think is the future of 4-H in Louisiana?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23
Stakeholder Perceptions, Non-Elected Community Leaders
(n = 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has been your experience with the 4-H programs of the Louisiana</td>
<td>No specific experiences mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are you overall views of the 4-H program ?</td>
<td>Excellent program which positively affects 4-H members' future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the 4-H program is trying to accomplish ?</td>
<td>Promote good citizenship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things you think the program should be trying to</td>
<td>None mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplish ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you think is being served by the 4-H program ?</td>
<td>Entire community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there others who you think should be served ?</td>
<td>None mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefits do you feel people receive from their participation in</td>
<td>Youth learn to be independent, creative thinkers and better citizens. Recognition for every child in the program was mentioned as an important benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other benefits do you feel people receive from the 4-H program ?</td>
<td>Community involvement which leads to a better citizenry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other things 4-H could do to bring about these benefits ?</td>
<td>None mentioned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23 continued  
Stakeholder Perceptions, Non-Elected Community Leaders  
(n = 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Consensus of Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel that 4-H operates as an educational program in the schools?</td>
<td>Very well. Program has a good co-curricular design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there needs of youth not being met that 4-H should be meeting?</td>
<td>None mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your role in the 4-H program do you feel adequately supported?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how?</td>
<td>Adequate support from Extension agents and volunteer leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, what more do you feel is needed?</td>
<td>None mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think is the future of 4-H in Louisiana?</td>
<td>Very positive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identify stakeholder needs, concerns and differences in perceptions.

Upon completion of the matrix of stakeholder views, the work group reached a consensus of the main themes emerging from the stakeholder interviews. These themes are divided by the current program situation and future programming needs.

**Current situation:**

* The 4-H program is structured more for younger youth and high school - gap exists for 6th, 7th, and 8th graders.
* The program emphasizes social skills.
* The program places much emphasis on role of 4-H in the community and the role of the community in 4-H.
* Overall, respondents had a positive view of the program. They felt it teaches life skills needed now and later.
* Respondents indicated that the program offers projects which are timely.
* The program helps develop self-sufficiency, life skills, citizenship, leadership, and families
* The 4-H program serves mostly rural youth, average and above average students. The program also serves the community as well as other family members
* Skills taught include life, technical and leadership skills.
* The program improves club members' self-esteem and sense of community by offering education outside of the school.

* Students were motivated to be better students through recognition, teamwork, and programs on career choices.

* The 4-H program offers experiential educational opportunities that complement the school curriculum and enhance individual student performance.

* Youth indicated that they enjoyed activities that related to both social interaction and technical projects.

* Youth indicated they wanted more programs dealing with problems faced by their own age group (e.g. careers, goal-setting, job interviews).

* 4-H club members indicated they received help from their parents and other family members.

**Future programming needs:**

* The future of the 4-H program is positive but qualified (continuing support of community, increase professional and volunteer staff, continued funding).

* 4-H needs to provide the present audience with issues training (e.g. drug awareness, health concerns, goal setting)

* The 4-H program needs to involve more youth, more urban youth and more minorities.
* 4-H needs to focus its educational program on higher risk groups.

* 4-H needs to increase its enrollment at high school level (junior and senior), beyond high school (college) and should perhaps conduct some programs for the elderly.

* The volunteer and professional base should be expanded in order that 4-H reaches more young people.

* 4-H needs to change its image to attract more non-traditional audiences.

* The 4-H program needs to be better promoted.

* Workshops should be conducted on a regular basis on subject matter other than livestock.

Develop the program model.

The generic program model was reviewed by the work group and revisions made to the model to accurately reflect the needs of the Louisiana 4-H program. Activities and indicators were developed for each main event as well as barriers and reductions to those barriers, which might prevent the next step of the logic model from occurring. The complete logic model is shown in Figure 3. Seven main events were identified by the work group: (1) Assess Needs; (2) Define Extension's Role and Nature of Commitment; (3) Assess Resources and Develop Program; (4) Acquire and/or Train Staff; (5) Initiate Networks/Coalitions; (6) Create
Awareness and Promote Program; and (7) Provide Educational Experiences.

The work group also identified barriers and barrier reductions which might prevent the educational experiences from having the desired effect upon the four target audiences; Leaders, Youth, Family Members, and Policy Makers.

A discussion follows identifying the activities and indicators of accomplishments for each main event.
The entries in each circle represent the following: B - Barriers  I - Intervening Events

Figure 3 Louisiana 4-H Program Logic Model
Assessing Needs. The first main event identified was that of Assessing Needs. Table 24 contains the activities and indicators of accomplishment for this event. Only one activity was listed under this event, namely to adequately identify local, state and national issues which the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service may need to deal with as it designs educational programs. In the LCES issues are identified by advisory committees whose membership reflects the various community segments, enterprises and demographic characteristics. Accomplishment of this activity would be indicated by scrutinizing minutes of committee meetings by a new procedure involving the establishment of area and state review committees.

Table 24
Main Event 1, Assess Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Indicators of Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assess Needs</td>
<td>National, State and Local issues identified by the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service advisory committees</td>
<td>Number of unmet needs identified from minutes of advisory committee meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary and review of local advisory committee minutes by area and state committee reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Define Extension’s Role and Nature of Commitment. The second main event identified by the work group was to Define Extension’s Role and the Nature of
Commitment. Table 25 contains the activities and indicators for this event.

The work group listed as activities various steps to obtain the needs identified by parish 4-H programs, summarize and prioritize those needs, and have a state administrative council approve or disapprove of the recommendations. The indicators that these activities have been accomplished would include: minutes from meetings held, list of recommendations made and letters of approval.

Table 25
Main Event 2, Define Extension’s Role and Nature of Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Indicators of Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define Extension’s Role and Nature of Commitment</td>
<td>State staff and representatives of field staff reviews and summarizes needs and sends out for review and comment</td>
<td>Recommendations implemented; letters of approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State committee convenes and discusses parish recommendations and makes recommendations to state advisory council</td>
<td>Advisory committee minutes and list of recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Council reviews recommendations, re: resources, priorities, staffing, political implications, legal implications</td>
<td>Advisory committee minutes; Recommendations implemented; Letters of approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessing Resources and Developing the Program. The third main event identified by the work group was that of Assessing Resources and Developing the Program. Table 26 contains activities and indicators of accomplishment for this event.

Activities associated with this main event included committing manpower, reviewing existing and/or developing materials and planning to initiate networks and coalitions, creating awareness and promoting the program and developing an evaluation plan. The indicators of accomplishment were reassignment and training/retraining of staff, production of needed materials and written plans to of activities.

Acquire and/or Train Staff. The fourth event was to acquire and/or train staff and volunteers. Table 27 contains the activities and indicators of accomplishment for this event.

Activities under this event include aspects of staffing such as hiring, training and retraining. Also included was the establishment of an intern program with a mentoring component. Indicators of accomplishment were staff reassignments, job description announcements, recruitment of volunteers, establishment of a mentoring program and placement of interns.
Table 26  
Main Event 3, Assess Resources and Develop Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Indicators of Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assess Resources and Develop</td>
<td>Commit staff: restaffing, retraining, hiring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reassignments, workshops etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>attended; job announcements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review existing materials and adapt or develop new materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop staffing and training plan</td>
<td>Written plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify delivery mechanisms, (i.e. networks, coalitions, school curriculum)</td>
<td>Written plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan for networks, coalitions</td>
<td>Written plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop plan to create awareness and promote program</td>
<td>Written plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop evaluation plan</td>
<td>Written plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initiate Networks and Coalitions. The fifth main event identified was that of Initiating Networks and Coalitions. Table 28 contains activities and indicators of this event.

Activities associated with this event reflected the need for collaboration with other youth-serving agencies in order to address the needs of youth and also the need to keep policy making groups informed about the accomplishments of the 4-H program.
Table 27
Main Event 4, Acquire and/or Train Staff and Volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Indicators of Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquire and/or Train Staff</td>
<td>Commit staff (salaried and volunteer); Restaffing; retraining, hiring</td>
<td>Assignments, reassignments, job descriptions, job orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Volunteers</td>
<td>Acquire new staff</td>
<td>New hires and volunteers recruited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide training</td>
<td>Training schedule Mentoring program established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acquire and mentor interns (as appropriate)</td>
<td>Interns on board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate adequacy of training</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of support received from these agencies as well as the requests for extension youth information and programs would serve as indicators of accomplishment.

Create Awareness and Promote Program. Main Event 6 was identified as Creating Awareness and Promoting the 4-H Program. Activities and indicators of accomplishment for this event are shown in Table 29.

Activities under this main event include efforts to make the general public aware of 4-H educational materials and programs available through mass media releases, recognition events and promotional events.
Table 28
Main Event 5, Initiate Networks and Coalitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Indicators of Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiate Networks and Coalitions</td>
<td>Work in collaboration with other youth serving agencies, institutions, businesses and foundation representatives</td>
<td>Joint efforts (e.g. programs, recognition), Expanded resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inform policy making boards (e.g. BESE, School Boards, Parish governments) re: program accomplishments</td>
<td>Visits and minutes of proceedings. Success stories. Demand for time and information (request received)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicators of accomplishment would include the amount of media coverage, and the number of recognition and promotional events held.

Provide Educational Experiences. This main event is a culmination of the successful passage through preceding events in the logic model. Here target audiences receive educational experiences which will result in the desired educational effects. Table 30 lists activities and indicators of accomplishment for this event.

The activities under this main event reflected a desire of the work group to see the 4-H professional function as an education program manager coordinating
Table 29
Main Event 6, Create Awareness and Promote Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Indicators of Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create Awareness and Promote Program</td>
<td>Disseminate promotional materials</td>
<td>Materials disseminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make media releases</td>
<td>Media coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hold recognition events (e.g. award banquets, certificates)</td>
<td>Funds, awards presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct promotional events (e.g. fairs, festivals, malls, project days, 4-H week)</td>
<td>Events conducted. Numbers in attendance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

educational efforts of a program delivery team comprised of other parish Extension professionals, para-professionals and volunteer leaders and school personnel. This role is different from the prevailing teaching role of the 4-H agent.

Indicators of accomplishment would be the organization and functioning of this team and information provided through the LCES reporting system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Indicators of Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide Educational Experiences</td>
<td>Youth Development Coordinator manages program delivery teams (e.g. other extension professional staff, para-professionals, volunteer leaders, school personnel, community leaders, policy makers)</td>
<td>POW, LEMIS, Success stories, accomplishment reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program delivery team provides educational experiences for target audiences through the following delivery modes: Organized clubs; Special interest, Short term programs and Day camps; Overnight camps; School Enrichment programs; Instructional TV/Video; Individual learning, Mentoring and Family learning programs; School Age Child Care</td>
<td>Total youth involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barriers and Barrier Reductions. Having described main events in the logic model, the work group identified barriers that would interrupt sequential completion of the logic model. Barrier reductions were also identified. Table 31 lists barriers and barrier reductions between Main Event 1, Identifying Needs and Issues and Main Event 2, Determining Extension’s Role and Nature of Commitment.

The work group identified an inadequate assessment of programming needs and issues as a barrier. Methods of reducing the barrier included forming well-informed, diverse advisory groups, allowing the advisory groups to function and responding to them regarding the accomplishments of the 4-H program. Training of 4-H agents in advisory group functioning was another reduction method identified.

Table 32 lists barriers and barrier reductions which would interfere with the movement to Main Event 3, Assessing Resources and Developing Program.

Two barriers were identified. One pointed to the possibility that some members of the state advisory committee would have provincial viewpoints which would cause these individuals to attempt to "protect their turf" rather than serve the best interest of the program. This situation could be circumvented by improving representation on the advisory committee.
Table 31
Barriers and Barrier Reductions between Main Event 1 and Main Event 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
<th>Main Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Issue/Needs Identification</td>
<td>Inadequate needs assessment</td>
<td>Form more diversified and/or well-informed advisory groups Provide opportunity for advisory group to comment on issues/needs identified Respond to advisory group on program accomplishment Train agents in the use of advisory groups</td>
<td>(2) Determine Extension's Role and Nature of Commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second barrier identified was failure of the state committee to respond, positively or negatively, to the recommendations submitted to them. Constructing a response mechanism to ensure feedback on each recommendation was the barrier reduction identified by the work group.
Table 32
Barrier and Barrier Reductions between Main Event 2 and Main Event 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
<th>Main Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Define Extension Role and Nature of Commitment</td>
<td>Possibility of provincial view points on state committee</td>
<td>Better representation on state committee</td>
<td>(3) Assess Resources and Develop Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of requirement for response</td>
<td>Construct response mechanism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main event 3, Assess Resources and Develop the Program, was linked sequentially to, main event 4, Acquire and/or Train Staff and Volunteers; main event 5, Initiate Networks and Coalitions; and main event 6, Create Awareness and Promote Program. As such the work group identified barriers and barrier reductions between main event 3 and these main events. Barriers and barrier reductions between main events 3 and 4 are shown in Table 33.

Barriers were identified as lack of resources which would prevent hiring and/or training of staff; recruitment constraints such as a small pool of candidates with the required degree (agriculture or home economics); small number of minority applicants; applicants who are unable to qualify for graduate school because of low grade point average or graduate record examination score; and differences in salary and workloads among parish programs.
throughout the state. An additional barrier identified was the mindset of the recruiter.

Barrier reductions were identified as reprioritization of the program and reallocation of resources to best use the resources available and to attempt to change the mindset of the recruiter.

The mindset barrier of territoriality and "turf protection", was identified as preventing movement from main event 3, assess program and develop resources, to main event 5, initiate networks and coalitions (Table 34). The work group felt this attitude would cause 4-H program deliverers to avoid attempting to build coalitions between 4-H and other youth-serving agencies. The work group felt that if the 4-H professional would understand the "total picture" and initiate proper communication with other youth-serving groups this situation could be avoided.

Insufficient communication staff support and media constraints were the two barriers identified which would prevent the movement from main event 3, assess program and develop resources, to main event 6, create awareness and promote program (Table 35). Two barrier reductions identified were increasing the number of the state and area communication staffs, and conducting staff training in the area of communication.

As the program logic model indicates, main events 4, 5 and 6 lead to main event 7 and also interact with each
other in order for the program to reach its goals. The work group again identified barriers and barrier reductions between each of these main events.

Table 33  
Barrier and Barrier Reductions between Main Event 3 and Main Event 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
<th>Main Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) Assess Resources and</td>
<td>Insufficient resources</td>
<td>Reprioritization of program and reallocation of resources (put staff where needed)</td>
<td>(4) Acquire and.or Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Program</td>
<td>Recruitment constraints (academic disciplines, minorities, GPA/GRE,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff and Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>locales, salary and workload differences by locale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mindset of recruiter (degree, gender, etc. of recruiter)</td>
<td>Change of mindset (re: workloads, salaries, differences in locale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34  
Barriers and Barrier Reductions between Main Event 3 and Main Event 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
<th>Main Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) Assess Program and</td>
<td>Mindset (re: territorialism and turf protection)</td>
<td>Understanding the &quot;total picture&quot;, proper communication</td>
<td>(5) Initiate Networks and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coalitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The work group recognized several barriers preventing movement from main event 4, Acquire and/or Train Staff to main event 5, Initiate Networks and Coalitions (Table 36). The first barrier identified was dislike of collaborative efforts by Extension professionals. The group felt that this barrier could be reduced by making more appropriate staff assignments (not placing persons disliking collaborative efforts in positions which require collaboration) and also training staff on the need for and methods of building networks. The work group also recognized that situations may exist where "personality differences" exist between legitimizers, preventing positive networking. The group felt that enlisting the aid of volunteers to deal with these groups and/or individuals may be productive.

Other barriers which may exist were identified as a lack of understanding by extension professionals as to the
need for networking and also organizational stereotyping of the 4-H organization by other groups and/or stereotyping of other groups by 4-H. An improved training program was viewed as the barrier reduction to alleviate both situations.

Table 36
Barriers and Barrier Reductions between Main Event 4 and Main Event 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
<th>Main Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) Acquire and/or Train Staff</td>
<td>Dislike for networking or coalitions</td>
<td>More appropriate staff assignments , training</td>
<td>(5) Initiate networks and coalitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incompatibility with local legitimizers</td>
<td>Work through volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of understanding re:needs</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational stereotypes</td>
<td>Training, marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main event 6, Creating Awareness and Promoting the program, was another sequential event stemming from main event 4, Acquire and/or Train Staff and Volunteers (Table 37). Barriers which might prevent this dealt with insufficient communication due to a lack of time on the part of the 4-H professional, lack of an organization policy as to the amount of agent time which should be devoted to event 6 and the lack of a comprehensive staff
development plan which would assist agents in determining their agendas.

The work group felt that a more consistent application of policy as well as a comprehensive staff development plan would reduce these barriers. Use of volunteers and proper understanding of time management techniques were also identified as important barrier reductions.

The attitude "...that's the way it has always been done" was viewed as a barrier in preventing movement from main event 4, Acquire and Train Staff to main event 7, Provide Educational Experiences (Table 38). Fostering openness to change was viewed as one method of reducing this barrier. Unclear job expectations were viewed as an additional barrier. Clarification of job expectations was identified as a means of reducing this barrier.

A lack of understanding of the program was identified as the barrier which would prevent movement from main event 5, initiate networks and coalitions to main event 6, create awareness and promote program (Table 39). It was felt that an improved line of communication would help reduce this barrier.

Barriers between main event 5, initiate networks and coalitions and main event 7, provide educational experiences included: competing demands on youth's time, programs that were not relevant to the needs of youth and
an imbalance between contribution (work required of the 4-H member) and recognition (Table 40).

Table 37
Barriers and Barrier Reductions between Main Event 4 and Main Event 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
<th>Main Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) Acquire and/or Train</td>
<td>Media constraints</td>
<td>Increase in state and area communication</td>
<td>(6) Create awareness and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and Volunteers</td>
<td>Insufficient communications with team, others,</td>
<td>s staff</td>
<td>promote program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>staff, legitimizers</td>
<td>Time management, volunteer assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time constraints on professional staff time</td>
<td>Teamwork, volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of organizational policy and practice</td>
<td>More consistent application of policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>differences (re:time use)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of a comprehensive staff development</td>
<td>Develop and implement a comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>staff development plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barrier reductions identified were a realization by program delivers that there are many demands on youth and that programs should be adjusted in consideration of these demands.
Table 38
Barriers and Barrier Reductions between Main Event 4 and Main Event 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
<th>Main Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) Acquire and/or Train Staff and Volunteers</td>
<td>Ways of doing things in the past conflict with proposed practices</td>
<td>Foster greater openness to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unclear job expectations</td>
<td>Clarify job expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Provide Educational Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39
Barriers and Barrier Reductions between Main Event 5 and Main Event 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
<th>Main Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) Initiate Networks and Coalitions</td>
<td>Lack of understanding of the program</td>
<td>Improved communication (awareness of program objectives)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Create awareness and Promote Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was felt that a good needs assessment, an activity in main event 1, would alleviate the barrier of irrelevant programming. Competition with other school events for student time and media coverage were listed as barriers between main event 6, create awareness and promote program, and main event 7, provide education experiences (Table 40). Scheduling of events to make better use of media coverage and creating the awareness that 4-H is an educational experience and therefore should be included during school hours were barrier reductions identified by the work group.
Table 40
Barrier and Barrier Reductions between Main Event 5 and Main Event 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
<th>Main Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) Initiate</td>
<td>Competing demands on the time of youth</td>
<td>Make program adjustments (within limits)</td>
<td>(7) Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks and</td>
<td>Program not relevant to the needs of youth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalitions</td>
<td>Imbalance between recognition and contribution (workload)</td>
<td>Better needs assessment</td>
<td>Experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41
Barrier and Barrier Reductions between Main Event 6 and Main Event 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
<th>Main Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6) Create Awareness and Promote Program</td>
<td>Competition with other media coverage</td>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>(7) Provide Educational Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competition with other school events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Realization that 4-H is an educational experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barriers and Barrier Reductions in Providing Educational Experiences to Target Audiences. In addition to identifying barriers and barrier reductions between main events, the work group also identified barriers to the
target audiences receiving educational experiences and the benefits therefrom in main event 7. Barrier reductions were also identified.

The barriers identified with regard to policy makers reflect the work group's belief that a lack of understanding of the 4-H program and its benefits would cause policy makers to not be as supportive of the program as desired (Table 42). Potential barriers include policy makers (school principals) restricting the number of students who could join 4-H and/or requiring a certain grade average to be maintained for allowing students to join 4-H. While the work group acknowledged the right of school personnel to set regulations they felt that increased communication with these policy makers could reduce the barriers mentioned.

Additional barriers such as changes in policy makers, liability concerns and policy changes call for agents to be aware of these situations and to adjust their programs accordingly.

The second target audience that was discussed during this part of the process was leaders. Barriers in providing educational experiences to leaders included: lack of voluntarism, a misconception of how agents should spend their time and recruitment of the wrong leaders and failure to provide proper orientation (Table 43).
Table 42
Barriers and Barrier Reductions in Providing Educational Experiences to Policy Makers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources</td>
<td>Awareness, adjust program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy changes due to changing circumstances</td>
<td>Awareness, adjust program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability concerns</td>
<td>Awareness, adjust program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local policy makers preference (e.g. GPA) to join 4-H</td>
<td>Face-to-face contacts, communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in policy makers</td>
<td>Face-to-face contacts, communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted access to school/youth</td>
<td>Orientation on organizational structure. Face-to-face contact. Program awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work group felt it was possible for leaders to think they were being given duties by the 4-H agent that were beyond their level of responsibility. Proper orientation of the leader to the jobs of the leader and the agent and the duties and responsibilities of each would help alleviate this barrier.

Recruiting the right leaders and orienting them to the job were additional barrier reductions identified.

Barriers identified in providing educational experiences to the target audience of family members included the family structure (traditional family, single parent etc.) and its effect on the support family members might provide to the 4-H program (Table 44).
Table 43
Barriers and Barrier Reductions in Providing Educational Experiences to Volunteer Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of communication</td>
<td>Open-door policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of voluntarism</td>
<td>Aggressive recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of how agents should spend</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of proper orientation</td>
<td>Better orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment (lack of the right leader)</td>
<td>Restructure recruitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agent awareness, training of agents and adjustment of programs to reflect difficulties caused by family structure were mentioned as barrier reductions.

Additional barriers included time and location constraints. The rationale behind this barrier is the increase in working women and single parent families and other changes in family structure. Scheduling 4-H events immediately after school presents a transportation problem. To reduce this barrier agents could schedule events in the evenings and/or weekends. An additional barrier mentioned was family members' perceptions of how agents should spend their time and who should bear the responsibility for certain tasks. Proper orientation as to the role of the family member(s) and the role of the agent should help to reduce this barrier.

Barriers mentioned in providing educational experiences for the target audience youth concerned
competing demands for youth time, lack of personnel, restrictive requirement for joining 4-H, lack of materials, leader preference and peer pressure (Table 45).

Each of these barriers had a specific barrier reduction identified such as increasing agent awareness, adjustments to the program, more flexible agent schedules and proper orientation and communication.

Table 44
Barriers and Barrier Reductions in Providing Educational Experiences to Family Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Barrier reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td>Agent awareness and training, adjust program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and location constraints</td>
<td>Adjust program, more flexible agent schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of how agents should spend their time</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of communication</td>
<td>Orientation and communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 45
Barriers and Barrier Reductions in Providing Educational Experiences to Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competing demands for youth time</td>
<td>Adjust program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of personnel (professional and volunteer)</td>
<td>Aggressive recruitment and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive requirements that impede participation</td>
<td>Awareness of origin and effects. Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of educational and support materials</td>
<td>Develop and/or obtain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader preference</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure</td>
<td>Change image; Spizzerinctum (Pied Piper)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barriers and Barrier Reductions between Target Audiences. The next step in the EA process was to identify barriers and barrier reductions between target audiences.

Barriers identified between leaders and family members included personality conflicts between leaders and family members, likelihood of problems occurring when leaders correct someone’s child, and leaders favoring some club members (Table 46).

The work group felt if leaders were aware of family structure and how to deal with family members and received some training in these areas the barriers could be reduced.
### Table 46
Barriers and Barrier Reductions between Leaders and Family Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality conflicts</td>
<td>Awareness and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ruffled feathers&quot;</td>
<td>Awareness and training. Using peers (for sharing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(correcting someone else's children)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader favoritism</td>
<td>Awareness and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of communication</td>
<td>Improved communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td>Agent awareness and training, adjust program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barriers and barrier reductions between leaders and policy makers were identified next (Table 47). The work group felt that a lack of knowledge on the part of leaders concerning policy makers and the structure of local policy making boards were the most formidable barriers between these two groups. Increased leader awareness and training were felt to be the most effective barrier reductions.

### Table 47
Barriers and Barrier Reductions between Leaders and Policy Makers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality conflicts</td>
<td>Awareness and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axes to grind</td>
<td>Orientation to &quot;politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge of policy makers</td>
<td>Awareness and orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures of local policy making boards</td>
<td>Awareness and orientation. Work towards change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barriers between leaders and youth and barrier reductions are shown in Table 48. Awareness and training of leaders were reductions to the barriers of inadequate number of leaders, time constraints for leaders to perform their job, personality conflicts, lack of motivation on the part of leaders and lack of training.

The work group identified the non-resident leader situation as an additional barrier. Many 4-H organizational leaders are school teachers who live some distance from the school at which they serve as a leader. This situation may preclude the leader from helping club members outside of school hours. The work group felt that agents could reduce this barrier by being aware of the situation and encouraging resident volunteers to assist the organizational leader.

A barrier between family members and youth was a lack of support from family members for youth participating in 4-H (Table 49). Awareness of this barrier and an educational effort by agents to make parents aware of the benefits of the 4-H program were seen as barrier reductions.

One barrier between youth and policy makers was the difficulty in getting youth and policy makers together to discuss the program so that policy makers could appreciate the benefits derived by youth (Table 50).
Creating liaisons between the groups and utilizing the 4-H Ambassador program to increase policy makers awareness were barrier reductions identified.

Table 48
Barriers and Barrier Reductions between Leaders and Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of enough leaders</td>
<td>Aggressive recruitment and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation gap (attitude gap)</td>
<td>Recruit more adaptable leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality conflicts</td>
<td>Awareness and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints for leaders to do the job</td>
<td>Awareness and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident leaders</td>
<td>Awareness and encourage local assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of motivation</td>
<td>Better recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training</td>
<td>Provide training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom for leaders to function</td>
<td>Acceptance of leaders as educators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49
Barriers and Barrier Reductions between Family Members and Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-supportive (emotional, financial, physical)</td>
<td>Awareness and adjust program (if possible), educate family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge (re:program)</td>
<td>Educate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of skills</td>
<td>Training for parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td>Awareness and adjust program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 50
Barriers and Barrier Reductions between Youth and Policy Makers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Barrier Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of liaison to establish contact</td>
<td>Create a liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints and scheduling conflicts</td>
<td>Harder effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of confidence</td>
<td>Practice and encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of appreciation of youth (re:sponsors)</td>
<td>Ambassador programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spinoffs. Spinoffs are unplanned happenings that may occur as a result of a main event in the logic model. Possible spinoffs identified by the work group are shown in Table 51. All identified spinoffs were positive in that LCES and the 4-H program would be strengthened and/or the agents and program participants would be benefitted in different ways. The graphic representation of spinoffs and their relation to main events is shown in Figure 4.

Table 51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event</th>
<th>Spinoffs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Assess Needs</td>
<td>Participants gain knowledge about the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Define Extension’s Role and Nature of Commitment</td>
<td>Increased experience in collaboration. Improve morale for field staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Assess Resources and Develop Program</td>
<td>New teaching vehicles; Greater staff involvement; Improved morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Acquire and/or Train Staff and Volunteers</td>
<td>Increased vitality of staff; Lower turnover; New ideas from other backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Initiate Networks and Coalitions</td>
<td>Greater credibility and visibility for organization; More stable funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Create Awareness and Promote Program</td>
<td>Greater credibility and visibility for organization; More stable funding; Improved image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Provide Educational Experiences</td>
<td>&quot;Psychic income&quot;; Greater involvement in community affairs Agents and leaders serve as role models for youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The work group felt that spinoffs associated with target audiences would be an increased visibility for the organization for the target audience of policy makers; improved family relationships for family members; and positive effects of youth on their peers.
Figure 4 Spinoffs Associated With Program Logic Model
Consequences. The work group identified four consequences of providing educational experiences, and indicators that these consequences have occurred (Table 52).

Table 52
Consequences of Providing Educational Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Indicators of Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater number of positive community leaders</td>
<td>Comparative study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved quality of family life</td>
<td>Lower incidence of child abuse, school drop-outs, divorce, teen parents, substance abuse, juvenile crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More active citizenry</td>
<td>Number of voters. Involved in community affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More empowered community</td>
<td>Community projects, lower out-migration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervening Events. Intervening events are described as conditions or occurrences which may prevent consequences from occurring as a result of the educational effects. These events are usually beyond the influence of the program staff (Mayeske, 1991). Using this definition, the work group identified six events, all negative, which might interfere with the developed program logic model; (1) Natural catastrophes; (2) Economic conditions; (3) Survival needs override other needs; (4) Family crises; (5) Increase in anti-social behaviors; and (6) Change in government policies.
Draw conclusions and make recommendations

The work group drew the following conclusions following a review of the process and the products developed:

1. Stakeholders have a good understanding of the 4-H youth program, support the LCES, and appreciate the performance of 4-H agents.

2. The 4-H program helps youth develop life skills, self-sufficiency, good citizenship and leadership and promotes stronger family units; is most effective with younger, rural, average and above-average youth; offers experiential learning that complements the school curriculum; increases family involvement and youth's motivation to be better students.

3. The 4-H program is not reaching enough urban, minority, early adolescents and older youth.

4. The volunteer and professional base of the program is too small and/or not appropriately allocated in some instances.

5. The 4-H program needs to be promoted better among the general public.

Recommendations were made by the work group based on the above conclusions. It was recommended that:

1. The 4-H youth advisory system for program development should be restructured to incorporate
inputs from the county, area and state level professional staff and stakeholders.

2. The program logic model developed in the evaluability assessment should be adopted by the LCES with all its programming underpinnings.

3. Personnel assignments and training should be focused on concerns found in the study and on process skills.

Plan specific steps for the utilization of evaluability assessment data.

At the end of the final work group session, a presentation was made to the state 4-H staff and the LCES Assistant Director supervising the 4-H program, describing the procedure and resulting products of the LCES 4-H Evaluability Assessment including conclusions and recommendations.

Subsequently, on June 3, 1992, the researcher along with two members of the work group met with the LCES Administrative Council comprised of the Director, Associate Director and two Assistant Directors and presented the conclusions and recommendations of the 4-H EA. A copy of the materials presented may be found in Appendix D.

Verification of the developed model

The final step in the evaluability assessment process involved determining the plausibility of the program model developed as a result of the analysis of the stakeholder
interviews and deliberation by the group. A group of six 4-H agents, one administrator, and one member of the state 4-H staff met to verify the developed model. Although only minor changes in content and expression were made by the verification group the model was improved. Table 53 presents the list of changes suggested by the verification group and incorporated into the model presented earlier in this chapter.

Table 53
Changes Made to Program Model by Verification Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event 2 - Define Extension's Role and Nature of Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Administrative Council reviews recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to read: Administrative Council reviews and approves/disapproves recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event 4 - Acquire and/or Train Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Commit staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change: Commit staff *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* salaried and volunteer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Event 7 - Provide Educational Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add: Delivery modes: organized clubs, special interest, short term program and day camps, overnight camps, school enrichment programs, instructional TV/Video, individual learning, mentoring and family learning programs, school age child care.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 53 continued
Changes Made to Program Model by Verification Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers and Reductions, Main Event 1 ---&gt; 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction: Form well-informed advisory groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to: Form more diversified and/or well-informed advisory groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunity for advisory group to comment on issues/needs identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to advisory group on program accomplishments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers and Reductions, Main Event 3 ---&gt; 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add reduction: Staff development in the area of communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers and Reductions, Main Event 4 ---&gt; 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add: Barrier - Lack of a comprehensive staff development plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction - Develop and implement a comprehensive staff development plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers and Reductions, Main Event 4 ---&gt; 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add: Barrier - Unclear job expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction - Clarify job expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers and Reductions, Main Event 5 ---&gt; 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add: Barrier - Program not relevant to the needs of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction - Better needs assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers and Reductions, Main Event 6 ---&gt; 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add: Barrier - Competition with other school events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction - Realization that 4-H is an educational experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 53 continued
Changes Made to Program Model by Verification Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers and Reductions, Main Event 7 ---&gt; Policy Makers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add: Barriers - Restricted access to school/youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction - Orient policy makers on organizational structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face contacts, Program awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers and Barrier Reductions, Leaders ---&gt; Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add: Barrier - Freedom for leader to function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction - Acceptance of the leader as an educator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers and Barrier Reductions, Leaders ---&gt; Family Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add: Barrier - Lack of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction - Improved communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: Barrier - Family structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction - Leader awareness and training, adjust program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verification group also identified barriers and barrier reductions between knowledge, attitude, skills and aspirations on the one hand and their translation into changes in behaviors/practices on the other. This information is presented in Table 54.
### Table 54
Barriers and Reductions between Changes in KASA and Behavior/Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Barrier Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of acceptance, by adults, of youth as equal partners</td>
<td>Better understanding, by adults, of the goals of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support and positive reinforcement from family and/or the community</td>
<td>Set realistic goals and offer a quality program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources</td>
<td>Legitimization of the program in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary.

4-H is an important part of the total Cooperative Extension Service programming in Louisiana. The total number of youth participating in Louisiana 4-H in 1991-92 was 62,967, with 11,482 volunteers (youth and adult) assisting 4-H agents in delivering educational programs in the areas of agriculture, home economics and related subjects.

Evaluability Assessment, a process developed by Joseph Wholey in the early 1970’s, has been gaining popularity in the Cooperative Extension System as a way of determining if a program is evaluable and in most instances as a way of designing a program that can be evaluated.

The purpose of this study was to apply the evaluability assessment process in examining the 4-H youth program of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. Specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Determine stakeholder perceptions of the Louisiana 4-H program.

2. Develop a program logic model for the Louisiana 4-H program.

3. Make recommendations to administrators of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service based on the findings of the evaluability assessment.
4. Observe the functioning of the evaluability assessment working group.

Methodology.

The methodology for this study was based on the evaluability assessment process described by Smith (1989) and a final verification process suggested by Mayeske (1991).

The steps outlined by Smith (1989) were:

1. Determine purpose, secure commitment and identify the work group members. Commitment was secured from the Director of the LCES to conduct the evaluability assessment. The work group was comprised of thirteen members; seven youth agents, three subject-matter specialists, one administrator, one representative of the 1890 institution and one volunteer leader.

2. Develop/clarify program theory. The work group developed a matrix of the desired educational effects of the 4-H program using the KASAB model (Bennett, 1979).

3. Identify and interview stakeholders. Ninety-five stakeholders representing fourteen stakeholder categories were interviewed and their comments transcribed by the researcher.

4. Describe stakeholder perceptions of the program. Stakeholder observations were summarized by the work
group and put into a matrix identifying stakeholder needs, concerns, and differences in perceptions.

5. **Identify stakeholder needs, concerns and differences in perceptions.** Thematic observations were drawn by the work group from the matrix developed in step four.

6. **Develop the program model.** A program logic model containing sequenced main events, activities and indicators of accomplishment, barriers and barrier reductions, as well as spinoffs and intervening events was developed by the work group.

7. **Draw conclusions and make recommendations.** Conclusions and recommendations drawn as a result of stakeholder interviews and analysis were developed by the work group.

8. **Plan specific steps for the utilization of evaluability assessment data.** Implementation of the recommendations developed by the work group was discussed with the Administrative Council of LCES by the researcher and two other members of the work group.

9. **Verification of the program design.** A verification group of six youth agents, one administrator and one member of the state 4-H staff met to discuss the program logic model and give suggestions for its improvement.
Findings.

Current 4-H Program. Using the definition of a plausible program as set forth in the EA process, the work group determined that the current 4-H did not follow the sequential If-Then format and was therefore not evaluable. The EA process was used by the work group as a program design tool.

Thematic Observations. The work group identified themes emerging from stakeholder interviews as listed below:

Current situation:

* The 4-H program is structured more for younger youth and high school youth. A gap exists for 6th, 7th, and 8th graders.
* The program emphasizes social skills
* The program places much emphasis on the role of 4-H in the community and the role of the community in 4-H
* Overall, respondents had a positive view of the program. They felt it teaches life skills needed now and later.
* Respondents indicated that the program offers projects which are timely.
* The program helps develop self-sufficiency, life skills, citizenship, leadership, and families.
The 4-H program serves mostly rural youth, average and above average students. The program also serves the community as well as other family members.

Skills taught include life, technical and leadership skills.

The program improves club members' self-esteem and sense of community by offering education outside of the school.

Students were motivated to be better students through recognition, teamwork, and program on career choices.

The 4-H program offers experiential educational opportunities that complement the school curriculum, and enhance individual student performance.

Youth indicated that they enjoyed activities that related to both social interaction and technical projects.

Youth indicated they wanted more programs dealing with problems faced by their own age group (e.g. careers, goal-setting, job interviews).

4-H club members indicated they received help from their parents and other family members.

Future programming needs:

The future of the 4-H program is positive but qualified (continuing support of community, increased professional and volunteer staff, continued funding).
* 4-H needs to provide the present audience with issues training (e.g. drug awareness, health concerns, goal setting).

* The 4-H program needs to involve more youth, more urban youth and more minorities.

* 4-H needs to focus its educational program on higher risk groups.

* 4-H needs to increase its enrollment at high school level (junior and senior), beyond high school (college) and should perhaps conduct some programs for the elderly.

* The volunteer and professional base should be expanded in order that 4-H reaches more young people.

* 4-H needs to change its image to attract more non-traditional audiences.

* The 4-H program needs to be better promoted.

* Workshops should be conducted on a regular basis on subject matter other than livestock.

Program Logic Model. The work group developed a program logic model comprised of the following main events: (1) Assess Needs; (2) Define Extension's Role and Nature of Commitment; (3) Assess Resources and Develop Programs; (4) Acquire and/or Train Staff and Volunteers; (5) Initiate Networks and Coalitions; (6) Create Awareness and Promote Programs; and (7) Provide Educational Experiences.
The work group also identified barriers that would interrupt the sequential completion of the logic model, barriers in providing educational experiences to the target audiences of Youth, Leaders, Family Members, and Policy Makers and barriers between target audiences. Barrier reductions were also identified for each category.

Spinoffs, unplanned happenings that may occur as a result of a main event in the logic model, were identified by the work group.

Observations of the Work Group. The following observations were reached by the researcher about the functioning of the work group during the evaluability assessment.

The EA process requires a very knowledgeable facilitator to conduct the procedure. This is supported by Smith (1989) who stated that EA is a comprehensive and complex undertaking, although not complicated. It is very difficult to see the "total picture" of the EA process until one has gone through the process. Members of the work group, particularly at the first meeting, had much difficulty understanding the importance of the initial steps of the process - identifying target audiences and developing the matrix of educational effects. As the process continued the work group began to comprehend the process but did not have a "total picture" until the completion of the logic model and its underpinnings.
It is therefore imperative that the facilitator of the process understand the goal of the project in order that he/she leads the work group through the process.

The work group develops a better understanding of program development. The EA process, as used in this study, was essentially a program design tool. The work group developed a better understanding of program development through their participation in the project. The work group developed a language among themselves, a renewed commitment to the Louisiana 4-H program and a sense of pride in the developed model. This change in the work group supports Smith's (1989) reference to important side effects that result from individuals being involved in a work group. The danger in this situation is that the work group views the model as their creation and is disappointed if that model is not fully understood by administrators and not fully implemented.

It is very difficult to explain the EA process to someone who has not been involved in the creation of the program logic model. An adequate explanation of the EA process takes a substantial amount of time. It is important, in that explanation, to describe all steps that lead to the development of the program logic model. It is also important to convey the implications of the developed program model, with all its underpinnings. This is a rather difficult undertaking. The EA process may be seen
by those not involved in it, as an attempt to dismantle the affected program and create a new one in its place, when in fact the EA process deems to describe the program and its components in such a way as to make the program more evaluable.

The EA process is a very useful program design tool. The EA process was initiated as an evaluation tool but over time, particularly in the Cooperative Extension System, has evolved into a program design tool. The process assists program planners, in this case the work group, in designing a program that will be evaluable. The Louisiana 4-H EA was used solely as a program design tool.

Conclusions

Objective 1: Determine stakeholder perceptions of the Louisiana 4-H program.

The Louisiana 4-H program has a positive image. Stakeholder perceptions of the Louisiana 4-H program indicated that the 4-H agents and the 4-H program were held in high regard. Stakeholders felt that the 4-H professional was doing a good job in providing educational opportunities to 4-H club members.

The Louisiana 4-H program should expand its audience and subject matter. Stakeholder responses indicated that the 4-H program should expand its audience by involving more urban and minority youth. Stakeholders also indicated that the program should expand its programming, not
abandoning the traditional agricultural and home economics subjects, but incorporating programs in the areas of career planning, peer pressure, drug awareness etc.

**Objective 2:** Develop a program logic model for the Louisiana 4-H program.

The program logic model, as developed by the work group, provides the If-Then format, supporting activities and indicators of accomplishment, which if properly implemented will lead to intended goals.

**Objective 3:** Make recommendations to the administration of LCES based on the findings of the evaluability assessment.

It is important to obtain from administrators, not only commitment to conduct an EA, but also commitment to accept the developed model and its underpinnings. The developed program logic model in its graphic form does not give a true indication of what acceptance of the model will involve. The program logic model gives the main events that were developed by the work group. These main events, in the case of the Louisiana 4-H program, were events that for the most part were already part of the program. The activities and indicators of accomplishment are the critical components that must be accepted in order for the EA process to reach its potential.

**Objective 4:** To observe the functioning of the evaluability assessment work group.
The work group is a key component of evaluability assessment. It is essential that they are led through the process by a knowledgeable facilitator who is able to adequately explain the process and keep the group focuse on the task at hand.

Recommendations

A strategy needs to be developed to adequately explain the EA process to administrators. The EA process, as noted above, is a very complex process. A system must be developed to present the process as well as the implications of the process, to administrators.

The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service should actively pursue the hiring of personnel from non-traditional academic backgrounds. Stakeholder responses indicated the 4-H program should expand its audience by involving more urban and minority youth. The current work force of the LCES may not be capable of delivering programs to these potential new audiences. An individual with an agricultural degree may not be interested in working in an urban setting. Also the number of minority applicants could possibly be increased by allowing candidates with non-agricultural degrees to apply for positions with LCES.

Additional research should be conducted to determine methods of increasing the use of evaluability assessment in the Cooperative Extension System while decreasing some of its limitations. The EA process is a very useful program
design tool, however some difficulties arise when trying to implement the process on a large scale: lack of sufficient number of trained facilitators; cost of conducting a series of two or three day meetings over an extended period of time; and commitment of administrators to fully implement the developed program logic model.

In spite of these difficulties, this researcher feels that EA should be used to the extent possible as it provides a number of positive effects: renewed commitment on the part of the work group to the program; a better understanding of program development by work group members; and most importantly a complete program design that, if properly implemented will reach the desired results.

The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service needs to fully implement the developed program logic model with all its underpinnings. The program logic model developed as a result of this study provides future direction for the Louisiana 4-H program. In the work group, LCES has a group committed to the model and its implementation. Steps should be taken to involve work group members in the development of future programming components of the Louisiana 4-H program.

Louisiana 4-H agents should be made aware of the positive image of 4-H and of Extension personnel across the state. Stakeholder perceptions indicated that Louisiana
4-H and Extension personnel both had a very positive image. Many 4-H agents are not aware of this positive image and the obvious increase in morale to be gained by sharing this information should not be overlooked.
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APPENDIX A

LETTERS CONCERNING STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS
December 18, 1991

Dear:

The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service is currently conducting research in order to improve the 4-H youth program in the state. You were identified by a committee of 4-H agents as a knowledgeable participant in the 4-H program who could provide useful information and insights regarding youth development in our state.

You will be contacted in the near future to set up a time for a telephone interview. The interview will consist of ten questions concerning your ideas about the 4-H program and will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes. We will be tape recording the interviews in order to accurately preserve your comments. However, the summary report will contain no comments attributable to any individual involved in the process. Your comments will be treated in strict confidence.

Thank you for your participation in this project. If you have any questions, please contact your parish 4-H agent or Robert Richard, Area Agent - Energy at 318-369-4442. You can look forward to a call in a few days.

Sincerely

Denver T. Loupe
Vice-Chancellor and Director
December 18, 1991

Dear:

You have been identified as a knowledgeable 4-H member in your parish and as such we would like to involve you in a project that, we feel, will help improve the 4-H program here in Louisiana.

You will be contacted in the near future to set up a time for a telephone interview. The interview will consist of ten questions concerning your ideas about the 4-H program and will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions. We want your opinion on various aspects of the 4-H program. We will be tape recording the interviews in order to accurately preserve your comments. However the final report will contain no comments attributable to any individual involved in the process. Your comments will be treated in strict confidence.

Thank you for your participation in this project. If you have any questions, please contact your parish 4-H agent or Robert Richard, Area Agent - Energy at 318-369-4442. You can look forward to a call in a few days.

Sincerely

Denver T. Loupe
Vice-Chancellor and Director
December 18, 1991

Dear:

The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service is currently conducting research in order to improve the 4-H youth program in the state. Your child has been identified by a committee of 4-H agents as a knowledgeable participant in the 4-H program who could provide useful information and insights regarding youth development in our state.

Your child will be contacted in the near future to set up a time for a telephone interview. The interview will consist of ten questions concerning their ideas about the 4-H program and will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes. We will be tape recording the interviews in order to accurately preserve their comments. However, the summary report will contain no comments attributable to any individual involved in the process. All comments will be treated in strict confidence.

We appreciate your support of this project. If you have any questions, please contact your parish 4-H agent or Robert Richard, Area Agent - Energy at 318-369-4442. You can look forward to a call in a few days.

Sincerely

Denver T. Loupe
Vice-Chancellor and Director
December 18, 1991

Dear:

You have been identified as a knowledgeable former 4-H member in your parish and as such we would like to involve you in a project that, we feel, will help improve the 4-H program here in Louisiana.

You will be contacted in the near future to set up a time for a telephone interview. The interview will consist of ten questions concerning your ideas about the 4-H program and will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions. We want your opinion on various aspects of the 4-H program. We will be tape recording the interviews in order to accurately preserve your comments. However the final report will contain no comments attributable to any individual involved in the process. Your comments will be treated in strict confidence.

Thank you for your participation in this project. If you have any questions, please contact your parish 4-H agent or Robert Richard, Area Agent - Energy at 318-369-4442. You can look forward to a call in a few days.

Sincerely

Denver T. Loupe
Vice-Chancellor and Director
December 18, 1991

Dear:

The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service is currently conducting research in order to improve the 4-H youth program in the state. Your child has been identified by a committee of 4-H agents as a knowledgeable former participant in the 4-H program who could provide useful information and insights regarding youth development in our state.

Your child will be contacted in the near future to set up a time for a telephone interview. The interview will consist of ten questions concerning their ideas about the 4-H program and will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes. We will be tape recording the interviews in order to accurately preserve their comments. However the summary report will contain no comments attributable to any individual involved in the process. All comments will be treated in strict confidence.

We appreciate your support of this project. If you have any questions, please contact your parish 4-H agent or Robert Richard, Area Agent - Energy at 318-369-4442. You can look forward to a call in a few days.

Sincerely

Denver T. Loupe
Vice-Chancellor and Director
December 16, 1991

TO: All Agents Doing 4-H Club Work and Parish Chairmen

As you may be aware a study is currently underway to formulate a program development model for Louisiana 4-H. This study, called an Evaluability Assessment, involves interviewing club members, former club members, parents, alumni, leaders, elected officials and other individuals associated with the 4-H program. A total of 110 individuals will be interviewed by phone within the next few weeks, including some from your parish.

In the event you receive inquiries from some of your program participants please assure them of the following:

* They were chosen because of their knowledge of the 4-H program.

* There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in their opinion.

* The interview is not an evaluation of their parish program or parish 4-H agent, rather we are attempting to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the total 4-H program.

* The interview will be recorded. This is in order that we accurately prepare information for the committee of agents working on the project. The materials which will be made available to the committee will contain no comment attributable to any individual.

* Persons who are interviewed will receive a copy of the final report sometime next summer.

Should you have any questions concerning this process please call this office or Robert Richard, Area Agent - Energy at 318-369-4442.

Sincerely

Norma O. Roberts
Division Leader (4-H)

NOR/rr
cc: Administrative Staff
APPENDIX B

STAKEHOLDER QUESTIONNAIRES
1. What has been your experience with the 4-H program of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service?
2. What are your overall views of the 4-H program?
3. What do you think the 4-H program is trying to accomplish?
   a) Are there other things you think the program should be trying to accomplish?
4. Who do you think is being served by the 4-H program?
   a) Are there others who you think should be served?
5. What benefits do you feel people receive from their participation in 4-H?
   a) What other benefits do you think result from the 4-H program?
   b) Are there other things 4-H could do to bring about these benefits?
6. How do you feel that 4-H operates as an educational program in local schools?
7. Are there needs of youth not being met that 4-H should be meeting?
8. In your role in the 4-H program do you feel you are adequately supported?
   a) If yes, how?
   b) If no, what more do you feel is needed?
9. What do you think is the future of 4-H in Louisiana?
Louisiana 4-H Evaluability Assessment
Stakeholder Questions
(Current 4-H Members)

1. What are some things you like about being in 4-H?
   (prompts)

2. What are some things you have learned about by being in 4-H?
   (prompts)

3. Are there some things you don't like about being in 4-H?
   (prompts)

4. Are there some other things you would like to do or learn about in 4-H?

5. How do you think you will use what you learn in 4-H?

6. What do you like about 4-H club meetings?

7. What do you dislike about 4-H club meetings?

8. Are most of the students in your grade in 4-H?
   a) if not why not?

9. Who helps you with your project work?

10. Do you think you will be in 4-H again next year?
Louisiana 4-H Evaluability Assessment
Stakeholder Questions
(4-H Dropouts)

1. What are some things you liked about being in 4-H?
   (prompts)

2. What are some things you learned about by being in 4-H?
   (prompts)

3. What were some things you didn’t like about being in 4-H?
   (prompts)

4. Are there some other things you would have liked to do or learn about in 4-H?

5. How do you think you will use what you learn in 4-H?

6. What did you like about 4-H club meetings?

7. What did you dislike about 4-H club meetings?

8. Were most of the students in your grade in 4-H?
   a) if not why not?

9. Who helped you with your project work?

10. How long were you in 4-H?

11. Why did you not rejoin 4-H?
    (prompts)
APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS
Summary of Stakeholder Interviews (Youth)

Question 1
What are some things you like(ed) about being in 4-H?

Current 4-H Member
New learning experiences, recognition and achievement, meeting new people, leadership roles, livestock.

4-H Dropout
Trips, awards, Shortcourse, learning, fun, friends, project work, 4-H camp, record books.

Question 2
What are some things you have learned about by being in 4-H?

Current 4-H Member
Personal development, sense of responsibility, self-confidence, increase subject matter skill, increased leadership skill, increased teamwork skill.

4-H Dropout
Public speaking ability, subject matter skills, how to get along with people, responsibility, community involvement.

Question 3
Are there some things you don’t (didn’t) like about being in 4-H?
Current 4-H Member

All nineteen respondents had positive rather than negative remarks. One respondent commented that more organization was needed, however this dealt with the local club situation not 4-H in general.

4-H Dropout

Most had positive comments. One respondent mentioned that the club was too large to get involved, one mentioned that he/she felt pressured to compete. One respondent felt that there was a lack of fairness at the local level.

Question 4

Are there some other things you would like (have liked) to do or learn (have learned) in 4-H?

Current 4-H Member

All respondents felt no need for changes. One respondent qualified that answer with a statement that there was a need for more environmental information and one other 4-Her wanted more on goal-setting skills.

4-H Dropout

Most had no comments, although they did mentioned they wished they had taken advantages of the opportunities available.
Question 5

How do you think you will use what you learned in 4-H?

Current 4-H Member

Social skills learned will be used along with ability to work with people, felt they would improve the quality of life because of the technical skills learned. Also felt that information gained would help in career choice and goal setting.

4-H Dropout

Career preparation, information gained concerning citizenship and government. Felt they gained in maturity and learned to take responsibility. Also felt they would use the technical skills learned. Arts and crafts were also mentioned.

Question 6

What do you like about 4-H club meetings?

Current 4-H Member

The opportunity to share information, leadership opportunities, educational program, fun. One respondent mentioned getting out of class.

4-H Dropout

Information learned from demonstrations, the opportunity to vote and express an opinion.
Question 7
What do you dislike about 4-H club meetings?

Current 4-H Members
Eleven of twenty-one said they liked everything. Other comments included; lack of organization, not enough time for club meetings, schedule conflicts (having to choose between 4-H and other clubs)

4-H Dropout
Thirteen of the fourteen "dropouts" interviewed mentioned no dislikes about 4-H club meetings. One respondent mentioned having better guest speakers.

Question 8
Are most of the students in grade in 4-H?

Current 4-H Members
No (18 of 21)
Yes (3 of 21)

4-H Dropouts
No (5 of 14)
Yes (7 of 14)
Two did not respond to the question
Question 9
In no to question 8, why not?

Current 4-H Member

Others are not aware of the program or its benefits. Conflict with other activities. One respondent mentioned school consolidation and one mentioned record books.

4-H Dropouts

Image of too much work, others think 4-H is kids stuff, aggie image.

Question 10
Who helps (helped) you with your project work?

Current 4-H Member

Parents and family, agents, leaders, other 4-Hers. One respondents stated no one helped.

4-H Dropouts

Other family members, two mentioned agents, one mentioned leader.

Question 11
Do you think you will be in 4-H again next year?

Current 4-H Members

The majority of those who would be returning to school (not graduating) said they would rejoin. One current member said they would not rejoin.

4-H Dropout

Question not applicable
Question 12

How long were you in 4-H?

(Question was asked only of dropouts)

4-H Dropouts

Average of the eleven responses was four years with a range from 2 - 8 years.

Question 13

Why did you not rejoin 4-H?

Current 4-H Members

Question not applicable

4-H Dropouts

Twelve of the fourteen respondents mentioned conflicts with other competing activities. One mentioned no time for 4-H, one stated they were tired of it (4-H), and one person said they had changed school.
Summary of Stakeholder Interviews (Adult)

Question 1

What has been your experience with the 4-h program of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service?

Administrator/Specialist

All administrator/specialists interviewed indicated they are still actively involved with the 4-H program.

4-H agents

The years of experience of 4-H agents interviewed ranged from 2.5 years to 14 years.

4-H Alumni

Most of the alumni interviewed were nine year club members. The number of years since their enrollment in 4-H ranged from two years to sixty years.

Organizational Leaders

At least half of those interviewed were former 4-H club members. Years of experience as organizational leaders ranged from two to fifteen years.

Project Leaders

All those interviewed were livestock project leaders. All had been active 4-H club members.

Activity Leaders

Years of experience as activity leaders ranged from three to seven years.
Family Members

All of the family members interviewed were former 4-H club members. Two of those interviewed were currently serving as 4-H club leaders.

School Personnel

All those interviewed had positive experiences. Three administrators had been 4-H leaders prior to assuming their current position.

Current Donors

All had been involved for many years. One of those interviewed had served as a project leader.

Former Donors

One was a former 4-H member, two were parents of current club members.

Elected Community Leaders

One of those interviewed was a former 4-H member. One was the grandparent of a current club member.

Non-Elected Community Leaders

Parent
Question 2

What are your overall views of the 4-H program?

Administrator/Specialist

All comments received were positive. These respondents felt that 4-H develops life skills, leadership, responsibility, and provides educational opportunities when the program is aggressively carried out.

4-H Agent

The respondents felt that the program was outstanding, the most vital part of the Extension Service. Respondents felt that the program develops leadership and responsibility. They felt that more public awareness was needed as well as some updating.

4-H Alumni

All comments were positive. Respondents felt that 4-H teaches responsibility, self-confidence, independence, projects, record-keeping and offered a broad spectrum of activities.

Organizational Leaders

Felt there was not enough minority participation and nothing was being done to increase minority participation. Respondents felt that the program as good for middle-level achievers, it promotes self-esteem, works well with schools in the lower grades, and had worthwhile community service and citizenship activities.
Project Leaders

Respondents felt the program provided an opportunity to succeed and taught life skills and leadership

Activity Leaders

Felt that 4-H is one of the best programs in the state. Teaches people leadership skills

Family Members

Felt 4-H is an excellent organization. Liked the opportunity for leadership and responsibility and would like to see more kids join.

School Personnel

Very positive responses. Felt that 4-H provides opportunities not otherwise available. Teaches leadership, responsibility and citizenship.

Current Donors

Felt that the program is great because of the work the Cooperative Extension Service does with young people

Former Donors

Felt that 4-H is a positive program conducted well by Extension personnel

Elected Community Leaders

View 4-H as an excellent program. Impressed with the curriculum. Felt the program needs more adult support

Non-Elected Community Leaders

Excellent program. Positively affect 4-H’ers future
Question 3

What do you think the 4-H program is trying to accomplish?

Administrator/Specialist

Develop life skills, responsibility, leadership and technical skills. Make kids better citizens and more responsible individuals.

4-H Agent

Develop self-sufficient human beings, leaders, good citizens and increase self-esteem of youth.

4-H Alumni

Develop responsible citizenry, increase community involvement, self-confidence, self-esteem and leadership skills.

Organizational Leaders

Family development, provide citizenship experiences, community activities, develop more responsible and reliable citizens. Teach life skills and self confidence. Education in a fun way. Tries to bring out the best. Encourages individual achievement.

Project Leaders

Keeps kids out of trouble. Gives kids a challenge. Teaches citizenship and responsibility.

Activity Leaders

Develop youth into productive citizens. Teaches leadership skills, life skills, moral values and respect for one another.
Family Members

Teaches leadership, responsibility and skills.
Prepares youth for the future.

School Personnel

Provides learning experiences. Teaches responsibility, leadership skills, citizenship and self-esteem.

Current Donors

Educate young people. Make youth better citizens.
One respondent was not sure.

Former Donors

Develop responsibility, self-esteem and citizenship.

Elected Community Leaders

Compliments the formal school system. Teaches citizenship, leadership and responsibility.

Non-Elected Community Leaders

Teaches citizenship
Question 4

Are there other things you think the program should be trying to accomplish?

Administrator/Specialist

Four-H needs to update methods, change approach. Needs to offer non-traditional subjects and more science-based programs.

4-H Agent

Four-H needs to reach non-traditional clientele. Re-focus time and make more productive use if time.

4-H Alumni

Four respondents thought there were no additional items needed. Others felt that 4-H needs to change with the times by working more with the elderly, more training sessions and more new ideas and programs.

Organizational Leaders

Need more urban and high school programming. Less diversified. Among the subject areas suggested were: child safety, drug awareness, self-esteem, how to handle stress, avoiding peer pressure and making life choices.

Project Leaders

Respondents felt 4-H needed to reach more children and let children know more about the opportunities in 4-H.

Activity Leaders

Felt 4-H should change image to adapt to society
Family Members

More urban involvement. Work to retain members through high school. More education of school personnel about 4-H.

School Personnel

Felt 4-H was limited because of time restraints. Also felt 4-H needed to target at-risk youth.

Current Donors

None mentioned

Former Donors

None mentioned

Elected Community Leaders

No specifics mentioned

Non-Elected Community Leaders

None mentioned
Question 5

Who do you think is being served by the 4-H program?

Administrator/Specialist

Interested youth, mostly rural non-farm, students, the community, the country. Ages 9 – 19.

4-H Agent

Mostly rural youth, adults and families

4-H Alumni

Youth, parents, community

Organizational Leaders

Rural youth, broad spectrum of youth. Also felt leaders being served.

Project Leaders

Felt that in the past it was mainly rural but now more urban and populated areas. One respondents felt livestock kids were being served, one felt inner-city kids.

Activity Leaders

Youth 8 – 19. Children, community.

Family Members

Felt the children enrolled and families were being served.

School Personnel

Felt that 4-H serves everyone, but attracts the average and above average student. Parent and community also being served.
Current Donors
Youth, entire community

Former Donors
Community at large

Elected Community Leaders
Children, average and better students

Non-Elected Community Leaders
Everyone in a round-about way

Question 6
Are there others who you think should be served?

Administrator/Specialist
Felt Extension was doing all it good with the available manpower; however did feel Extension should better serve metropolitan areas and minorities.

4-H Agent
More urban and at-risk youth. Need to develop leaders to multiply efforts.

4-H Alumni
Most felt no additional needs. One respondent mentioned more urban youth needed to be served.

Organizational Leaders
Make program more appropriate to urban and inner city youth.
Project Leaders

Four felt there were no additional needs. More inner city kids were mentioned although it was acknowledged that it was difficult for 4-H to get into the school system.

Activity Leaders

Inner city programs needed

Family Members

City kids and make program available in more schools. Felt the family and community should be more involved.

School Personnel

Felt larger numbers should be served at the junior high and senior high levels. Also saw need for involving more lower than average and special education students.

Current Donors

No specifics mentioned

Former Donors

Perhaps students beyond high school

Elected Community Leaders

No specifics mentioned

Non-Elected Community Leaders

No specifics mentioned

Question 7

What benefits do you feel people receive from their participation in 4-H?

Administrator/Specialist

Life skills, technical skills, confidence and leadership.
4-H Agent

Leadership, responsibility, self-confidence and self-esteem.

4-H Alumni

Sense of accomplishment, achievement. Learn to get along with others and helping other people. Learn how to study, keep records and how to hold meetings. Learn about career choices.

Organizational Leaders

Personal development, e.g. organizational skills, careers, citizenship, public speaking, manual skills, personal hygiene. Learn about the impact of agriculture on the community. Acquire a sense of belonging, self-confidence, leadership. Learn life-long skills, study skills.

Project Leaders

Youth receive education outside the classroom. Parent enjoy seeing the kids compete. Valuable learning experiences from meeting other people.

Activity Leaders

Learn to set goals, self-esteem, increase their educational ability. Learn to meet others. Learn about record keeping and money management.
Family Members


School Personnel

Youth gain experiences to draw from later in life. Teaches self-confidence, self-worth, self-respect. Involves social as well as educational. Teaches youth to lead as well as to follow.

Current Donors

Teaches youth how to deal with others, increases community awareness. Good preparation for life.

Former Donors


Elected Community Leaders

Youth learn to be good, productive citizens. Learn about self, how to accept competition. Learn to meet people.

Non-Elected Community Leaders

Youth learn to be independent, creative thinkers, better citizens and leaders. Recognition provided for every child.
Question 8

What other benefits do you feel people receive from the 4-H program?

Administrator/Specialist

Adults better understand the needs and desires of youth. Encourages higher education and leadership. Provides recognition. Produces a more rational citizenry. Youth learn group dynamics.

4-H Agent

Youth have opportunities to make choices, good or bad.

4-H Alumni

Competition benefits the community and agriculture. Youth learn to meet people.

Organizational Leaders

Scholarships, parliamentary procedure, citizenship, community awareness. Youth have the opportunity to belong to a group. Project books provide general information. Youth learn the difference between right and wrong.

Project Leaders

Program is family oriented. Provides good image about kids.

Activity Leaders

Helps school performance. Youth learn about self-esteem. Improves the community. Youth learn how to meet people.
Family Members

Occupies time positively. Community enrichment and involvement.

School Personnel

Allow 4-H and school to look good together. Improves school performance.

Current Donors

Agricultural careers may be enhanced.

Former Donors

Family benefits. Livestock projects may be economically beneficial.

Elected Community Leaders

None mentioned

Non-Elected Community Leaders

Encourages community involvement. Produces better citizens

Question 9

Are there other things 4-H could do to bring about these benefits?

Administrator/Specialist

More opportunities for adults to be involved. More specialist involvement in 4-H. School enrichment, community clubs.

4-H Agent

Attract more urban youth. Emphasize junior leadership.
4-H Alumni

Better job of marketing 4-H. More motivated leaders and more parental involvement. More agents needed to organize clubs.

Organizational Leaders

Minority role models in state office. More parental involvement.

Project Leaders

Increase number of 4-H agents. Consider family schedules of working parents when scheduling 4-H events.

Activity Leaders

Increase the number of leaders.

Family Members

Reach more students.

School Personnel

Alter image. More support from home and businesses.

Current Donors

Drug awareness

Former Donors

None mentioned

Elected Community Leaders

None mentioned

Non-Elected Community Leaders

None mentioned
Question 10

How do you feel that 4-H operates as an educational program in the schools?

Administrator/Specialist

Provides educational opportunities not available in the classroom on a regular basis. Makes Extension more visible and part of the educational system. Need to become more aware of the school curriculum to fit school programs better. Need more flexible time for agents and in programming.

4-H Agent

Provides non-formal and experiential learning.

4-H Alumni

Provides educational and motivational experiences. Complimentary to the school system. Project books serves a resources to the students.

Organizational Leaders

Supplements instruction. Very dependent on the leader. Gives youth the opportunity to apply skills in everyday life.

Project Leaders

Educational, hands-on experience

Activity Leaders

Excellent

Family Members

Great combination of educator and co-curricular cooperation
**School Personnel**

Integral part of the school system.

**Current Donors**

Motivates club members to become better students

**Former Donors**

Very well, although acknowledge some weak leaders.

**Elected Community Leaders**

Very good educational program. Some problems with competition for school time.

**Non-Elected Community Leaders**

Good co-curricular design

**Question 11**

**Are there needs of youth not being met that 4-H should be meeting?**

**Administrator/Specialist**

Not reaching some children that we should be reaching.

**4-H Agent**

Needs of urban and at-risk youth

**4-H Alumni**

Need workshops other than livestock. Need to work with older youth, metropolitan youth. Provide training in decision making and job skills.

**Organizational Leaders**

Program on career awareness, cultural diversity, peer pressure.
Project Leaders

Drug related problems, AIDS. Balance resources between northern and southern parts of the state.

Activity Leaders

More information on drug abuse

Family Members

Felt all needs were being met

School Personnel

Get non-traditional audiences involved. Involve parents and orient as to what their role could be.

Current Donors

None mentioned

Former Donors

None mentioned

Elected Community Leaders

None mentioned

Non-Elected Community Leaders

None mentioned

Question 12

In your role in the 4-H program do you feel you are adequately supported?

Administrator/Specialist

Five respondents answered yes; one answered yes and no

4-H Agent

One answered yes; three answered yes and no
4-H Alumni
    Yes

Organizational Leaders
    Yes

Project Leaders
    Yes

Activity Leaders
    Yes

Family Members
    Yes

School Personnel
    Yes

Current Donors
    Yes

Former Donors
    From a business point of view - No

Elected Community Leaders
    Yes

Non-Elected Community Leaders
    Yes

Question 13

If yes, how?

Administrator/Specialist

Administration, staff, programs and materials
4-H Agent

By the 4-H staff and specialists, local Extension staff, school system and policy makers.

4-H Alumni

Agents, family members, leaders and Extension administration.

Organizational Leaders

Agents, family members, leaders and Extension administration, school personnel.

Project Leaders

Agents and leaders.

Activity Leaders

Parish Extension agent

Family Members

Extension and school personnel

School Personnel

School administrators, faculty and staff, parents, community, Extension staff.

Current Donors

Extension staff, community, mutual donor-recipient.

Former Donors

Extension staff, community, mutual donor-recipient.

Elected Community Leaders

Cooperation of adults, especially Extension staff and the Agricultural Center.
Non-Elected Community Leaders

Agents and leaders

Question 14
If no, what more do you feel is needed?

Administrator/Specialist
Reallocation of funds and personnel. More subject-matter training. Attention to program other than livestock.

4-H Agent
More personnel. Flexibility in programming. More support from agents doing adult work.

4-H Alumni
More clubs, adopt-a-student program, on-the-job-training

Organizational Leaders
More support at school

Project Leaders
None mentioned

Activity Leaders
More agent time

Family Members
None mentioned

School Personnel
None mentioned

Current Donors
None mentioned
**Former Donors**

Desires to be a part of the educational program.

**Elected Community Leaders**

None mentioned

**Non-Elected Community Leaders**

None mentioned

**Question 15**

What do you think is the future of 4-H in Louisiana?

**Administrator/Specialist**

Bright, unlimited. As good as personnel and planning. Stress school enrichment, curriculum development. Keep policy-makers informed. Good marketing effort.

**4-H Agent**

New focus away from traditional programming but cannot lose traditional. More urban 4-H, leader development.

**4-H Alumni**

Positive, wonderful future. Move away from the traditional.

**Organizational Leaders**

Good

**Project Leaders**

Changing from rural to urban

**Activity Leaders**

On the upswing

**Family Members**

Focus on current needs, expand enrollment
School Personnel

Positive. People need to be willing to take leadership roles.

Current Donors

Excellent

Former Donors

Bright, but funding is critical

Elected Community Leaders

Future looks good, continue with support of business and community

Non-Elected Community Leaders

Future is great
APPENDIX D

PRESENTATION TO LCES
ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
OVERVIEW OF THE 4-H EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to design the 4-H youth development program of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service (LCES) following the Evaluability Assessment process focused on stakeholder views and a specific modelling logic.

Results

Five target groups of the 4-H program were identified: 4-H youth, other youth, family members, leaders, and policy makers. Themes emerging from stakeholder views of the 4-H program included:

1. The program:
   a. is structured more for younger and high school youth than for 6-8 grade youth,
   b. serves mostly rural youth, average and above average achieving students,
   c. highly emphasizes social skills,
   d. inculcates self-sufficiency, life skills, citizenship, leadership and family relationships,
   e. needs to involve more urban and minority youth,
   f. offers experiential educational opportunities that complement the school curriculum and enhances individual student performance.

2. The image of 4-H does not attract non-traditional audiences
3. The volunteer and professional base is limited

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn.

1. Stakeholders have a good understanding of the 4-H youth program, support the LCES, and appreciate the performance of 4-H agents.

2. The 4-H program helps youth develop life skills, self-sufficiency, citizenship and leadership; promotes stronger family units; is most effective with younger, rural, academically average and above average youth; offers experiential learning that complements the school curriculum; increases family involvement and youth’s motivation to be better students.

3. The 4-H program is not reaching enough urban, minority, early adolescents and older youth.

4. The volunteer and professional base of the program is too small.

5. The 4-H program needs to be better promoted.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made:

1. The 4-H youth advisory system for program development should be restructured to incorporate inputs from the county, area and state level professional staff and stakeholders.

   The working group of the 4-H Evaluability Assessment felt that the mechanism for the 4-H Advisory Committee should be similar to that used by the Livestock Show Advisory Committee.
Parish agents will be encouraged to hold parish advisory committee meetings for the purpose of identifying program concerns dealing with the 4-H program. Obviously parish advisory committees will continue to deal with parish level contests, rules, and other items associated with the local 4-H program. However it is the intent of the working group that parish committees also deal with items that have programmatic implications. Examples would include: 4-H literature concerns, educational program availability, educational intent of 4-H camp etc.

Parish concerns would then be sent to the District Agent who would, in turn, conduct a meeting of 4-H agents in the area to discuss parish level concerns and formulate a prioritized list of concerns. This list would then be forwarded to the state 4-H advisory committee.

The state advisory committee will review recommendations from all seven areas of the state and develop a set of recommendations, with regard to programming, for the coming year. This set of recommendations will then be sent to the state 4-H advisory (management) council. It is requested that the state council respond to the recommendations by sending a letter with the results of the advisory council’s meeting, to all 4-H agents, if not all agents and specialists.

There may exist a need for various ad hoc committees to be formed to deal with the implementation of the
recommendations that will come from the state advisory committee. These committees should be chaired by the appropriate state 4-H specialist or parish or area agent. These committees should exist solely for the implementation of recommendations.

The proposed time frame for the implementation of such an advisory system is as follows:
Parish Advisory Committees meet - September 1992 - April 1993
4-H agents meet as an area to discuss recommendations - May 1993
State 4-H Advisory Committee meets - August 1993
State 4-H Management Council meets and responds - September 1993

In an effort to assist parish agents prepare for these changes a 45 minute session on the use of parish advisory committees has been scheduled for presentation at the LAE4-HA Annual Meeting in August of 1992.
PARISH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DISTRICT AGENT COMPILES PARISH RECOMMENDATIONS

AREA 4-H AGENTS MEET AND AGREE UPON RECOMMENDATIONS

STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETS TO COMPILE AND AGREE UPON RECOMMENDATIONS

State Committee comprised of:
4-H Division Leader, Chairperson
4-H Specialists 3
Staff Development Specialist 1
District Agents 2
National Conference Delegates 2
Division Leaders 3
Subject matter Specialist 3
4-H Agents (1 per area) 7
President, LAE4-HA 1
Adult Leaders 3
(one to be a representative of the State 4-H Foundation)

4-H MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETS TO ADOPT/NOT ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS

4-H Management Council comprised of:
Dr. Denver T. Loupe, Chairman
Adult Leaders 3
(one to be a representative of the State 4-H Foundation)
President, LAE4-HA 1
4-H Agents 3
National Conference Delegates 2
Dr. Norma Roberts
Dr. Stanley Lamendola
2. The program logic model developed in the EA should be adopted by the LCES with all its programming underpinnings.

A program logic model of sequenced main events, activities and indicators for each main event, barriers impeding movement from one main event to the next, and barrier reductions to facilitate such progress was developed by the working group.

The program logic model was comprised of the following sequenced main events: (1) Assess needs; (2) Define Extension's role and nature of commitment; (3) Allocate resources and develop program; (4) Acquire and/or train staff; (5) Initiate networks/coalitions; (6) Create awareness and promote program; and (7) Provide educational experiences to target audiences.

The working group recommends that this logic model, with all its programming underpinnings be accepted by the LCES as the guideline for 4-H programming.
The entries in each circle represent the following: B - Barriers  I - Intervening Events
3. Personnel assignments and training should be focused on concerns found in the study and on process skills

The working group recommends that training for newly hired agents incorporate the concerns found in the study (more urban and minority involvement, increased programming for older youth...) and process skills (communication, educational methodology, motivation and discipline of youth etc.).

The group suggest that this training be made available to new agents for two weeks each year for the first three years of a youth agent’s employment with LCES. The group realizes that this amount of time away from the parish, in addition to the time already allocated to agent training, shortcourse, camp, livestock show and other events, is substantial.

Possible ways of dealing with this increased time away from the parish were discussed and include: restructuring the two courses currently required of new agents to include some of these concerns and process skills; putting new agents on a different track during interdisciplinary training which would include process skills.

It was also suggested that some of this training might be conducted at Camp Grant Walker thereby decreasing the costs of this training.
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