



Building Non-Profit
Capacity and
Community
Partnerships:

Findings from
the Communities
Empowering Youth
(CEY) Evaluation



TECHNICAL REPORT

OPRE REPORT #: 2011-35

NOVEMBER 2011

BUILDING NON-PROFIT CAPACITY AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS: FINDINGS FROM THE COMMUNITIES EMPOWERING YOUTH (CEY) EVALUATION

TECHNICAL REPORT

OPRE Report 2011-35

November 2011

Submitted to:

Nancye Campbell, Project Officer
Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Submitted by:

Kim Francis, Amy Minzner, Lianne Fisman, and Lindsay Fox, Abt Associates
Barbara Fink, Branch Associates

Contract Number: HHS P233200800067G

Project Director: Amy Minzner
Abt Associates
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA, 02138

This report is in the public domain. Permission to reproduce is not necessary. Suggested citation: Francis, Kim, et al. (2011). Building Non-Profit Capacity and Community Partnerships: Findings from the Communities Empowering Youth (CEY) Evaluation – Technical Report, OPRE Report # 2011-35, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, the Administration for Children and Families, or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

This report and other reports sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation are available at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/index.html>. A restricted use dataset, including all data used to complete this report, will be available through the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) sometime in 2012.



Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
1.1	The CEY Evaluation Design	1
1.2	Organizational Capacity Building Domains	4
1.3	Partnership Capacity Domain	4
1.4	Additional Survey Items	5
2.	Methodology	6
2.1	Sampling Design.....	6
2.2	Survey Weights.....	7
2.3	CEY Survey Measures.....	9
2.4	Analytic Approach.....	16
2.5	Multiple Comparisons Analysis	20
3.	Results – Temporal Comparisons.....	22
3.1	Data from Lead Organizations	22
3.2	Data from Partner Organizations.....	37
4.	Results – Subgroup Comparisons.....	53
4.1	Lead Organizations by Cohort.....	54
4.2	Partners by Cohort	61
4.3	Lead Organizations by Pre-existing Partnership	69
4.4	Partners by Pre-existing Partnership.....	76
4.5	Lead Organizations by Partnership Size.....	84
4.6	Partners by Partnership Size	91
	References	99

List of Exhibits

Exhibit 1.1:	CEY Evaluation Data Collection Schedule	2
Exhibit 1.2:	CEY Evaluation Response Rates	3
Exhibit 1.3:	Number of Partners in the Sample (S) and Who Responded (R) to the Survey	3
Exhibit 2.1:	Distribution of the 2006 CEY Grantees by Strata	6
Exhibit 2.2:	Organization and Partnership Characteristics	9
Exhibit 2.3:	Leadership Development.....	10
Exhibit 2.4:	Organizational Development.....	11
Exhibit 2.5:	Program Development.....	13
Exhibit 2.6:	Community Engagement.....	13
Exhibit 2.7:	Partnership Capacity.....	14
Exhibit 2.8:	Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the CEY Grant	15
Exhibit 2.9:	Partnership Development and Dynamics	15
Exhibit 2.10:	Results of the Multiple Comparisons Analysis	21
Exhibit 3.1:	Characteristics of Lead Organizations.....	22
Exhibit 3.2:	Characteristics of Lead Organizations (cont.)	24
Exhibit 3.3:	Changes in Leadership Development—Lead Organizations.....	24
Exhibit 3.4:	Changes in Organizational Development—Lead Organizations.....	26
Exhibit 3.5:	Changes in Program Development—Lead Organizations	31
Exhibit 3.6:	Changes in Community Engagement—Lead Organizations.....	32
Exhibit 3.7:	Changes in Partnership Capacity—Lead Organizations	33
Exhibit 3.8:	Changes in Perceptions of the Effectiveness of CEY Grant—Lead Organizations ...	35
Exhibit 3.9:	Changes in Partnership Development and Dynamics—Lead Organizations	36
Exhibit 3.10:	Characteristics of Partner Organizations	37
Exhibit 3.11:	Characteristics of Partner Organizations (cont.)	38
Exhibit 3.12:	Changes in Leadership Development—Partners.....	38
Exhibit 3.13:	Changes in Organizational Development – Partners.....	40
Exhibit 3.14:	Changes in Program Development – Partners.....	45
Exhibit 3.15:	Changes in Community Engagement—Partners.....	46
Exhibit 3.16:	Changes in Partnership Capacity—Partners.....	48
Exhibit 3.17:	Changes in Perceptions of the Effectiveness of CEY Grant—Partners	50
Exhibit 3.18:	Changes in Partnership Development and Dynamics—Partners	51
Exhibit 4.1:	Subgroup Changes in Leadership Development—Lead Organizations Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007	54

Exhibit 4.2:	Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007.....	55
Exhibit 4.3:	Subgroup Changes in Program Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007	58
Exhibit 4.4:	Subgroup Changes in Community Engagement— Lead Organizations Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007	59
Exhibit 4.5:	Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity— Lead Organizations Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007	60
Exhibit 4.6:	Subgroup Changes in Leadership Development— Partners Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007	61
Exhibit 4.7:	Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Partners Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007	62
Exhibit 4.8:	Subgroup Changes in Program Development— Partners Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007	65
Exhibit 4.9:	Subgroup Changes in Community Engagement— Partners Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007	66
Exhibit 4.10:	Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity— Partners Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007	67
Exhibit 4.11:	Subgroup Changes in Leadership Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships.....	69
Exhibit 4.12:	Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships	70
Exhibit 4.13:	Subgroup Changes in Program Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships.....	73
Exhibit 4.14:	Subgroup Changes in Community Engagement— Lead Organizations Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships.....	74
Exhibit 4.15:	Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity— Lead Organizations Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships.....	75
Exhibit 4.16:	Subgroup Changes in Leadership Development— Partners Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships.....	76
Exhibit 4.17:	Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Partners Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships.....	77
Exhibit 4.18:	Subgroup Changes in Program Development— Partners Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships.....	80
Exhibit 4.19:	Subgroup Changes in Community Engagement— Partners Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships.....	81
Exhibit 4.20:	Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity— Partners Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships	82
Exhibit 4.21:	Subgroup Changes in Leadership Development—Lead Organizations Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships	84

Exhibit 4.22:	Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships	85
Exhibit 4.23:	Subgroup Changes in Program Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships	88
Exhibit 4.24:	Subgroup Changes in Community Engagement— Lead Organizations Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships	89
Exhibit 4.25:	Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity— Lead Organizations Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships	90
Exhibit 4.26:	Subgroup Changes in Leadership Development—2007 Partners Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships	91
Exhibit 4.27:	Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development—2007 Partners Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships	92
Exhibit 4.28:	Subgroup Changes in Program Development—2007 Partners Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships	95
Exhibit 4.29:	Subgroup Changes in Community Engagement—2007 Partners Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships	96
Exhibit 4.30:	Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity—2007 Partners Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships	97

1. Introduction

In 2006, the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) at the Department of Health and Human Services established the Communities Empowering Youth (CEY) program.¹ CEY's intent was to address the capacity building needs of partnerships of nonprofit organizations (NPOs) that were tackling issues of gang violence, youth violence, or child abuse and neglect. CEY projects consisted of a partnership between a lead organization/institution (the grantee) and at least two other partnering NPOs that provided services to youth within a specific geographical area. In 2006 ACF, through the Office of Community Services (OCS), awarded three-year grants to 100 CEY partnerships; in 2007 ACF funded 31 additional partnerships.

Abt Associates conducted the evaluation of the CEY program for ACF. This evaluation included annual surveys of the organizations receiving CEY funding over the program's three-year grant cycle. The survey measures changes in two types of capacity: 1) organizational capacity of each lead organization and their partner organizations and 2) partnership capacity.

This technical report describes the methodology of the baseline (2008), first follow-up (2009), and second follow-up (2010) surveys, and provides detailed tables of results. It is divided into four chapters. Chapter 1 provides an overview of the CEY evaluation, including the study design and definitions of *organizational capacity* and *partnership capacity*. Chapter 2 discusses the evaluation methodology including sampling design, weights, and analytic approach. Chapter 3 presents baseline organizational characteristics and the results of the temporal comparisons from the survey data. Chapter 4 presents the subgroup comparisons.

This Technical Report is a companion document to the main report, *Building Non-Profit Capacity and Community Partnerships: Findings from the Communities Empowering Youth Evaluation*. The main report includes a summary of the study's findings and conclusions.

1.1 The CEY Evaluation Design

The federal CEY evaluation is a descriptive, longitudinal outcome study of changes in organizational capacity and partnership development among the CEY lead organizations and their partners over their three-year grant cycles.² The evaluation focused on a representative sample of 50 (of 100) lead organizations from the 2006 grant year cohort and all 31 lead organizations from the 2007 grant year cohort. The entire population of partners associated with each lead organization in the study is also included. Thus, the evaluation sample is generalizable to all 131 CEY grants and over 800 associated partner organizations.

¹ CEY is one of the three major programs comprising the Compassion Capital Fund (CCF). The primary purposes of CCF were to help nonprofit organizations (NPOs) increase their effectiveness, enhance their ability to provide social services to those most in need, expand their organizations, diversify their funding sources, and create collaborations to better serve those in need.

² In addition to the survey, the CEY evaluation included a longitudinal case study to document operational activities and partnership interactions over the course of the three-year grant period.

As noted above, the evaluation examined two general types of capacity: organizational capacity of both the lead organization and each partner organization, and partnership capacity. Organizational capacity includes the four capacity domains specified in the CEY grant announcement: 1) leadership development, 2) organizational development, 3) program development, and 4) community engagement. Partnership capacity includes the areas of goal setting and action planning, communication, leadership, and sustainability for each CEY partnership.

The three research questions for this evaluation are:

1. To what extent and in what domains did organizational capacity increase?
2. To what extent and in what domains did the CEY partnerships' capacity increase?
3. How do capacity outcomes vary by characteristics of the lead agency, the partners and the partnership?

The evaluation was designed to measure changes in organizational and partnership capacity against an established baseline by conducting annual follow-up surveys over the initiative's three-year time period. As shown in Exhibit 1.1, the evaluation team collected data annually from the CEY lead grantees and their partners between 2008 and 2010. Follow-up data were collected once from the 2006 cohort (in 2009) and twice from the 2007 cohort (in 2009 and 2010). The second follow-up survey was only conducted for the 2007 cohort because the grants for the 2006 cohort expired in 2009.³

CEY Cohort	Baseline Survey 2008	Follow-up Survey 2009	Follow-up Survey 2010
2006	✓	✓	
2007	✓	✓	✓

All three waves of data were collected using an individualized Web-based survey that accommodated the distinct roles of lead and partner organizations, as well as the relationships between organizations. Paper surveys were made available to respondents upon request, typically when the organization lacked high-speed Internet access. During the months prior to each round of data collection, a thorough tracking effort was conducted to ensure accurate e-mail addresses and contact information. OCS program officers also encouraged lead organizations to cooperate with the survey. Further, each lead and partner organization had available to them a team of data collection liaisons provided by the Abt evaluation team to assist them in completing the survey. Baseline survey data collection occurred from February 2008 through June 2008. First follow-up data collection occurred from April 2009 through August 2009, and second follow-up data collection occurred from April 2010 through August

³ The 2008 survey was considered baseline for the 2007 cohort due to the delayed implementation schedule of this group; no significant grant activity occurred prior to the 2008 survey. The 2006 cohort reported retrospective baseline data at the time of the 2008 survey; because no significant differences were detected between their retrospective responses and their 2008 responses, the 2008 data were treated as baseline for the 2006 cohort as well.

2010. The technical assistance provided by the liaisons and the intensive use of an integrated and customized tracking database contributed to the high response rates, shown in Exhibit 1.2

Organization Type	Baseline Survey 2008	Follow-up Survey 2009	Follow-up Survey 2010
Lead Organizations	100%	100%	100%
Partners	95	97	94
Overall	96	97	95

Exhibit 1.3 presents the number of partners in the sample at baseline, first follow-up, and second follow-up and the number who responded to each of the surveys. The baseline survey included 81 lead organizations (50 from the 2006 cohort, 31 from 2007) and their 459 original partner organizations, and the first follow-up survey included the same 81 lead organizations and their 479 current partner organizations. At second follow-up, only the organizations from the 2007 cohort were surveyed. Thus, the second follow-up survey included 31 lead organizations and their 142 current partner organizations. While the survey sample included the entire population of partners associated with each lead organization at the time of the survey, some partners did not respond to the baseline or the follow-up surveys. Moreover, we also included 34 “former partners” in the first follow-up survey sample in addition to the 479 current partners, and, at second follow-up, 15 “former partners” were included in addition to the 142 current partners. “Former partners” are organizations that participated in a CEY partnership at baseline but left the partnership some time thereafter.

	2006 Cohort		2007 Cohort		All	
	S	R	S	R	S	R
Baseline	326	306	133	130	459	436
First Follow-up	355	346	158	151	513	497
Current	334	332	145	144	479	476
Continuing	305	303	119	118	424	421
New	29	29	26	26	55	55
Former	21	14	13	7	34	21
Second Follow-up	-	-	158	149	158	149
Current	-	-	143	139	143	139
Continuing	-	-	137	133	137	133
New	-	-	6	6	6	6
Former	-	-	6	5	6	5
Former-former ^a	-	-	9	5	9	5

^a “Former-former partners” are organizations that participated in a CEY partnership at baseline but left the partnership before the first follow-up. These organizations were surveyed as “former partners” at the first follow-up and as “former-former partners” at the second follow-up.

1.2 Organizational Capacity Building Domains

The CEY evaluation used the broad organizational capacity building outcome domains developed by ACF and outlined in the CEY program grant announcement. The CEY evaluation team, in collaboration with ACF, developed survey questions intended to measure the four domains drawing from existing surveys from previous Compassion Capital Fund evaluations and experts in the field of nonprofit capacity. The four outcome domains were operationalized as follows:

1. **Leadership Development** includes professional development activities that enhance the knowledge and skills of staff in the organization including board members, executive directors, full- and part-time staff, and volunteers.
2. **Organizational Development** is a broad domain that includes the tools and management systems needed to improve organizational effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. These include mission statements and strategies, number and types of revenue sources, funding readiness, staff and volunteer management, and information technology (IT) management. Organizational development also includes reviewing board functions and helping board members to understand their responsibilities.
3. **Program Development** capacity includes efforts to support effective and sustainable programming, such as improving program design and service delivery, as well as the monitoring and evaluation of program services.
4. **Community Engagement** includes the extent to which nonprofit organizations offer programs focused on community needs, obtain credibility and support from the wider community, and establish or enhance community outreach activities and collaborative relationships.

1.3 Partnership Capacity Domain

A fifth outcome domain, partnership capacity, was operationalized into five sub-areas:

1. **Leadership Development** in the partnership capacity context includes building and managing interagency relationships. For the CEY evaluation, we further define leadership development as the development of trust and relationship building among leaders within each organization and across staff.
2. **Shared Mission and Objectives** includes developing a clear, inspiring, shared purpose that is central to the work of partnering organizations.
3. **Communication** is the extent to which participating in the CEY partnership led to better communication and working relationships among participating organizations.
4. **Action Planning** is outlining tasks that need to be achieved, including timelines and formal delegation of responsibilities.

5. ***Sustainability Planning*** involves creating a plan to continue the partnership past the 3-year grant cycle.

1.4 Additional Survey Items

In response to findings from the baseline survey and initial site visits, the evaluation team added measures to the follow-up surveys in the following two areas: 1) Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the CEY Grant; and 2) Partnership Development and Dynamics. Brief descriptions of these areas are provided below:

1. ***Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the CEY Grant.*** A series of questions was added to the first and second follow-up surveys to improve understanding of how participating organizations perceived the effectiveness of the CEY grant and the extent to which they were satisfied with partnership and capacity-building activities.
2. ***Partnership Development and Dynamics.*** Because several of the partnerships were fluid, with their composition changing from year to year, we added a series of questions to the first and second follow-up surveys to improve understanding about why partners left or joined the partnerships. The questions are tailored for lead organizations, former partner organizations, and new partner organizations.

2. Methodology

This chapter describes the methodology used to design, implement, and analyze the CEY survey. We begin by discussing the sampling design of the study and calculation of weights. Then we define the capacity and partnership measures and the subgroups formed to analyze the survey data, followed by a description of the analytic approach.

2.1 Sampling Design

The CEY grantees are divided into two cohorts, 2006 and 2007, based on the initial year of their grant awards. A detailed discussion of the sample selection process for each cohort is presented below.

2.1.1 Sample Selection of the 2006 Grantees

From the target population of 100 lead organizations in the 2006 cohort, we selected a representative sample of 50 organizations, including all of their partner organizations.⁴

We selected organization type (i.e., faith-based, community-based) as the key stratifying variable for the sampling design.⁵ Within each of these groups, we further sorted the population of grantees based on whether they provided capacity building only, or capacity building *and* direct services. Distribution of the population by strata, and the sample by strata, is shown in Exhibit 2.1.

Exhibit 2.1: Distribution of the 2006 CEY Grantees by Strata

Type	Capacity Building	Capacity Building and Direct Service	Total
Faith-based	2 (2)	8 (8)	10 (10)
Community-based	18 (12)	72 (28)	90 (40)
Total	20 (14)	80 (36)	100 (50)

We allocated the sample to each stratum to ensure reliable estimates both for faith-based and community-based grantees. In collaboration with ACF, we included all faith-based grantees in the sample with certainty because of the small number of faith-based grantees. As Exhibit 2.1 shows, the final 2006 sample includes all 10 faith-based lead organizations.

We selected the remaining 40 2006 grantees by sampling from two strata of the community-based grantees: 1) the capacity building stratum, and 2) the stratum for both capacity building and direct service. The sampling design did not entail strict proportional allocation. To ensure reliable estimates for each stratum while keeping the sample size at 40 community-based grantees, we oversampled in

⁴ The sample size of 50 was based on a power analysis presented in the design report (Abt Associates & Branch Associates, 2007).

⁵ Organization type was selected because a preliminary objective of the evaluation was to study the differences between faith-based and community-based organizations.

the first stratum and decreased the sample count in the second stratum. The details of how the 40 community-based grantees were selected are presented next.

Community-Based Capacity Building Stratum: First, we allocated the sample proportionately to the population. Proportional allocation resulted in a small sample size (8 out of 40 organizations). Therefore, the second step was to adjust the sample slightly to ensure reliable estimates for each stratum. This resulted in oversampling in this stratum, selecting 12, instead of 8, organizations from the 18 lead organizations within this stratum.

In order to select 12 grantees in our sample from the 18 available in the community-based and capacity building stratum, we sorted the list of grantees by urbanicity (rural, urban, or mixed) and numbered them from 1 to 18. Sorting before sample selection and using systematic sampling methods for selection of the sample ensured proportional representation of urbanicity in the sample.

Once we sorted the list of grantees by urbanicity, an equal probability systematic sample was selected. We determined the sampling interval for the selection of the sample by taking the ratio of the population size and sample size. In this case, the sampling interval was $18/12 = 1.5$. Using a random start (derived by selecting a random number between 0 and 1 and multiplying this number by the sampling interval) and the sampling interval of 1.5, 12 grantees were selected into the sample.

Community-Based Stratum with Both Capacity Building and Direct Services: Similar to the previous stratum, we first allocated the sample proportionately. This resulted in 32 organizations within this stratum. In the second step, we adjusted the sample of this stratum to restrict the sample of community-based organization to be 40. Thus, we decreased the sample size slightly and selected 28 out of 72 lead organizations.

We employed the same procedure described above for sample selection in this stratum. We sorted the list of 72 community-based grantees with both capacity building and direct services by rural, urban, and mixed and numbered from 1 to 72. The sampling interval was $72/28 = 2.5714$. Using a random start and a sampling interval of 2.5714, we selected 28 grantees into the sample.

2.1.2 Sample Selection of the 2007 Grantees

We did not sample the 2007 grantees. Therefore, all 31 funded lead organizations (and their partner organizations) were included in this study.

2.2 Survey Weights

To calculate population-based estimates (such as totals, averages, ratios, and proportions), which will allow inference to the total population of 131 funded lead organizations and their partners, we assigned each sampled organization a weight. We calculated the assigned survey weight by multiplying two components described below: the sampling weight and the nonresponse adjustment.

2.2.1 Sampling Weight

We computed separate sampling weights for the lead organizations and partner organizations. The sampling weight for the lead organizations is the inverse of the probability of its selection into the sample. Therefore, all lead organizations selected with certainty, namely all faith-based lead organizations in the 2006 cohort and all lead organizations in the 2007 cohort, were assigned the sampling weight of 1.0. The sampling weight for the other sampled lead organizations is equal to the sampling interval. Therefore, the sampling weight for the lead organizations in the community-based capacity building stratum was 1.5 and that for the lead organizations in the community-based stratum with both capacity building and direct service was 2.5714.

Because partners are nested within lead organizations, the sampling weight for the partner organizations is the multiple of two factors: the sampling weight of its lead organization, and the inverse of the probability of its selection after the lead organization is selected. We selected all partner organizations of the lead organizations in the sample, making the probability of their selection certain and equal to 1.0. Therefore, the sampling weight for all partner organizations was equal to the weight of their respective lead organizations.

2.2.2 Nonresponse Adjustment⁶

After data collection, we calculated the final response rates and adjusted the sampling weights for survey nonresponse. The nonresponse adjustment is the inverse of the survey response rate. If nonresponse to the survey is not taken into account in the weight, the weighted statistics will not provide accurate population estimates.

For all lead organizations, the survey response rates were 100 percent for the baseline, first follow-up, and second follow-up surveys. Hence, no nonresponse adjustment to the sampling weights was needed for the lead organizations. In other words, all lead organizations were assigned the nonresponse adjustment of 1.0.

For the partner organizations, the response rate varied from one partnership to another and between the baseline and follow-up surveys. Nonresponse weights were calculated for each partner by first calculating the response rate of the whole partnership to which each partner belonged, and then taking the inverse. The partner nonresponse adjustments for the baseline survey ranged from 1.0 to 3.0; first follow-up survey ranged from 1.0 to 1.4; and second follow-up survey ranged from 1.0 to 1.7. In the next section, we present an example of how we calculated survey weights for partner organizations.

2.2.3 An Example of Weight Calculation for a Partner Organization

A 2006 lead organization with a sampling weight of 1.5 had 10 partner organizations, but only 8 of them completed the survey resulting in a partnership response rate of 80 percent. To produce population-based estimates, the 8 partner organizations that responded to the survey needed to

⁶ At first follow-up, the data collection team discovered that one partner organization had closed, and at second follow-up, five partner organizations had closed, and one had merged into another organization. When calculating the nonresponse adjustment, these organizations were not included; only organizations deemed as eligible respondents at a given time point are included in the nonresponse calculations.

represent all 10 partner organizations. The survey weight for a responding partner is thus the partner sampling weight adjusted for nonresponse, which is obtained by multiplying the lead sampling weight (1.5) by the inverse of the probability for the selection of partners (1.0) and the inverse of the partnership response rate (1.25). Therefore, the survey weight for each of the eight partner organizations of the lead organization in this example is $1.5 * 1.0 * 1.25 = 1.875$.

2.3 CEY Survey Measures

In this section, we present the individual survey items contained in the CEY survey. The first section lists items pertaining to organizational and partnership characteristics. The next five sections correspond to the five domains measured in the CEY survey. The last two sections list additional items that were added to the follow-up surveys to improve understanding of organizations' perceptions of the effectiveness of the grant and why partners left or joined the partnerships.

2.3.1 Organization and Partnership Characteristics

The CEY survey contained a section with questions about each organization's history, the types of services it provides, and the geographic area in which it provides these services. Additionally, lead organizations were asked questions about their past relationships with other CEY project partners and the structure of their partnerships.

Exhibit 2.2: Organization and Partnership Characteristics

Survey Question	Response Category
Organizational Characteristics	
When was your organization formed?	Month/Year
Is your organization best described as faith-based or secular?	1 = Faith-based 0 = Secular
Is the area your organization serves best described as...	1 = A small town 2 = A large town 3 = A city 4 = An entire state 5 = Multiple geographically distinct areas
At present, is your organization a Weed & Seed agency?	0 = No 1 = Yes
At present, is your organization partnering with any Weed & Seed agencies on the CEY project?	0 = No 1 = Yes
In the past 12 months, has your organization addressed gang violence?	0 = No 1 = Yes
In the past 12 months, has your organization addressed youth violence?	0 = No 1 = Yes
In the past 12 months, has your organization addressed child abuse/neglect?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Does your organization provide direct client services?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Does your organization provide capacity building support to other organizations?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Is the executive director paid?	0 = No 1 = Yes

Exhibit 2.2: Organization and Partnership Characteristics

Survey Question	Response Category
<i>Partnership Characteristics</i>	
What structure best describes your partnership?	1 = My organization is the lead and has organized a set of partners to achieve CEY capacity building goals 2 = My organization is the lead and has organized a set of partners who each support their own group of partner orgs 3 = A coalition or committee of organizations shares lead organization responsibilities with my organization designated as the CEY lead
Was your CEY partnership an existing partnership?	0 = No 1 = Yes
How many total partner organizations belong to your CEY partnership?	#

2.3.2 Domain 1: Leadership Development

The CEY survey questions related to this domain ask whether executive directors, staff, and volunteers participated in different types of professional development training.

Exhibit 2.3: Leadership Development

Survey Question	Response Category
<i>Executive Director Development</i>	
Did the executive director participate in any training related to management and administration?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Did the executive director participate in any training related to fundraising?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Did the executive director participate in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?	0 = No 1 = Yes
<i>Full- and Part-time Staff Development</i>	
How many paid staff participated in any training related to management and administration?	#
How many paid staff participated in any training related to fundraising?	#
How many paid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?	#
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to management and administration?	#
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to fundraising?	#
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?	#
<i>Volunteer Development</i>	
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to management and administration?	#
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to fundraising?	#
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?	#

2.3.3 Domain 2: Organizational Development

The CEY survey items listed below address organizational development. The items ask about the presence of mission statements, strategic plans, and fund development plans, as well as the structure and staffing of the organization. Also included are measures of revenue, revenue sources, and the use of information technology.

Exhibit 2.4: Organizational Development

Survey Question	Response Category
Mission and Strategic Planning	
In the past 12 months, has your organization formally assessed its organizational needs/strengths?	0 = No 1 = Yes (As part of CEY process, independent of CEY process, both)
Does your organization have a mission statement?	0 = No (No, Unwritten) 1 = Yes (Written)
Does your organization have a strategic plan?	0 = No (No, Unwritten) 1 = Yes (Written)
Governance and Organizational Structure	
Is your organization governed by a parent or umbrella organization's Board of Directors?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Is your organization governed by an Advisory Panel?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Is your organization governed by its own Board of Directors?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Board responsibilities include: Goal/Strategy development	0 = No 1 = Yes
Board responsibilities include: Community/Stakeholder outreach	0 = No 1 = Yes
Board responsibilities include: Budget development	0 = No 1 = Yes
Board responsibilities include: Financial review	0 = No 1 = Yes
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of program outcomes	0 = No 1 = Yes
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of executive director	0 = No 1 = Yes
Board responsibilities include: Recruitment of new board members	0 = No 1 = Yes
Board responsibilities include: Provision of formal orientation to new board members	0 = No 1 = Yes
At present, how many individuals are on your organization's board?	#
In the past 12 months, how many individuals served as executive director of your organization?	#
Organization has 501(c)3 status	0 = No (Unincorporated, unincorporated by hosted by a 501(c)3 organization, In process of obtaining 501(c)3 status) 1 = Yes (A 501(c)3 organization)
Revenue Sources	
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total revenue?	#
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total expenditures?	#
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from federal government agencies?	0 = No (No, Sought) 1 = Yes (Sought & obtained)

Exhibit 2.4: Organizational Development

Survey Question	Response Category
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from state or local government agencies?	0 = No (No, Sought) 1 = Yes (Sought & obtained)
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from institutional funding sources (e.g., corporations, foundations)?	0 = No (No, Sought) 1 = Yes (Sought & obtained)
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from individual donors or events?	0 = No (No, Sought) 1 = Yes (Sought & obtained)
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from Fees for Service?	0 = No (No, Sought) 1 = Yes (Sought & obtained)
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from another organization?	0 = No (No, Sought) 1 = Yes (Sought & obtained)
Funding Readiness	
Does your organization have a fundraising/fund development plan?	0 = No (No, Unwritten) 1 = Yes (Written)
Does your organization have financial management procedures for ensuring expenditures are properly authorized?	0 = No (No, Unwritten) 1 = Yes (Written)
Does your organization have an individual, distinct from the executive director, who is responsible for financial management?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Human Resources Management	
How many paid staff are full-time employees?	#
How many unpaid staff are full-time employees?	#
How many paid staff are part-time employees?	#
How many unpaid staff are part-time employees?	#
How many volunteers are part-time employees?	#
Is there a job description for paid staff?	0 = No (No, Unwritten) 1 = Yes (Written)
Is there a job description for unpaid staff?	0 = No (No, Unwritten) 1 = Yes (Written)
Is there a job description for volunteers?	0 = No (No, Unwritten) 1 = Yes (Written)
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of paid staff?	0 = No 1 = Yes (all or not all)
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of unpaid staff?	0 = No 1 = Yes (all or not all)
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of volunteers?	0 = No 1 = Yes (all or not all)
IT Management	
Does your organization regularly use computer software to keep financial records?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Do you have an adequate number of computers to meet your organization's needs?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Is the software on these computers adequate to meet your organization's needs?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Does your organization have access to the Internet?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Does your organization use the Internet to support an organizational website?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Does your organization use the Internet to support for program email?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Does your organization use the Internet to support for research purposes?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Does your organization use the Internet to support for community outreach purposes?	0 = No 1 = Yes

2.3.4 Domain 3: Program Development

The CEY survey questions related to this domain measure the quantity of service delivery and whether the grantees evaluate program outcomes and/or participant satisfaction.

Exhibit 2.5: Program Development	
Survey Question	Response Category
Service Delivery	
In a month of service delivery, total number of program participants organization serves	#
In a month of service delivery, what is the total number of organizations for whom capacity building services are provided?	#
Program Evaluation	
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with direct services provided?	0 = No 1 = Yes
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of direct service program participant outcomes?	0 = No 1 = Yes
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with capacity building services provided?	0 = No 1 = Yes
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of capacity building program participant outcomes?	0 = No 1 = Yes

2.3.5 Domain 4: Community Engagement

The CEY survey measures this domain with items that ask grantees whether they have partnerships in the public, private, and nonprofit sectors, and whether they have used new or improved community outreach strategies.

Exhibit 2.6: Community Engagement	
Survey Question	Response Category
Partnerships	
Organization engaged in partnership arrangements with other organizations in its community/service area (not CEY)?	0 = No 1 = Yes
(If Yes to other non-CEY partnerships) Partnership arrangements with organizations in: government?	0 = No 1 = Yes
(If Yes to other non-CEY partnerships) Partnership arrangements with organizations in: business/private?	0 = No 1 = Yes
(If Yes to other non-CEY partnerships) Partnership arrangements with organizations in: educational institutions?	0 = No 1 = Yes
(If Yes to other non-CEY partnerships) Partnership arrangements with organizations in: faith-based nonprofit?	0 = No 1 = Yes
(If Yes to other non-CEY partnerships) Partnership arrangements with organizations in: secular nonprofit?	0 = No 1 = Yes
Community Outreach	
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it gains knowledge about the community it serves?	0 = No 1 = Yes
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for gaining knowledge about the community it serves?	0 = No 1 = Yes
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it markets its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?	0 = No 1 = Yes
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for marketing its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?	0 = No 1 = Yes

2.3.6 Domain 5: Partnership Capacity

Partnership capacity sub-areas include relationship building, creating a shared mission or objectives, establishing consistent communication, developing a shared action plan, and creating a sustainability plan.

Exhibit 2.7: Partnership Capacity	
Survey Question	Response Category
Leadership Development	
Lead operates with the best interest of your organization in mind	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree
Lead is collegial. It respects your organization	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree
Lead is even-handed and ensures that project efforts are not skewed to a single party's interests	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree
Lead is competent. It is able to provide the capacity building assistance your organization wants or expects	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree
Lead is dependable. It follows through on commitments in a timely and efficient manner.	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree
Shared Mission and Objectives	
Does your CEY partnership have a mission statement?	0 = No (No, Unwritten) 1 = Yes (Written)
Your organization fully understands the goals of your CEY partnership	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree
Your organization was involved in setting the goals of your CEY partnership	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree
Your CEY partnership's goals are well aligned with the goals of your organization	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree
Lead's mission and/or work is well aligned with your organization's mission.	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree
Communication	
Participating in the CEY partnership led to better communication and working relationships among participating organizations than before	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree
Action Plan	
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines tasks to be achieved?	0 = No (No, Unwritten) 1 = Yes (Written)
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines timeline by which these tasks are to be achieved?	0 = No (No, Unwritten) 1 = Yes (Written)
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines individuals or organizations responsible for completing each task?	0 = No (No, Unwritten) 1 = Yes (Written)
Sustainability Plan	
Does your partnership have a sustainability plan?	0 = No (No, Unwritten) 1 = Yes (Written)
On a scale of 1-5 please describe your opinion as to how likely or unlikely it is that your CEY partnership will continue past the 3-year grant cycle.	1 = Highly likely to 5 = Highly Unlikely

2.3.7 Additional Measures: Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the CEY Grant

The CEY survey questions listed below address organizations' perceptions of the efficacy of the CEY grant and the extent to which they were satisfied with partnership and capacity-building activities.

Exhibit 2.8: Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the CEY Grant

Survey Question	Response Category
Thinking about the changes that the CEY partnership may have undergone since you joined it, to what extent did CEY grant funding and activities make a positive difference in your partnership's capacity to serve your community?	1 = A great extent to 4 = Not at all
The number and types of meetings, technical assistance, and trainings my organization participated in were sufficient to meet the objectives and expectations we had when we started/joined the partnership.	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree
The CEY grant supported capacity building activities increased my agency's ability to meet the needs of youth in the community.	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree
The partnership model required by the CEY grant is a good approach to increase organizational capacity among participating organizations.	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree
Thinking about the changes that your organization may have undergone since the receipt of the CEY grant, to what extent did the CEY funding and activities make a positive difference in your organizational capacity? [Lead organizations]	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree
Thinking about the changes that your organization may have undergone since you joined your CEY partnership, to what extent did the CEY funding and activities make a positive difference in your organizational capacity? [Partners]	1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree

2.3.8 Additional Measures: Partnership Development and Dynamics

Over the course of two years, the data collection team discovered that partnerships can be fluid, their composition changing from year to year. In response to this, we added new questions to the lead and partners' follow-up surveys about why partners left or joined the partnerships.

Exhibit 2.9: Partnership Development and Dynamics

Survey Question	Response Category
We sought a new CEY partner organization(s) because we had resources to serve more organizations. [Lead organizations with new partners]	1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Strongly disagree
We sought a new CEY partner organization(s) because their skills and knowledge filled a gap in the CEY partnership. [Lead organizations with new partners]	1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Strongly disagree
The new partners initiated contact and sought to join the CEY partnership. [Lead organizations with new partners]	1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Strongly disagree
Joined the CEY partnership to improve your organizational capacity through receipt of training, technical assistance, or financial support. [New Partners]	1 = High priority to 5 = Low priority
Joined the CEY partnership to assess community needs. [New Partners]	1 = High priority to 5 = Low priority
Joined to CEY partnership to engage in peer learning. [New Partners]	1 = High priority to 5 = Low priority
Joined the CEY partnership to streamline service provision in your community. [New Partners]	1 = High priority to 5 = Low priority
Joined the CEY partnership to access new funding sources. [New Partners]	1 = High priority to 5 = Low priority
Joined the CEY partnership to enhance image/visibility. [New Partners]	1 = High priority to 5 = Low priority
Joined the CEY partnership to influence policy, institutional change. [New Partners]	1 = High priority to 5 = Low priority
Our organization's mission and goals did not align with the partner organization. [Lead organizations with former partners]	1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Strongly disagree
The partner organization did not commit enough time to participate in CEY activities. [Lead organizations with former partners]	1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Strongly disagree

Exhibit 2.9: Partnership Development and Dynamics

Survey Question	Response Category
The partner organization did not make efforts to communicate with us as the lead organization. [Lead organizations with former partners]	1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Strongly disagree
We had a strained relationship with the partner organization. [Lead organizations with former partners]	1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Strongly disagree
The CEY partnership dynamic has improved since discontinuing partnership with the organization. [Lead organizations with former partners]	1 = Strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree
Our organization's mission and goals did not align with the CEY partnership. [Former Partners]	1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Strongly disagree
The CEY partnership activities were too time-consuming. [Former Partners]	1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Strongly disagree
The lead organization did not make efforts to facilitate communication within the CEY partnership. [Former Partners]	1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Strongly disagree
We had a strained relationship with the lead organization. [Former Partners]	1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Strongly disagree

2.4 Analytic Approach

2.4.1 Temporal Comparisons

The results of the analysis of all three years of survey data, presented in Chapters 3 and 4, involved two types of comparisons: temporal and subgroup. For the temporal comparisons, we examined three comparisons of the capacity changes in the lead organizations and their partners: from the baseline survey to the first follow-up survey; from the first follow-up survey to the second; and from the baseline survey to the second follow-up survey. For the leads, these changes were the organizational-level change scores. For the partners, these changes are the difference between the averages or proportions at the corresponding time points.

While the lead organizations were the same between the baseline and the follow-up surveys, the partner organizations did not overlap completely. Therefore, we used different statistical approaches for each subsample.

Lead Organizations: We conducted a weighted t -test for paired samples to determine whether the lead organization change scores were equal to zero, the null hypothesis. The weighted t -test computes the t -statistic that can be evaluated against the t distribution to reject a null hypothesis at a defined significance level with $n-1$ degrees of freedom. When d_w is the weighted sample mean change score, s_w is the weighted sample standard deviation of the change scores, and w_i is the weight for the i^{th} observation, the t -statistic to test whether the change is different from zero is given by:

$$\frac{d_w - 0}{s_w / \sqrt{\sum w_i^2}}$$

Partner Organizations: As mentioned in Section 1.4, the composition of some CEY partnerships changed over time. Because the sample of partners in the three surveys did not overlap completely,

we applied a method proposed by Kish⁷ to test the statistical significance of changes between the three surveys when the sample members are partially overlapping.

Specifically, at baseline the 2006 cohort consisted of 50 lead organizations with 326 partners, but that number increased to 334 partners by the time of the first-follow-up survey. Similarly, the 2007 cohort comprised 31 lead organizations with 133 partners at baseline, 145 partners at first follow-up, and 142 partners at second follow-up. These changes were not solely due to the addition of new partners; some partners left the partnership, permanently closed, or merged with another organization.⁸ Specifically, the 50 partnerships in the 2006 cohort lost 21 partners and gained 29 new partners from baseline to first follow-up. The 31 partnerships in the 2007 cohort lost 14 partners (1 closed) and gained 26 new partners between baseline and first follow-up; between first follow-up and second, the 31 partnerships lost 15 partner organizations (5 closed and 1 merged) and gained 6 new partners.

The partially overlapping nature of the partner organization sample requires an adjustment to the standard error when testing if changes in averages or proportions between time points were different from zero. A *z*-test was used, adjusting the standard error for the partially overlapping sample.⁹ To calculate the standard error of the difference, the variance of the difference in averages between two overlapping samples is the sum of the variances of each of the averages less two times the covariance. In other words, the variance of the difference in averages of the two overlapping samples with variance v_1 and v_2 and covariance c_{12} is given by:

$$v_1 + v_2 - 2c_{12}$$

Kish¹⁰ elaborated this method to calculate the covariance of partially overlapping samples. When v_1 and v_2 are the variances of the two sample proportions; n_1 and n_2 are the samples sizes; n is the sample size of the overlap, and ρ is the correlation coefficient of the two samples, the variance of the difference between the two samples is given by:

$$v_1 + v_2 - 2n\rho \sqrt{\frac{v_1 \times v_2}{n_1 \times n_2}}$$

The standard error of the difference in the two averages or proportions is then the square root of the variance. Using this method, we computed the standard errors of the difference in proportions or averages where the two samples were the samples of partners at the baseline and the first follow-up surveys. Using the partner weights, we calculated the proportions or averages and the standard errors and conducted a *z*-test. The *z*-statistic can be evaluated against the *z* distribution to reject a null

⁷ Kish, 1965, pp. 457 - 462.

⁸ At first follow-up, the data collection team discovered that one partner organization had closed, and at second follow-up, five partner organizations had closed, and one had merged into another organization.

⁹ It may be the case that due to the nested structure of the program, the capacity scores of partners associated with the same lead organization are correlated. However, due to the exploratory, descriptive nature of the study a decision was made with ACF to not adjust for this potential clustering.

¹⁰ Kish, 1965, pp. 457-462.

hypothesis at a defined significance level. When s is the standard error and d is the difference in averages or proportions, the z -statistic is given by:

$$\frac{d - 0}{s}$$

2.4.2 Subgroup Definitions

We tested for subgroup differences based on the following subgroups:

1. Cohort (year of grant award);
2. Pre-existing partnerships; and
3. Partnership size.

We selected these subgroups for analysis after reviewing the previous Compassion Capital Fund (CCF) evaluation reports, CEY special topics case studies, the CEY baseline survey data, and the research literature on organizational capacity. This process produced a list of potential subgroup variables, which we then assessed for analytic feasibility.

Our criteria for selection of these subgroups required variables to: 1) be of policy interest to OCS, particularly those that would provide applicable and actionable information to incorporate into future requests for grant proposals; 2) be measured at baseline so as to be exogenous and not related to the provision of CEY-funded capacity-building services; and 3) have enough variability to make the analysis meaningful. An ideal subgroup variable has enough difference between organizations that answer “yes” or “no” to a survey item to make the analysis meaningful. For example, a separate subgroup analysis on access to technology could not be conducted if all organizations responded “yes” to having a computer.

Other subgroups considered by the evaluation team included organizational size, organizational age, and whether organizations have paid executive directors. The impact evaluation of the Compassion Capital Fund analyzed these subgroups and found no discernable patterns.¹¹ Given the similarity between the NPOs in the CCF and CEY studies, we did not include these subgroups in the CEY analysis.

A discussion of our rationale for selecting the aforementioned subgroups is provided below.

2.4.2.1 Grant Year Cohort

The decision to examine the differences in organizational capacity and partnership outcomes based on cohort year reflected the slight differences in language in the two corresponding CEY grant funding announcements. Specifically, the 2007 announcement emphasized “stable” partnerships, with at least 25 percent of the funding to be passed through to the partner organizations. The earlier 2006 announcement did not emphasize pre-existing partnerships or provide guidance on how grant funds

¹¹ Abt Associates & Branch Associates, 2010.

were to be distributed. The cohort subgroup would be of policy interest if capacity and partnership outcomes vary due to the aforementioned RFP specifications.

2.4.2.2 Pre-existing Partnerships

The second subgroup in our analysis is whether the partnership pre-dated the CEY program. A partnership is considered to pre-date the CEY program if it existed before receiving CEY funding and has not added any new partners since receiving funding. While this subgroup is similar to the cohort subgroup above in that one of the ways cohorts may differ is by the presence of stable partnerships, this subgroup analysis is a more precise measure of whether partnerships pre-dated the CEY program. At baseline, 28 lead organizations (35 percent) reported that they were leading an existing partnership with no new members. A total of 53 organizations (65 percent) added new partner organizations for the CEY grant (either as an existing partnership expanding to include new members (47 percent), or as a completely new partnership (19 percent)). Similarly, there were changes in partnership composition from the baseline to first follow-up period (as described in Section 1.4). Pre-existing partnerships may already have established relationships and trust between partners, resulting in different outcomes than newly formed partnerships.

2.4.2.3 Partnership Size

The final subgroup is partnership size, measured by the number of partner organizations within each partnership. At baseline, CEY partnership size ranged from 1 to 37 partner organizations, with a median of 5 partner organizations. In this analysis, partnerships with 6 or more partner organizations are classified as large, and partnerships with 5 or fewer are considered small. If certain outcomes were to vary with partnership size¹², this could provide guidance in future grant announcements involving partnerships and capacity building.

2.4.3 Subgroup Analysis¹³

The three subgroups described above were analyzed separately for lead organizations and partners. At first follow-up, the analysis pooled the 2006 and 2007 cohorts (except for the analysis by cohort subgroup) and examined subgroup differences in the changes between baseline and first follow-up. At the second follow-up, subgroup analysis was conducted only for the partnership size subgroup, and only for partner organizations. There are three reasons for the limited subgroup analysis at second follow-up: first, due to the small sample size of 2007 cohort lead organizations at second follow-up (n=31), the subgroup analyses could focus only on partner outcomes. Second, because data from the 2006 cohort were not collected at second follow-up, “cohort” was no longer a feasible subgroup. Third, there was not enough variability in the “pre-existing partnership” variable in the 2007 cohort of partners, so this subgroup also was no longer feasible. The subgroup analyses conducted at second follow-up examined differences in the changes between baseline and second follow-up only.

¹² Similarly, organizational psychologists have researched the relationship between group size and outcomes such as leadership and team performance, finding that an optimal group or team size is between 5 and 12 people (Bass & Norton, 1951; Robbins & Judge, 2007, 2008; Weick, 1993).

¹³ For some items, significance tests could not be performed due to lack of variance in one of the subgroups at one or more time points. This is denoted in the tables in Chapter 4.

For the subgroup comparisons, we analyzed whether changes between each set of time points differed between the various subgroups of interest described in Section 2.4.3. In other words, we computed subgroup differences of the change scores. Because any two subgroups are independent from each other, the variance of the difference in subgroup change scores is simply the sum of the variance of each of the change scores. The standard error is the square root of that variance. We used the standard error to compute the z-statistic, which was used to determine the statistical significance of the difference in change scores between two subgroups.

2.5 Multiple Comparisons Analysis

The issue of multiple comparisons arises when there are a large number of individual outcomes to be tested. The more items tested, the more likely it is that one will incur a Type 1 error, or a spurious statistically significant effect. If this is not taken into account, incorrect policy conclusions about effective programs may be made. How best to address this problem is the subject of ongoing debate among methodologists.

Adjusting for multiple comparisons, whether the family-wise error or the false discovery rate, is important for impact evaluations. The error rate can be controlled by creating *a priori* outcome domains that are based in literature and a theoretical underpinning to limit the number of significance tests on numerous outcomes. Multiple comparisons adjustments, such as the Benjamini-Hochberg adjustment for the false discovery rate, are typically employed on confirmatory analyses only. Confirmatory analyses are a set of analyses related to specific research questions or hypotheses of primary interest, such as a program's impact on a key outcome. Exploratory analyses are typically not subject to post-hoc adjustments.¹⁴ Exploratory analyses are often descriptive in nature and generate hypotheses for future testing.

The CEY evaluation is an exploratory, descriptive outcomes study of changes in organizational capacity and partnership development among CEY grantees. The core study included a total of 91 outcomes across five domains (four organizational capacity domains and one partnership capacity domain), with three temporal comparisons each. Outcomes of primary interest could not be prioritized during the design stage due to the broad nature of the intervention. Additionally, latent constructs were not developed to combine several related indicators into one variable. In discussion with ACF, the decision was made to employ a post-hoc sensitivity test on each domain to address multiple comparisons and help inform the level of confidence with which the results for the individual outcomes could be interpreted. The multiple comparisons analysis used seemingly unrelated estimation in STATA 11 to combine effects (changes) within a domain and test simultaneously whether they were jointly equal to zero using an F-test. Specifically, the temporal comparisons of baseline vs. F1 and baseline vs. F2 were first tested separately using seemingly unrelated estimation, and then an F-test assessed if these two results were jointly significant. If the F-test was significant, we rejected the null hypothesis that all the effects within a domain were equal to zero. If a domain was significant under the multiple comparisons analysis, the results of the individual significance tests within that domain are more likely to represent systematic changes and less likely to be due to Type 1 error.

¹⁴ Schochet, 2008.

Exhibit 2.10: Results of the Multiple Comparisons Analysis

Domain	Lead Organizations p-value	Partner Organizations p-value
Leadership Development	0.330	0.418
Organizational Development	0.184	0.110
Program Development	0.421	0.031*
Community Engagement	0.124	0.020*
Partnership Capacity	0.070	0.148
* p-value < 0.05		

3. Results – Temporal Comparisons

The tables presented in this chapter describe how the CEY organizations and their partnerships changed between the three points at which they were surveyed. Specifically, the team analyzed changes from baseline to first follow-up, first follow-up to second follow-up, and baseline to second follow-up. These changes are displayed as change scores (i.e., the difference in averages or proportions between the baseline and the follow-up periods). The tables also include tests to determine if the changes are statistically significant using the methods described in Section 2.4. The focus of the analyses is descriptive, and it provides exploratory information about changes in outcomes reported by the organizations. We also conducted post-hoc sensitivity analyses at first follow-up by excluding former partners from the analysis and found that the results are highly consistent.

The analyses described above were conducted separately for lead organizations and partners and are grouped as such in the tables below. Within each group, the first two tables contain data on characteristics for which change scores were not calculated since these variables are not outcomes. The next five tables present the results of the significance tests performed on all of the items within each of our five domains: leadership development, organizational development, program development, community engagement, and partnership capacity. Next, there is a table containing the results of the significance tests performed on the additional items pertaining to organizations’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the CEY grant. The last table shows data related to partnership development and dynamics for which significance tests were not performed due to small sample sizes. The results presented below are weighted and include sample sizes (n), averages, standard deviations, and ranges where applicable. For tables containing results of significance tests, each change score is assigned stars to indicate statistical significance. Two stars indicate a statistically significant difference at the 1 percent level, one star indicates a statistically significant difference at the 5 percent level, and omission of a star indicates that the difference was not statistically significant at either the 1 percent or the 5 percent levels.

3.1 Data from Lead Organizations

3.1.1 Lead Organization Characteristics

	Baseline Number of Respondents (N)	Baseline Average or % Yes	Baseline Standard Deviation (SD)	Baseline Range
How old is the organization (years)?	81	29.0	24.9	3.5-127.8
Is organization faith-based?	81	21.0	-	
Geographic area organization serves: ^a	81	3.7	1.1	1-5
Is organization a Weed &Seed agency?	81	4.9	-	-
Is organization currently partnering with any Weed & Seed agencies on the CEY project?	81	19.8	-	-

Exhibit 3.1: Characteristics of Lead Organizations

	Baseline Number of Respondents (N)	Baseline Average or % Yes	Baseline Standard Deviation (SD)	Baseline Range
In the past 12 months, has your organization addressed: Gang violence?	81	71.6	-	-
In the past 12 months, has your organization addressed: Youth violence?	81	90.1	-	-
In the past 12 months, has your organization addressed: Child abuse/neglect?	81	77.8	-	-
Does your organization provide direct client services?	81	75.3	-	-
Does your organization provide capacity building support to other organizations?	81	96.3	-	-
Was your CEY partnership an existing partnership?	81	34.6	-	-

^a Average is based on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 is a small town (population less than 10,000); 2 is a large town (population between 10,000 and 50,000), 3 is a city (large, densely populated area that may include several administrative districts), 4 is an entire state, and 5 is multiple geographically distinct areas.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline Survey

Note: Our sample at baseline includes 81 lead organizations that represent the population of 131 lead organizations. Statistics shown above are unweighted.

Exhibit 3.2: Characteristics of Lead Organizations (cont.)

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up			
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range
Is the executive director paid?	79	100.0	-	-	81	98.8	-	-	31	100.0	-	-
What structure best describes your CEY partnership? ^a	79	1.3	0.6	1-3	79	1.3	0.6	1-3	31	1.3	0.5	1.0-3.0
Total number of partner organizations	81	6.7	4.0	2-30	81	6.9	4.2	2-30	31	4.6	2.8	1-12

^a Average is based on a scale from 1 to 3 where 1 is –My organization is the lead and has organized a set of partners to achieve CEY capacity building goals”; 2 is –My organization is the lead and has organized a set of partners who each support their own group of partners organizations”; and 3 is –A coalition or committee of organizations shares lead organization responsibilities with my organization as the CEY designated lead. The coalition or committee shares the responsibilities for organizing and supporting other partner organizations.”

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and Follow-up Surveys

Note: Our sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations that represent the population of 131 lead organizations. Our sample at second follow-up includes 31 lead organizations that represent the population of 31 lead organizations in the 2007 cohort.

3.1.2 Leadership Development

Exhibit 3.3: Changes in Leadership Development—Lead Organizations

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Executive Director Development															
Did the executive director participate in any training related to management and administration?															
Cohort 2006	50	86.8	-	-	50	90.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.0	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	83.9	-	-	31	77.4	-	-	31	96.8	-	-	-6.5	19.4*	12.9*
Did the executive director participate in any training related to fundraising?															
Cohort 2006	50	71.4	-	-	50	78.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	71.0	-	-	31	64.5	-	-	31	67.7	-	-	-6.5	3.2	-3.2
Did the executive director participate in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?															
Cohort 2006	50	83.1	-	-	50	83.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	74.2	-	-	31	71.0	-	-	31	74.2	-	-	-3.2	3.2	0.0
Full- and Part-Time Staff Development															
How many paid staff participated in any training related to management and administration?															
Cohort 2006	49	21.5	63.5	1-250	50	13.1	32.0	1-160	-	-	-	-	-8.4	-	-
Cohort 2007	29	18.2	58.4	0-317	31	20.8	63.3	0-350	31	16.1	35.1	0-189	2.5	-4.6	-2.1
How many paid staff participated in any training related to fundraising?															
Cohort 2006	50	6.2	11.3	0-34	48	5.6	20.2	0-88	-	-	-	-	-0.6	-	-
Cohort 2007					31	2.2	1.9	0-6					-1.4	6.2	4.8

Exhibit 3.3: Changes in Leadership Development—Lead Organizations

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
How many paid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	43.6	115.5	0-431	50	22.6	69.3	0-257	-	-	-	-	-21	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	30	30.9	67.3	0-317	31	22.9	44.2	0-175	31	16.7	42.5	0-189	-7.9	-6.3	-14.2*
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to management and administration? ^a															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	17	5.1	10.9	0-20	14	2.5	5.3	0-11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	9	0.8	1.4	0-4	8	6.1	15.8	0-45	9	0.8	1.3	0-4	-	-	-
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to fundraising? ^a															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	17	1.6	5.8	0-12	13	2.2	5.7	0-11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	9	0.3	1	0-3	8	1.3	2.4	0-6	9	0.4	0.7	0-2	-	-	-
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery? ^a															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	17	6.5	13.1	0-23	13	3.4	6.1	0-11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	9	10.4	29.8	0-90	8	2.0	2.3	0-6	9	1.0	1.5	0-4	-	-	-
Volunteer Development															
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to management and administration?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	28	6.3	19	0-50	31	5.5	15.8	0-40	-	-	-	-	-0.8	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	15	2.3	5.6	0-20	18	2.7	6.4	0-20	12	5.7	14.4	0-50	0.4	2.9	3.3
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to fundraising?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	29	7.9	27.2	0-90	32	1.3	4.0	0-11	-	-	-	-	-6.6	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	14	3.9	13.3	0-50	18	1.6	4.8	0-20	13	8.2	27.6	0-100	-2.3	6.6	4.3
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	29	36.5	128.4	0-300	34	50.0	249.3	0-864	-	-	-	-	13.4	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>					19	28.9	69.6	0-300					-31.1	34.6	3.5*

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a Significance tests were not performed due to small sample sizes.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. The sample at second follow-up includes 31 lead organizations (2007 cohort only) and represents the population of 31 lead organizations in 2010. –Baseline vs. F1” denotes changes between baseline and first follow-up; –F1 vs. F2” denotes changes between first follow-up and second follow-up; –Baseline vs. F2” denotes changes between baseline and second follow-up.

3.1.3 Organizational Development

Exhibit 3.4: Changes in Organizational Development—Lead Organizations

	Baseline			First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up			Significance Tests			
	Number of	Average or	Standard	N	Average or	(SD)	Range	N	Average or	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
			Range		% Yes									
Mission and Strategic Planning														
In the past 12 months, has your organization formally assessed its organizational needs/strengths?														
Cohort 2006	50	97.4	-	50	96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-1.4	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	93.5	-	31	100	-	-	31	96.8	-	-	6.5	-3.2	3.2
Does your organization have a mission statement?														
Cohort 2006	50	94.9	-	50	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	96.8	-	31	100.0	-	-	31	100.0	-	-	3.2	0.0	3.2
Does your organization have a strategic plan?														
Cohort 2006	50	77.5	-	50	93.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.9*	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	64.5	-	31	80.6	-	-	31	83.9	-	-	16.1	3.2	19.4
Governance and Organizational Structure														
Is your organization governed by a parent or umbrella organization's Board of Directors?														
Cohort 2006	50	13.3	-	50	23.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.3	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	16.1	-	31	19.4	-	-	31	19.4	-	-	3.2	0.0	3.2
Is your organization governed by an Advisory Panel?														
Cohort 2006	49	3.6	-	50	8.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	6.5	-	31	9.7	-	-	31	3.2	-	-	3.2	-6.5	-3.2
Is your organization governed by its own Board of Directors?														
Cohort 2006	50	86.7	-	50	76.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-10.3	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	83.9	-	31	80.6	-	-	31	80.6	-	-	-3.2	0.0	-3.2
Board responsibilities include: Goal/Strategy development														
Cohort 2006	45	98.9	-	41	96.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	26	88.5	-	25	88	-	-	25	100.0	-	-	-0.5	12.0	11.5
Board responsibilities include: Community/Stakeholder outreach														
Cohort 2006	45	84.5	-	41	74.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-10.3	-	-
Cohort 2007	26	80.8	-	25	84.0	-	-	25	76.0	-	-	3.2	-8.0	-4.8
Board responsibilities include: Budget development														
Cohort 2006	45	79.9	-	41	64.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-15.5	-	-
Cohort 2007	26	57.7	-	25	60	-	-	25	68.0	-	-	2.3	8.0	10.3
Board responsibilities include: Financial review														
Cohort 2006	45	100.0	-	41	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-
Cohort 2007	26	100.0	-	25	100.0	-	-	25	96.0	-	-	0	-4.0	-4.0
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of program outcomes														
Cohort 2006	45	77	-	41	76.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.9	-	-
Cohort 2007	26	50	-	25	68	-	-	25	72.0	-	-	18.0	4.0	22.0*

Exhibit 3.4: Changes in Organizational Development—Lead Organizations

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of executive director															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	45	94.2	-	-	41	93.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.7	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	26	88.5	-	-	25	96.0	-	-	25	100.0	-	-	7.5	4.0	11.5
Board responsibilities include: Recruitment of new board members															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	45	87.4	-	-	41	90.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.9	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	26	96.2	-	-	25	88.0	-	-	25	92.0	-	-	-8.2	4.0	-4.2
Board responsibilities include: Provision of formal orientation to new board members															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	45	72.5	-	-	41	89.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.5*	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	26	69.2	-	-	25	72.0	-	-	25	60.0	-	-	2.8	-12.0	-9.2
At present, how many individuals are on your organization's board?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	46	12.7	9.3	3-29	42	12.6	10.8	0-35	-	-	-	-	-0.1	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	26	13.1	7.6	6-31	25	11.6	6.5	4-33	25	11.1	6.7	4-31	-1.4	-0.6	-2.0
In the past 12 months, how many individuals have served as executive director or your organization? ^a															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	-	-	-	-	50	1.1	0.4	1-2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	-	-	-	-	31	1.1	0.2	1-2	31	1.1	0.3	1-2	-	0.0	-
Organization has 501(c)3 status															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	45	97.2	-	-	45	91.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5.9	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	29	100.0	-	-	30	93.3	-	-	29	96.6	-	-	-6.7	3.2	-3.4
Revenue Sources															
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total revenue? ^b															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	1,700,000	60,992,124	14,470-332,770,000	50	1,000,000	41,315,749	16,752-177,330,000	-	-	-	-	-700,000 *	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	735,835	3,524,542	0-13,642,283	31	1,282,766	13,833,992	187,500-76,996,995	31	1,384,766	6,237,726	205,000-28,685,000	546,931	102,000	648,931 **
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total expenditures? ^b															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	1,741,000	67,364,078	1,854-332,770,000	50	939,962	39,440,867	7,683-169,090,000	-	-	-	-	-801,038 *	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	670,831	3,424,098	70,000-14,538,962	31	1,196,563	13,827,880	175,000-76,996,995	31	1,175,442	6,098,108	200,000-27,550,000	525,732 *	-21,121	504,611 **
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from federal government agencies?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	63.9	-	-	50	50.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-13.8	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	71.0	-	-	31	54.8	-	-	31	45.2	-	-	-16.1	-9.7	-25.8**
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from state or local government agencies?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	70.9	-	-	50	66.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-4.1	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	74.2	-	-	31	67.7	-	-	31	64.5	-	-	-6.5	-3.2	-9.7
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from institutional funding sources (e.g., corporations, foundations)?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	71.9	-	-	50	68.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3.6	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	77.4	-	-	31	67.7	-	-	31	64.5	-	-	-9.7	-3.2	-12.9

Exhibit 3.4: Changes in Organizational Development—Lead Organizations

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from individual donors or events?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	73.4	-	-	50	70.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2.5	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	67.7	-	-	31	64.5	-	-	31	61.3	-	-	-3.2	-3.2	-6.5
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from Fees for Service?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	59.1	-	-	50	60.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	51.6	-	-	31	45.2	-	-	31	54.8	-	-	-6.5	9.7	3.2
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from another organization?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	29.1	-	-	50	29.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.1	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	25.8	-	-	31	22.6	-	-	31	22.6	-	-	-3.2	0.0	-3.2
Funding Readiness															
Does your organization have a fundraising/fund development plan?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	46.9	-	-	50	66.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	19.4**	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	51.6	-	-	31	41.9	-	-	31	54.8	-	-	-9.7	12.9	3.2
Does your organization have financial management procedures for ensuring expenditures are properly authorized?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	89.8	-	-	50	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.2*	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	90.3	-	-	31	93.5	-	-	31	93.5	-	-	3.2	0.0	3.2
Does your organization have an individual, distinct from the executive director, who is responsible for financial management?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	100.0	-	-	50	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	93.5	-	-	31	100.0	-	-	31	96.8	-	-	6.5	-3.2	3.2
Human Resources Management															
How many paid staff are full-time employees?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	63.5	145.5	1-395	50	41.9	113.2	0-395	-	-	-	-	-21.5*	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	30	47.6	83.0	0-300	31	50.0	88	2-350	31	43.4	71.9	1-257	2.4	-6.6	-4.2
How many unpaid staff are full-time employees? ^c															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	15	0.2	0.9	0-2	14	0.4	1.3	0-4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	8	0.4	0.5	0-1	7	1.3	1.9	0-4	8	0.6	1.4	0-4	-	-	-
How many paid staff are part-time employees?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	27.0	125.9	0-545	50	26.5	181.2	0-803	-	-	-	-	-0.5	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	30	17.9	41.2	0-180	31	15.5	30.3	0-145	31	15.0	35.5	0-190	-2.3	-0.6	-2.9
How many unpaid staff are part-time employees? ^c															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	15	7.1	14.2	0-31	14	5.3	8.6	0-20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	8	12.5	31.4	0-90	7	7.7	16.5	0-45	8	2.0	1.9	0-5	-	-	-
How many volunteers are part-time employees?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	34	113.0	429.3	0-1448	35	153.2	634.7	1-2126	-	-	-	-	40.3	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	24	146.6	355.1	0-1655	18	82.4	148.3	1-602	15	254.7	593.3	1-2322	-64.2	172.3	108.2

Exhibit 3.4: Changes in Organizational Development—Lead Organizations

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Is there a job description for paid staff?															
Cohort 2006	50	94.9	-	-	50	94.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	96.8	-	-	31	96.8	-	-	31	100.0	-	-	0.0	3.2	3.2
Is there a job description for unpaid staff? ^c															
Cohort 2006	21	58.4	-	-	14	81.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	9	55.6	-	-	7	42.9	-	-	8	87.5	-	-	-	-	-
Is there a job description for volunteers?															
Cohort 2006	35	56.0	-	-	35	74.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	18.0	-	-
Cohort 2007	26	65.4	-	-	18	55.6	-	-	16	68.8	-	-	-9.8	13.2	3.4
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of paid staff?															
Cohort 2006	50	72.9	-	-	50	75.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	74.2	-	-	31	58.1	-	-	31	71.0	-	-	-16.1	12.9*	-3.2
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of unpaid staff? ^c															
Cohort 2006	18	36.0	-	-	14	44.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	9	33.3	-	-	8	62.5	-	-	8	50.0	-	-	-	-	-
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of volunteers?															
Cohort 2006	35	21.9	-	-	36	6.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-15.5*	-	-
Cohort 2007	25	8.0	-	-	19	15.8	-	-	16	12.5	-	-	7.8	-3.3	4.5
IT Management															
Does your organization regularly use computer software to keep financial records?															
Cohort 2006	50	97.4	-	-	50	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	96.8	-	-	31	100.0	-	-	31	96.8	-	-	3.2	-3.2	0.0
Do you have an adequate number of computers to meet your organization's needs?															
Cohort 2006	50	75.4	-	-	50	87.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.3	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	64.5	-	-	31	83.9	-	-	31	93.5	-	-	19.4*	9.7	29.0**
Is the software on these computers adequate to meet your organization's needs?															
Cohort 2006	50	72.4	-	-	50	82.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.2	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	64.5	-	-	31	74.2	-	-	31	90.3	-	-	9.7	16.1	25.8*
Does your organization have access to the Internet?															
Cohort 2006	50	100.0	-	-	50	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	100.0	-	-	31	100.0	-	-	31	100.0	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0
Does your organization use the Internet to support an organizational website?															
Cohort 2006	50	93.9	-	-	50	96.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	90.3	-	-	31	93.5	-	-	31	96.8	-	-	3.2	3.2	6.5
Does your organization use the Internet for program email?															
Cohort 2006	50	100.0	-	-	50	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	93.5	-	-	31	100.0	-	-	31	100.0	-	-	6.5	0.0	6.5

Exhibit 3.4: Changes in Organizational Development—Lead Organizations

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Does your organization use the Internet for research purposes?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	100.0	-	-	50	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	100.0	-	-	31	100.0	-	-	31	100.0	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0
Does your organization use the Internet for community outreach purposes?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	82.0	-	-	50	86.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.1	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	80.6	-	-	31	87.1	-	-	31	90.3	-	-	6.5	3.2	9.7

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a The question at baseline referenced a different timeframe so results are not shown.

^b The number reported in the “Average or % Yes” column represents the weighted median. Significance tests were performed on the unweighted medians using a signed rank test.

^c Significance tests were not performed due to small sample sizes.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. The sample at second follow-up includes 31 lead organizations (2007 cohort only) and represents the population of 31 lead organizations in 2010. “Baseline vs. F1” denotes changes between baseline and first follow-up; “F1 vs. F2” denotes changes between first follow-up and second follow-up; “Baseline vs. F2” denotes changes between baseline and second follow-up.

3.1.4 Program Development

Exhibit 3.5: Changes in Program Development—Lead Organizations

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Service Delivery															
In a month of service delivery, total number of program participants organization serves															
Cohort 2006	37	2,134.4	7382.6	20-26,000	35	1,400.0	3311.5	0-13,000	-	-	-	-	-734.4	-	-
Cohort 2007	25	1,056.0	1211.8	3-4,200	23	1,117.0	1642.7	0-5,463	22	1,177.0	1480.5	74-5,500	61.0	60.0	121.0
In a month of service delivery, what is the total number of organizations for whom capacity building services are provided?															
Cohort 2006	50	22.3	57.4	0-300	50	18.0	43.2	1-231	-	-	-	-	-4.3	-	-
Cohort 2007	28	14.5	20.9	2-97	29	12.6	12.4	2-43	31	12.2	15.1	2-79	-1.9	-0.3	-2.2
Program Evaluation															
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with direct services provided?															
Cohort 2006	37	87.4	-	-	34	91.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-
Cohort 2007	25	100.0	-	-	22	95.5	-	-	22	90.9	-	-	-4.5	-4.5	-9.1
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of direct service program participant outcomes?															
Cohort 2006	37	88.1	-	-	34	84.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	25	88.0	-	-	22	77.3	-	-	22	72.7	-	-	-10.7	-4.5	-15.3
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with capacity building services provided?															
Cohort 2006	49	91.1	-	-	50	95.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.4	-	-
Cohort 2007	27	92.6	-	-	29	96.6	-	-	31	93.5	-	-	4.0	-3.0	1.0
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of capacity building program participant outcomes?															
Cohort 2006	48	71.1	-	-	50	62.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-8.9	-	-
Cohort 2007	26	69.2	-	-	29	69.0	-	-	31	67.7	-	-	-0.3	-1.2	-1.5

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. The sample at second follow-up includes 31 lead organizations (2007 cohort only) and represents the population of 31 lead organizations in 2010. –Baseline vs. F1” denotes changes between baseline and first follow-up; –F1 vs. F2” denotes changes between first follow-up and second follow-up; –Baseline vs. F2” denotes changes between baseline and second follow-up.

3.1.5 Community Engagement

Exhibit 3.6: Changes in Community Engagement—Lead Organizations

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests		
	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Partnerships									
Organization engaged in partnership arrangements with other organizations in its community/service area (not CEY)?									
Cohort 2006	50	100.0	50	97.4	-	-	-2.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	96.8	31	96.8	31	96.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: government?									
Cohort 2006	50	83.1	49	90.6	-	-	7.5	-	-
Cohort 2007	30	83.3	30	80.0	30	83.3	-3.3	3.3	0.0
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: business/private?									
Cohort 2006	50	78	49	74.8	-	-	-3.2	-	-
Cohort 2007	30	63.3	30	76.7	30	86.7	13.3	10.0	23.3*
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: educational institutions?									
Cohort 2006	50	86.8	49	93.3	-	-	6.5	-	-
Cohort 2007	30	93.3	30	90.0	30	93.3	-3.3	3.3	0.0
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: faith-based nonprofit?									
Cohort 2006	50	90.8	49	93.2	-	-	2.4	-	-
Cohort 2007	30	86.7	30	86.7	30	83.3	0	-3.3	-3.3
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: secular nonprofit?									
Cohort 2006	50	93.9	49	90.6	-	-	-3.2	-	-
Cohort 2007	30	90.0	30	93.3	30	90.0	3.3	-3.3	0.0
Community Outreach									
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it gains knowledge about the community it serves?									
Cohort 2006	50	87.1	50	89.3	-	-	2.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	83.9	31	83.9	31	80.6	0.0	-3.2	-3.2
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for gaining knowledge about the community it serves?									
Cohort 2006	50	79.4	50	81.2	-	-	1.8	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	67.7	31	74.2	31	74.2	6.5	0.0	6.5
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it markets its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?									
Cohort 2006	50	92.3	50	93.4	-	-	1.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	80.6	31	96.8	31	93.5	16.1	-3.2	12.9
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for marketing its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?									
Cohort 2006	50	87.2	50	90.9	-	-	3.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	31	58.1	31	83.9	31	87.1	25.8*	3.2	29.0*

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. The sample at second follow-up includes 31 lead organizations (2007 cohort only) and represents the population of 31 lead organizations in 2010. -Baseline vs. F1” denotes changes between baseline and first follow-up; -F1 vs. F2” denotes changes between first follow-up and second follow-up; -Baseline vs. F2” denotes changes between baseline and second follow-up.

3.1.6 Partnership Capacity

Exhibit 3.7: Changes in Partnership Capacity—Lead Organizations

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests		
	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Shared Mission and Objectives									
Does your CEY partnership have a mission statement?									
Cohort 2006	50	56.1	48	74.8	-	-	18.7*	-	-
Cohort 2007	30	36.7	30	73.3	31	83.9	36.7**	10.5*	47.2**
Your organization fully understands the goals of your CEY partnership ^{a, b}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	50	96.4	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	96.8	31	96.8	-	0.0	-
Your organization was involved in setting the goals of your CEY partnership ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	50	95.4	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	96.8	31	100.0	-	3.2	-
Your CEY partnership's goals are well aligned with the goals of your organization ^{b, c}									
Cohort 2006	50	99.0	50	95.4	-	-	-3.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	90.3	31	100.0	-	9.7	-
Communication									
Participating in the CEY partnership led to better communication and working relationships among participating organizations than before ^{b, d}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	50	94.9	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	96.8	31	96.8	-	0.0	-
Action Plan									
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines tasks to be achieved? ^c									
Cohort 2006	50	90.3	50	87.2	-	-	-3.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	74.2	31	74.2	-	0.0	-
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines timeline by which these tasks are to be achieved? ^c									
Cohort 2006	50	77.4	50	73.9	-	-	-3.5	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	67.7	31	67.7	-	0.0	-
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines individuals or organizations responsible for completing each task? ^c									
Cohort 2006	50	74.9	50	74.4	-	-	-0.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	61.3	30	56.7	-	-4.6	-
Sustainability Plan									
Does your partnership have a sustainability plan? ^c									
Cohort 2006	50	24.4	49	32.4	-	-	8.0	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	30	10.0	30	13.3	-	3.3	-

Exhibit 3.7: Changes in Partnership Capacity—Lead Organizations

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests		
	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
On a scale of 1-5 please describe your opinion as to how likely or unlikely it is that your CEY partnership will continue past the 3-year grant cycle. ^c									
Cohort 2006	47	80.2	48	79.3	-	-	-0.9	-	-
Cohort 2007	30	86.7	30	76.7	31	61.3	-10.0	-15.4	-25.4*

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a Question was asked only of partners at baseline.

^b The baseline, first follow-up, and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being “Strongly Agree” and 5 being “Strongly Disagree.”

^c Question was asked only of the 2006 cohort at baseline.

^d Question was asked only at first follow-up and second follow-up.

^e The baseline, first follow-up, and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered “Highly Likely” or “Likely” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being “Highly Likely” and 5 being “Highly Unlikely.”

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. The sample at second follow-up includes 31 lead organizations (2007 cohort only) and represents the population of 31 lead organizations in 2010. “Baseline vs. F1” denotes changes between baseline and first follow-up; “F1 vs. F2” denotes changes between first follow-up and second follow-up; “Baseline vs. F2” denotes changes between baseline and second follow-up.

3.1.7 Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the CEY Grant

Exhibit 3.8: Changes in Perceptions of the Effectiveness of CEY Grant—Lead Organizations

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests		
	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Partnership Capacity									
Thinking about the changes that the CEY partnership may have undergone since you joined it, to what extent did CEY grant funding and activities make a positive difference in your partnership's overall capacity to serve your community? ^{a, b}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	48	74.8	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	64.5	31	74.2	-	9.7	-
Satisfaction with Partnership and Capacity-Building Activities									
The number and types of meetings, technical assistance, and trainings my organization participated in were sufficient to meet the objectives and expectations we had when we started/joined the partnership ^{b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	50	89.8	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	100.0	31	100.0	-	0.0	-
The CEY grant supported capacity building activities increased my agency's ability to meet the needs of youth in the community ^{b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	49	92.2	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	93.5	31	93.5	-	0.0	-
The partnership model required by the CEY grant is a good approach to increase organizational capacity among participating organizations ^{b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	50	94.4	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	93.5	31	90.3	-	-3.2	-
Thinking about the changes that your organization may have undergone since the receipt of the CEY grant, to what extent did the CEY funding and activities make a positive difference in your organizational capacity? ^{a, b}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	50	68.4	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	61.3	31	71.0	-	9.7	-

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a The first follow-up and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered "To a Great Extent" on a scale from 1 to 4 with 1 being "To a Great Extent" and 4 being "Not at All."

^b Question was asked only at first follow-up and second follow-up.

^c The first follow-up and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being "Strongly Agree" and 5 being "Strongly Disagree."

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. The sample at second follow-up includes 31 lead organizations (2007 cohort only) and represents the population of 31 lead organizations in 2010. "Baseline vs. F1" denotes changes between baseline and first follow-up; "F1 vs. F2" denotes changes between first follow-up and second follow-up; "Baseline vs. F2" denotes changes between baseline and second follow-up.

3.1.8 Partnership Development and Dynamics

Exhibit 3.9: Changes in Partnership Development and Dynamics—Lead Organizations

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests		
	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Lead Organizations with New Partners									
We sought the new partner because we had resources to serve more organizations. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	7	85.7	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	12	83.3	4	75.0	-	-	-
We sought the new partner because their skills and knowledge filled a gap in the CEY partnership. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	7	71.4	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	12	75.0	4	75.0	-	-	-
The new partner initiated contact and sought to join the CEY partnership. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	7	42.9	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	12	50.0	4	50.0	-	-	-
Lead Organizations with Former Partners									
Our organization's mission and goals did not align with the partner organization. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	7	28.6	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	8	12.5	5	0.0	-	-	-
The partner organization did not commit enough time to participate in CEY activities. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	7	71.4	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	8	75.0	5	80.0	-	-	-
The partner organization did not make efforts to communicate with us as the lead organization. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	7	85.7	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	8	62.5	5	40.0	-	-	-
We had a strained relationship with the partner organization. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	7	28.6	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	8	0.0	5	60.0	-	-	-
The CEY partnership dynamic has improved since discontinuing partnership with the organization. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	7	42.9	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	8	50.0	5	80.0	-	-	-

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a The first follow-up and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being “Strongly Agree” and 5 being “Strongly Disagree.”

^b Question was asked only at first follow-up and second follow-up.

^c Significance tests were not performed due to small sample size.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline, Follow-Up 1, and Follow-Up 2 Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. The sample at second follow-up includes 31 lead organizations (2007 cohort only) and represents the population of 31 lead organizations in 2010. “Baseline vs. F1” denotes changes between baseline and first follow-up; “F1 vs. F2” denotes changes between first follow-up and second follow-up; “Baseline vs. F2” denotes changes between baseline and second follow-up.

3.2 Data from Partner Organizations

3.2.1 Partner Characteristics

Exhibit 3.10: Characteristics of Partner Organizations

	Baseline Number of Respondents (N)	Baseline Average or % Yes	Baseline Standard Deviation (SD)	Baseline Range
How old is the organization (years)?	436	24.1	30.9	1.7-210.2
Is organization faith-based?	436	-	-	-
Geographic area organization serves: ^a	436	3.0	0.5	1-5
Is organization a Weed & Seed agency?	436	8.3	-	-
Is organization currently partnering with any Weed & Seed agencies on the CEY project?	436	21.3	-	-
In the past 12 months, has your organization addressed: Gang violence?	436	60.3	-	-
In the past 12 months, has your organization addressed: Youth violence?	436	80.7	-	-
In the past 12 months, has your organization addressed: Child abuse/neglect?	436	62.6	-	-
Does your organization provide direct client services?	436	88.0	-	-
Does your organization provide capacity building support to other organizations?	436	43.1	-	-

^a Average is based on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 is a small town (population less than 10,000); 2 is a large town (population between 10,000 and 50,000), 3 is a city (large, densely populated area that may include several administrative districts), 4 is an entire state, and 5 is multiple geographically distinct areas.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline Survey

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts).

Exhibit 3.11: Characteristics of Partner Organizations (cont.)

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up			
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range
Is the executive director paid?	400	80.3	-	-	397	74.34	-	-	105	81.9	-	-

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and Follow-up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at second follow-up includes 158 partner organizations and represents the population of 158 partner organizations in 2010 (2007 cohort only).

3.2.2 Leadership Development

Exhibit 3.12: Changes in Leadership Development—Partners

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Executive Director Development															
Did the executive director participate in any training related to management and administration?															
Cohort 2006	306	84.2	-	-	332	87.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	76.9	-	-	144	82.9	-	-	125	95.8	-	-	6	12.9**	18.9**
Did the executive director participate in any training related to fundraising?															
Cohort 2006	306	71.4	-	-	332	77.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.5*	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	58.8	-	-	144	72.2	-	-	125	81.3	-	-	13.4**	9.1*	22.5**
Did the executive director participate in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?															
Cohort 2006	306	79.7	-	-	332	84.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	68.4	-	-	144	78	-	-	125	87.1	-	-	9.6	9.1*	18.7**
Full- and Part-Time Staff Development															
How many paid staff participated in any training related to management and administration?															
Cohort 2006	233	4.5	14.8	0-120	258	6.1	35.6	0-400	-	-	-	-	1.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	103	6.8	16.7	0-100	129	4.8	15.3	0-160	120	4.1	8.2	0-51	-2.1	-0.7	-2.8*
How many paid staff participated in any training related to fundraising?															
Cohort 2006	234	1.9	5.7	0-45	257	1.9	5.8	0-50	-	-	-	-	0	-	-
Cohort 2007	102	2.4	8.2	0-58	128	1.2	1.9	0-14	119	2.4	6.5	0-50	-1.2	1.2*	0.1
How many paid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?															
Cohort 2006	235	16.1	132.3	0-1515	260	8.7	39.5	0-400	-	-	-	-	-7.5	-	-
Cohort 2007	103	8.8	21.3	0-130	129	6.2	16.2	0-160	121	7.1	13.7	0-100	-2.6	0.9	-1.7

Exhibit 3.12: Changes in Leadership Development—Partners

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to management and administration?															
Cohort 2006	120	2.8	15.2	0-100	149	2.3	16	0-120	-	-	-	-	-0.5	-	-
Cohort 2007	59	1.8	4.7	0-25	65	1.6	2.8	0-13	75	1.2	2.9	0-16	-0.2	-0.4	-0.6
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to fundraising?															
Cohort 2006	118	0.9	2.7	0-15	149	1.1	2.5	0-12	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	58	1.9	10.5	0-80	64	0.9	2.1	0-13	76	0.8	1.7	0-10	-1.1	0.0	-1.1
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?															
Cohort 2006	119	3	19.2	0-130	149	2.6	17.5	0-130	-	-	-	-	-0.5	-	-
Cohort 2007	59	3.2	11.7	0-80	65	2.1	3.5	0-20	77	2.1	3.6	0-15	-1.1	0.0	-1.1
Volunteer Development															
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to management and administration?															
Cohort 2006	186	3.7	22.1	0-200	237	3.1	17.8	0-200	-	-	-	-	-0.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	87	6.1	37.9	0-350	106	2.1	5.8	0-35	100	3.1	9.1	0-75	-4.0	1.0	-3.0
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to fundraising?															
Cohort 2006	180	2.1	8.1	0-40	233	2.7	13.6	0-100	-	-	-	-	0.7	-	-
Cohort 2007	85	4.3	18.1	0-140	105	0.6	1.8	0-12	103	2.1	5.5	0-40	-3.7	1.5**	-2.2
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?															
Cohort 2006	202	10.5	45.5	0-300	245	14.7	97.8	0-962	-	-	-	-	4.2	-	-
Cohort 2007	93	15.9	40.1	0-250	117	23.5	88.9	0-782	109	27.8	106	0-900	7.7	4.3	12

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at second follow-up includes 158 partner organizations and represents the population of 158 partner organizations in 2010 (2007 cohort only). –Baseline vs. F1” denotes changes between baseline and first follow-up; –F1 vs. F2” denotes changes between first follow-up and second follow-up; –Baseline vs. F2” denotes changes between baseline and second follow-up.

3.2.3 Organizational Development

Exhibit 3.13: Changes in Organizational Development – Partners

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Mission and Strategic Planning															
In the past 12 months, has your organization formally assessed its organizational needs/strengths?															
Cohort 2006	306	93.2	-	-	346	95.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	91.0	-	-	151	97.5	-	-	149	95.5	-	-	6.5 *	-2.0	4.5
Does your organization have a mission statement?															
Cohort 2006	306	94.7	-	-	346	97.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.0 *	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	93.9	-	-	151	97.1	-	-	149	98.7	-	-	3.3	1.5	4.8 *
Does your organization have a strategic plan?															
Cohort 2006	306	63.6	-	-	346	73.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.6 **	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	57.0	-	-	151	69.7	-	-	149	78.4	-	-	12.7 *	8.7 *	21.4 **
Governance and Organizational Structure															
Is your organization governed by a parent or umbrella organization's Board of Directors?															
Cohort 2006	306	20.5	-	-	346	18.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2.2	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	22.7	-	-	151	19.4	-	-	149	15.8	-	-	-3.3	-3.6	-6.9
Is your organization governed by an Advisory Panel?															
Cohort 2006	306	16.0	-	-	346	13.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2.7	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	16.4	-	-	151	16.8	-	-	149	13.9	-	-	0.3	-2.9	-2.6
Is your organization governed by its own Board of Directors?															
Cohort 2006	306	85.0	-	-	346	85.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	77.6	-	-	151	79	-	-	149	81.6	-	-	1.5	2.5	4
Board responsibilities include: Goal/Strategy development															
Cohort 2006	267	98.1	-	-	295	95.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2.9	-	-
Cohort 2007	102	92.3	-	-	121	94.5	-	-	121	97.4	-	-	2.2	2.9	5.1
Board responsibilities include: Community/Stakeholder outreach															
Cohort 2006	267	84.3	-	-	295	87.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.8	-	-
Cohort 2007	102	77.3	-	-	121	88.6	-	-	121	87.8	-	-	11.3 *	-0.8	10.5 *
Board responsibilities include: Budget development															
Cohort 2006	267	81.5	-	-	295	82.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.2	-	-
Cohort 2007	102	78.7	-	-	120	83.1	-	-	121	84.7	-	-	4.5	1.6	6.1
Board responsibilities include: Financial review															
Cohort 2006	267	96.5	-	-	295	96.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4	-	-
Cohort 2007	102	94.9	-	-	121	99	-	-	121	97.7	-	-	4.1	-1.3	2.8
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of program outcomes															
Cohort 2006	266	84.4	-	-	295	81.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2.7	-	-
Cohort 2007	102	75.2	-	-	120	77.5	-	-	121	81.0	-	-	2.2	3.5	5.8

Exhibit 3.13: Changes in Organizational Development – Partners

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of executive director															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	266	84.3	-	-	295	88.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.1	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	102	81.9	-	-	121	88.3	-	-	121	85.4	-	-	6.3	-2.9	3.5
Board responsibilities include: Recruitment of new board members															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	266	89.7	-	-	295	91.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.1	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	102	83.4	-	-	121	95.1	-	-	121	95.4	-	-	11.7 **	0.4	12.1 **
Board responsibilities include: Provision of formal orientation to new board members															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	266	77.2	-	-	295	78.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.2	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	102	65.4	-	-	120	80.1	-	-	121	80.3	-	-	14.7 **	0.2	14.9 **
At present, how many individuals are on your organization's board?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	267	9.6	9.6	3-60	297	9.8	9	3-60	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	103	10.5	6.6	0-34	121	9.9	5.7	2-35	121	10.3	6.2	2-32	-0.6	0.4	-0.2
In the past 12 months, how many individuals have served as executive director or your organization? ^a															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	-	-	-	-	346	1.0	0.5	0-3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	-	-	-	-	150	1.0	0.3	0-2	149	1	0.4	0-2	-	0.0	-
Organization has 501(c)3 status															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	287	78.9	-	-	328	87.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.5 **	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	123	74.7	-	-	146	76.4	-	-	140	84.4	-	-	1.8	8.0 *	9.7 *
Revenue Sources															
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total revenue? ^b															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	305	123,374	95,636,293	0-924,210,000	344	121,850	48,650,098	0-550,000,000	-	-	-	-	-1,524	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	130	149,700	2,286,065	0-14,456,250	151	180,000	1,647,985	0-17,000,000	148	156,554	2,011,739	0-17,000,000	30,300	-23,446	6,854 *
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total expenditures? ^b															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	305	111,962	95,306,721	0-924,210,000	344	121,850	46,898,418	0-530,000,000	-	-	-	-	9,888	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	130	170,000	2,278,061	0-14,332,234	151	175,000	1,760,317	0-16,000,000	148	146,199	1,953,727	0-16,000,000	5,000	-28,801	-23,801 *
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from federal government agencies?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	306	24.7	-	-	346	23.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.8	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	130	34	-	-	151	25.4	-	-	149	26.7	-	-	-8.6 *	1.4	-7.3
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from state or local government agencies?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	306	39.7	-	-	346	42.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.8	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	130	46.9	-	-	151	46.3	-	-	149	39.8	-	-	-0.6	-6.5	-7.1
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from institutional funding sources (e.g., corporations, foundations)?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	306	44.6	-	-	346	43.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.8	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	130	51.8	-	-	151	52.8	-	-	149	50.7	-	-	1	-2.1	-1

Exhibit 3.13: Changes in Organizational Development – Partners

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from individual donors or events?															
Cohort 2006	306	60.3	-	-	346	58.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2.2	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	64.7	-	-	151	57.8	-	-	149	60.9	-	-	-6.9	3.1	-3.8
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from Fees for Service?															
Cohort 2006	305	30.8	-	-	346	26.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-4.3	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	36.5	-	-	151	41.4	-	-	149	42.9	-	-	4.9	1.5	6.4
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from another organization?															
Cohort 2006	306	40.1	-	-	346	26.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-13.6 **	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	29.3	-	-	151	26.5	-	-	149	27.8	-	-	-2.8	1.3	-1.5
Funding Readiness															
Does your organization have a fundraising/fund development plan?															
Cohort 2006	306	37.3	-	-	346	48	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.7 **	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	33.2	-	-	151	41.3	-	-	149	50.1	-	-	8.1	8.8 *	16.9 **
Does your organization have financial management procedures for ensuring expenditures are properly authorized?															
Cohort 2006	306	72.8	-	-	346	77.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.3	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	76.1	-	-	151	75.3	-	-	149	80.9	-	-	-0.8	5.7	4.9
Does your organization have an individual, distinct from the executive director, who is responsible for financial management?															
Cohort 2006	306	83.9	-	-	332	87.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.3	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	82.6	-	-	144	84.2	-	-	139	88.5	-	-	1.6	4.3	5.9
Human Resources Management															
How many paid staff are full-time employees?															
Cohort 2006	243	16.1	95.8	0-740	273	15.3	76.7	0-600	-	-	-	-	-0.8	-	-
Cohort 2007	110	9	21.7	0-148	135	8.1	23.2	0-200	130	9.3	26.3	0-200	-0.9	1.2	0.3
How many unpaid staff are full-time employees?															
Cohort 2006	118	0.7	2.4	0-15	152	1	2.9	0-15	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-
Cohort 2007	67	0.9	3.9	0-30	65	1	2.2	0-15	82	0.7	1.2	0-6	0.1	-0.3	-0.2
How many paid staff are part-time employees?															
Cohort 2006	243	5.1	14.6	0-69	273	6.3	18.9	0-125	-	-	-	-	1.2	-	-
Cohort 2007	110	8.7	19.7	0-142	135	7.9	20.7	0-200	129	7.1	17	0-144	-0.8	-0.8	-1.6
How many unpaid staff are part-time employees?															
Cohort 2006	118	4.8	22.8	0-153	152	4.7	21.2	0-155	-	-	-	-	-0.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	67	2.8	6	0-40	65	4.5	6.9	0-37	82	4.1	6.6	0-35	1.7	-0.4	1.3
How many volunteers are part-time employees?															
Cohort 2006	217	31.7	116.4	0-680	268	49.7	487.1	1-4879	-	-	-	-	18	-	-
Cohort 2007	103	51.4	133.5	0-1100	119	49.1	111.1	1-782	116	59.6	202.9	1-1900	-2.3	10.5	8.2
Is there a job description for paid staff?															
Cohort 2006	261	92.6	-	-	275	92.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-
Cohort 2007	116	92.3	-	-	135	92.7	-	-	129	89.6	-	-	0.4	-3.1	-2.7

Exhibit 3.13: Changes in Organizational Development – Partners

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Is there a job description for unpaid staff?															
Cohort 2006	145	55.6	-	-	153	65	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.4	-	-
Cohort 2007	78	49.2	-	-	67	61.5	-	-	82	72.1	-	-	12.3	10.7 *	23.0 **
Is there a job description for volunteers?															
Cohort 2006	252	47.3	-	-	271	58.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.2 **	-	-
Cohort 2007	118	48.4	-	-	120	55.7	-	-	118	59.8	-	-	7.3	4.1	11.4 *
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of paid staff?															
Cohort 2006	255	60.3	-	-	275	63.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.5	-	-
Cohort 2007	115	42.7	-	-	135	49.8	-	-	129	50.4	-	-	7.1	0.6	7.7
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of unpaid staff?															
Cohort 2006	143	21.5	-	-	154	36.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.1 **	-	-
Cohort 2007	75	23.7	-	-	67	20.9	-	-	82	36.8	-	-	-2.8	15.9 **	13.2 *
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of volunteers?															
Cohort 2006	242	14.7	-	-	273	20.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.7	-	-
Cohort 2007	113	16.7	-	-	120	11	-	-	118	16	-	-	-5.7	5	-0.7
IT Management															
Does your organization regularly use computer software to keep financial records?															
Cohort 2006	306	84.2	-	-	332	89.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.2 *	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	82.3	-	-	144	94.2	-	-	139	91.4	-	-	11.9 **	-2.8	9.0 **
Do you have an adequate number of computers to meet your organization's needs?															
Cohort 2006	306	48.5	-	-	332	66.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	17.9 **	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	32.7	-	-	144	67.1	-	-	139	74.2	-	-	34.4 **	7.1	41.5 **
Is the software on these computers adequate to meet your organization's needs?															
Cohort 2006	306	52.0	-	-	332	75.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	23.0 **	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	40.6	-	-	144	69.1	-	-	139	77.2	-	-	28.5 **	8.1	36.5 **
Does your organization have access to the Internet?															
Cohort 2006	306	95.7	-	-	332	97.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.9	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	92.4	-	-	144	95.8	-	-	139	97.6	-	-	3.5	1.7	5.2 *
Does your organization use the Internet to support an organizational website?															
Cohort 2006	295	67.8	-	-	324	76.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.8 **	-	-
Cohort 2007	120	75.2	-	-	139	87.8	-	-	136	88.4	-	-	12.6 **	0.6	13.2 **
Does your organization use the Internet for program email?															
Cohort 2006	295	95.3	-	-	324	95.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	120	94.3	-	-	139	97.8	-	-	136	94.3	-	-	3.5	-3.5	-0.1
Does your organization use the Internet for research purposes?															
Cohort 2006	295	94.8	-	-	324	95.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.8	-	-
Cohort 2007	120	94.3	-	-	139	97.5	-	-	136	97.1	-	-	3.2	-0.4	2.8

Exhibit 3.13: Changes in Organizational Development – Partners

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Does your organization use the Internet for community outreach purposes?															
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	295	71.5	-	-	324	81.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.8 **	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	120	72.6	-	-	139	83.0	-	-	136	86.0	-	-	10.4 *	3.0	13.4 **

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a The question at baseline referenced a different timeframe so results are not shown.

^b The number reported in the “Average or % Yes” column represents the weighted median. Significance tests were performed on the unweighted medians using a signed rank test.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at second follow-up includes 158 partner organizations and represents the population of 158 partner organizations in 2010 (2007 cohort only). “Baseline vs. F1” denotes changes between baseline and first follow-up; “F1 vs. F2” denotes changes between first follow-up and second follow-up; “Baseline vs. F2” denotes changes between baseline and second follow-up.

3.2.4 Program Development

Exhibit 3.14: Changes in Program Development – Partners

	Baseline				First Follow-Up				Second Follow-Up				Significance Tests		
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	Standard deviation (SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	N	Average or % Yes	(SD)	Range	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Service Delivery															
In a month of service delivery, total number of program participants organization serves															
Cohort 2006	267	423.8	2127.6	0-15,000	319	353.6	1311.2	0-9,000	-	-	-	-	-70.2	-	-
Cohort 2007	119	362.9	656.1	0-4,500	147	380.1	778.5	0-5,000	145	526.4	1185.7	2-7000	17.2	146.3	163.5 *
In a month of service delivery, what is the total number of organizations for whom capacity building services are provided?															
Cohort 2006	140	14.7	88.7	0-700	161	6.3	10.6	0-40	-	-	-	-	-8.3	-	-
Cohort 2007	53	5.2	6.8	0-30	64	4.8	5.6	0-30	61	5.3	6.3	0-31	-0.5	0.5	0.1
Program Evaluation															
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with (direct) services provided?															
Cohort 2006	261	82.4	-	-	313	88.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.5 *	-	-
Cohort 2007	114	74.9	-	-	146	90.6	-	-	145	91.1	-	-	15.7 **	0.5	16.2 **
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of (direct service) program participant outcomes?															
Cohort 2006	260	64.1	-	-	313	68.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	114	54.1	-	-	146	65.3	-	-	145	67.2	-	-	11.2 *	1.9	13.0 *
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with (capacity building) services provided?															
Cohort 2006	136	80.0	-	-	156	88.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.6 *	-	-
Cohort 2007	48	70.7	-	-	63	95.0	-	-	61	85.5	-	-	24.3 **	-9.5	14.9
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of (capacity building) program participant outcomes?															
Cohort 2006	134	56.1	-	-	156	59.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.8	-	-
Cohort 2007	46	36.9	-	-	63	60.4	-	-	61	68.7	-	-	23.5 **	8.2	31.8 **

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at second follow-up includes 158 partner organizations and represents the population of 158 partner organizations in 2010 (2007 cohort only). –Baseline vs. F1” denotes changes between baseline and first follow-up; –F1 vs. F2” denotes changes between first follow-up and second follow-up; –Baseline vs. F2” denotes changes between baseline and second follow-up.

3.2.5 Community Engagement

Exhibit 3.15: Changes in Community Engagement—Partners

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests		
	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Partnerships									
Organization engaged in partnership arrangements with other organizations in its community/service area (not CEY)?									
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	305	83.9	346	86.4	-	-	2.4	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	130	88.5	151	97.5	149	94.2	9.0 **	-3.3	5.7
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: government?									
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	262	53.6	306	61.5	-	-	7.9 *	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	116	52.9	147	52.8	141	58.4	-0.1	5.6	5.5
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: business/private?									
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	262	60.6	306	63.3	-	-	2.7	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	116	53.1	147	57.7	141	69.4	4.6	11.7 **	16.3 **
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: educational institutions?									
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	262	79.7	306	80.9	-	-	1.2	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	116	77.9	147	84.7	141	81.6	6.8	-3.2	3.6
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: faith-based nonprofit?									
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	262	71.0	306	78.2	-	-	7.2 *	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	115	78.6	147	77.4	141	80.2	-1.2	2.7	1.6
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: secular nonprofit?									
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	261	80.6	306	78.3	-	-	-2.3	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	116	83.5	147	82.6	141	83.8	-0.9	1.2	0.3
Community Outreach									
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it gains knowledge about the community it serves?									
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	306	71.4	346	85.3	-	-	13.9 **	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	130	69.5	151	87.6	149	87.3	18.1 **	-0.3	17.8 **
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for gaining knowledge about the community it serves?									
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	306	59.9	346	73.6	-	-	13.8 **	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	130	65.0	151	75.1	149	77.3	10.1 *	2.1	12.3 **
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it markets its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?									
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	306	91.1	345	92.3	-	-	1.2	-	-
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	130	81.8	151	94.8	149	94.9	12.9 **	0.1	13.0 **

Exhibit 3.15: Changes in Community Engagement—Partners

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests		
	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for marketing its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?									
Cohort 2006	306	72.2	345	77.7	-	-	5.5	-	-
Cohort 2007	130	63.2	151	78.5	149	80.6	15.3 **	2.1	17.3 **

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at follow-up two includes 158 partner organizations and represents the population of 158 partner organizations in 2010 (2007 cohort only). —Baseline vs. F1” denotes changes between baseline and first follow-up; —F1 vs. F2” denotes changes between first follow-up and second follow-up; —Baseline vs. F2” denotes changes between baseline and second follow-up.

3.2.6 Partnership Capacity

Exhibit 3.16: Changes in Partnership Capacity—Partners

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests		
	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Leadership Development									
Lead operates with the best interest of your organization in mind ^{a, b}									
Cohort 2006	294	88.9	324	85.6	-	-	-3.2	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	138	82.3	139	87	-	4.7	-
Lead is collegial. It respects your organization ^{a, b}									
Cohort 2006	294	91.8	327	88.9	-	-	-2.9	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	139	89.7	139	90.4	-	0.7	-
Lead is even-handed and ensures that project efforts are not skewed to a single party's interests ^{a, b}									
Cohort 2006	290	91	321	85.5	-	-	-5.4 *	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	136	86.8	136	88.9	-	2.1	-
Lead is competent. It is able to provide the capacity building assistance your organization wants or expects ^{a, b}									
Cohort 2006	292	86.4	329	81.8	-	-	-4.7	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	140	84.7	139	91.2	-	6.5 *	-
Lead is dependable. It follows through on commitments in a timely and efficient manner ^{a, b}									
Cohort 2006	294	87.5	328	82.4	-	-	-5.1 *	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	140	82.8	139	87.6	-	4.9	-
Shared Mission and Objectives									
Does your CEY partnership have a mission statement?									
Cohort 2006	242	86.2	280	86.1	-	-	-0.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	89	70.7	114	89.1	124	93.4	18.5 **	4.3	22.8 **
Your organization fully understands the goals of your CEY partnership ^a									
Cohort 2006	299	84.4	326	83.0	-	-	-1.4	-	-
Cohort 2007	126	69.6	140	85.8	139	91.3	16.3 **	5.5	21.8 **
Your organization was involved in setting the goals of your CEY partnership ^{a, b}									
Cohort 2006	280	69.7	306	71.6	-	-	1.8	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	137	73.7	137	79.9	-	6.2	-
Your CEY partnership's goals are well aligned with the goals of your organization ^{a, b}									
Cohort 2006	290	88	322	84.4	-	-	-3.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	136	83.7	139	85.5	-	1.8	-
Lead's mission and/or work is well aligned with your organization's mission ^a									
Cohort 2006	294	87.1	323	87.3	-	-	0.2	-	-
Cohort 2007	128	84.7	135	88.1	137	91.5	3.3	3.5	6.8
Communication									
Participating in the CEY partnership led to better communication and working relationships among participating organizations than before ^{a, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	327	86.0	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	141	90.8	138	87.6	-	-3.2	-

Exhibit 3.16: Changes in Partnership Capacity—Partners

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests		
	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Action Plan									
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines tasks to be achieved? ^b									
Cohort 2006	270	86.2	298	87.4	-	-	1.2	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	131	86.8	136	86.2	-	-0.6	-
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines timeline by which these tasks are to be achieved? ^b									
Cohort 2006	256	80.5	282	83.0	-	-	2.5	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	126	83.2	130	78.9	-	-4.3	-
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines individuals or organizations responsible for completing each task? ^b									
Cohort 2006	252	77.5	275	80.2	-	-	2.8	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	124	74.4	130	80.0	-	5.7	-
Sustainability Plan									
Does your partnership have a sustainability plan? ^b									
Cohort 2006	184	62.8	224	50.6	-	-	-12.1 **	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	88	43.4	106	39.5	-	-4.0	-
On a scale of 1-5 please describe your opinion as to how likely or unlikely it is that your CEY partnership will continue past the 3-year grant cycle. ^d									
Cohort 2006	285	81.7	304	80.3	-	-	-1.4	-	-
Cohort 2007	122	85.2	138	80.8	128	78.8	-4.4	-2.0	-6.4

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a The baseline, first follow-up, and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being “Strongly Agree” and 5 being “Strongly Disagree.”

^b Question was asked only of the 2006 cohort at baseline.

^c Question was asked only at first follow-up and second follow-up.

^d The baseline, first follow-up, and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered “Highly Likely” or “Likely” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being “Highly Likely” and 5 being “Highly Unlikely.”

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at second follow-up includes 158 partner organizations and represents the population of 158 partner organizations in 2010 (2007 cohort only). “Baseline vs. F1” denotes changes between baseline and first follow-up; “F1 vs. F2” denotes changes between first follow-up and second follow-up; “Baseline vs. F2” denotes changes between baseline and second follow-up.

3.2.7 Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the CEY Grant

Exhibit 3.17: Changes in Perceptions of the Effectiveness of CEY Grant—Partners

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests		
	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
Partnership Capacity									
Thinking about the changes that the CEY partnership may have undergone since you joined it, to what extent did CEY grant funding and activities make a positive difference in your partnership's overall capacity to serve your community? ^{a, b}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	322	56.3	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	139	62.6	136	70.7	-	8.1	-
Satisfaction with Partnership and Capacity-Building Activities									
The number and types of meetings, technical assistance, and trainings my organization participated in were sufficient to meet the objectives and expectations we had when we started/joined the partnership ^{b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	328	88.2	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	142	87.2	139	91.3	-	4.1	-
The CEY grant supported capacity building activities increased my agency's ability to meet the needs of youth in the community ^{b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	324	91.2	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	143	91.5	139	96.8	-	5.4	-
The partnership model required by the CEY grant is a good approach to increase organizational capacity among participating organizations ^{b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	326	90.9	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	142	92.3	138	90.8	-	-1.6	-
Thinking about the changes that your organization may have undergone since you joined your CEY partnership, to what extent did CEY supported activities make a positive difference in your organizational capacity? ^{a, b}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	325	62.4	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	142	68.8	139	79.1	-	10.3 *	-

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a The first follow-up and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered "To a Great Extent" on a scale from 1 to 4 with 1 being "To a Great Extent" and 4 being "Not at All."

^b Question was asked only at first follow-up and second follow-up.

^c The first follow-up and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being "Strongly Agree" and 5 being "Strongly Disagree."

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline, Follow-Up 1, and Follow-Up 2 Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at second follow-up includes 158 partner organizations and represents the population of 158 partner organizations in 2010 (2007 cohort only). "Baseline vs. F1" denotes changes between baseline and first follow-up; "F1 vs. F2" denotes changes between first follow-up and second follow-up; "Baseline vs. F2" denotes changes between baseline and second follow-up.

3.2.8 Partnership Development and Dynamics

Exhibit 3.18: Changes in Partnership Development and Dynamics—Partners

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests		
	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
New Partners									
Joined the CEY partnership to improve our organizational capacity through receipt of training, technical assistance, or financial support. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	29	86.2	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	26	92.3	6	83.3	-	-	-
Joined the CEY partnership to assess community needs. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	29	72.4	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	26	69.2	6	66.7	-	-	-
Joined the CEY partnership to engage in peer learning. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	29	69	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	26	84.6	6	50	-	-	-
Joined the CEY partnership to streamline service provision in our community. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	29	62.1	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	26	76.9	6	66.7	-	-	-
Joined the CEY partnership to access new funding sources. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	29	82.8	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	26	84.6	6	83.3	-	-	-
Joined the CEY partnership to enhance image/visibility. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	29	69	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	26	80.8	6	83.3	-	-	-
Joined the CEY partnership to influence policy, institutional change. ^{a, b, c}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	29	62.1	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	26	69.2	6	50	-	-	-
Former Partners									
Our organization's mission and goals did not align with the CEY partnership. ^{a, b, d}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	14	14.3	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	7	28.6	5	0	-	-	-
The CEY partnership activities were too time-consuming. ^{a, b, d}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	14	35.7	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	7	57.1	5	40	-	-	-
The lead organization did not make efforts to facilitate communication within the CEY partnership. ^{a, b, d}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	14	7.1	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	7	14.3	5	60	-	-	-

Exhibit 3.18: Changes in Partnership Development and Dynamics—Partners

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests		
	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	N	% Yes	Baseline vs. F1	F1 vs. F2	Baseline vs. F2
We had a strained relationship with the lead organization. ^{a, b, d}									
Cohort 2006	-	-	14	14.3	-	-	-	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	7	42.9	5	40	-	-	-

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a Question was asked only at first follow-up and second follow-up.

^b Significance tests were not performed due to small sample size.

^c The first follow-up and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered “High Priority” or “Priority” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being “High Priority” and 5 being “Low Priority.”

^d The first follow-up and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being “Strongly Agree” and 5 being “Strongly Disagree.”

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at second follow-up includes 158 partner organizations and represents the population of 158 partner organizations in 2010 (2007 cohort only). “Baseline vs. F1” denotes changes between baseline and first follow-up; “F1 vs. F2” denotes changes between first follow-up and second follow-up; “Baseline vs. F2” denotes changes between baseline and second follow-up.

4. Results – Subgroup Comparisons

This chapter presents the results of the subgroup analyses. As described in Section 2.4, we analyzed subgroups of three types:

1. Cohort 2006 and 2007,
2. Pre-existing partnerships (Q54), and
3. Partnership size (Q63a).

All three subgroups were analyzed after first follow-up, but only partnership size among partner organizations was analyzed after second follow-up. The tables below present the results of the subgroup analyses in this order:

1. Lead organizations by Cohort (baseline to first follow-up)
2. Partner organizations by Cohort (baseline to first follow-up)
3. Lead organizations by Pre-existing Partnership (baseline to first follow-up)
4. Partner organizations by Pre-existing Partnership (baseline to first follow-up)
5. Lead organizations by Partnership Size (baseline to first follow-up)
6. Partner organizations by Partnership Size (baseline to second follow-up).

Each set of results contains five tables, one for each domain.

For each type of subgroup, we calculated the difference in change scores between the two subgroups, and tested whether these differences were statistically different from zero using the method described in Section 2.6. For example, to test whether changes in the number of full-time staff differed between the 2006 and 2007 cohorts, we calculated the change between baseline and first follow-up in full-time staff for the 2006 cohort (-21.5) and the 2007 cohort (2.4). The subgroup difference is the difference between these differences (23.9).

In the exhibits that follow, if the subgroup difference is positive and significant, capacity gains were larger for the second subgroup listed. If the difference is negative and significant, capacity gains were larger for the first subgroup listed. Each subgroup difference is assigned stars to indicate statistical significance. Two stars indicate a statistically significant difference at the 1 percent level, one star indicates a statistically significant difference at the 5 percent level, and omission of a star indicates that the difference was not statistically significant at either the 1 percent or the 5 percent levels.

4.1 Lead Organizations by Cohort

Exhibit 4.1: Subgroup Changes in Leadership Development—Lead Organizations Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Executive Director Development						
Did the executive director participate in any training related to management and administration?						
Cohort 2006	50	86.8	50	90.8	4.0	-10.5
Cohort 2007	31	83.9	31	77.4	-6.5	
Did the executive director participate in any training related to fundraising?						
Cohort 2006	50	71.4	50	78.1	6.6	-13.1
Cohort 2007	31	71.0	31	64.5	-6.5	
Did the executive director participate in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
Cohort 2006	50	83.1	50	83.2	0.1	-3.3
Cohort 2007	31	74.2	31	71.0	-3.2	
Full- and Part-Time Staff Development						
How many paid staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
Cohort 2006	49	21.5	50	13.1	-8.4	11.0
Cohort 2007	29	18.2	31	20.8	2.5	
How many paid staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
Cohort 2006	50	6.2	48	5.6	-0.6	-0.7
Cohort 2007	29	3.5	31	2.2	-1.4	
How many paid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
Cohort 2006	50	43.6	50	22.6	-21.0	13.1
Cohort 2007	30	30.9	31	22.9	-7.9	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to management and administration? ^a						
Cohort 2006	17	5.1	14	2.5	-	-
Cohort 2007	9	0.8	8	6.1	-	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to fundraising? ^a						
Cohort 2006	17	1.6	13	2.2	-	-
Cohort 2007	9	0.3	8	1.3	-	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery? ^a						
Cohort 2006	17	6.5	13	3.4	-	-
Cohort 2007	9	10.4	8	2.0	-	
Volunteer Development						
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
Cohort 2006	28	6.3	31	5.5	-0.8	1.2
Cohort 2007	15	2.3	18	2.7	0.4	
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
Cohort 2006	29	7.9	32	1.3	-6.6	4.3
Cohort 2007	14	3.9	18	1.6	-2.3	
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
Cohort 2006	29	36.5	34	50.0	13.4	-44.5
Cohort 2007	16	60.0	19	28.9	-31.1	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a Significance tests were not performed due to small sample sizes.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. –Baseline vs. F1 Difference” denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.2: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Mission and Strategic Planning						
In the past 12 months, has your organization formally assessed its organizational needs/strengths?						
Cohort 2006	50	97.4	50	96.0	-1.4	7.9
Cohort 2007	31	93.5	31	100.0	6.5	
Does your organization have a mission statement?						
Cohort 2006	50	94.9	50	100.0	5.1	-1.9
Cohort 2007	31	96.8	31	100.0	3.2	
Does your organization have a strategic plan?						
Cohort 2006	50	77.5	50	93.4	15.9 *	0.3
Cohort 2007	31	64.5	31	80.6	16.1	
Governance and Organizational Structure						
Is your organization governed by a parent or umbrella organization's Board of Directors?						
Cohort 2006	50	13.3	50	23.6	10.3	-7.1
Cohort 2007	31	16.1	31	19.4	3.2	
Is your organization governed by an Advisory Panel?						
Cohort 2006	49	3.6	50	8.7	5.1	-1.9
Cohort 2007	31	6.5	31	9.7	3.2	
Is your organization governed by its own Board of Directors?						
Cohort 2006	50	86.7	50	76.4	-10.3	7.1
Cohort 2007	31	83.9	31	80.6	-3.2	
Board responsibilities include: Goal/Strategy development						
Cohort 2006	45	98.9	41	96.7	-2.1	1.7
Cohort 2007	26	88.5	25	88.0	-0.5	
Board responsibilities include: Community/Stakeholder outreach						
Cohort 2006	45	84.5	41	74.1	-10.3	13.6
Cohort 2007	26	80.8	25	84.0	3.2	
Board responsibilities include: Budget development						
Cohort 2006	45	79.9	41	64.5	-15.5	17.8
Cohort 2007	26	57.7	25	60.0	2.3	
Board responsibilities include: Financial review						
Cohort 2006	45	100	41	100.0	0.0	0.0
Cohort 2007	26	100	25	100.0	0.0	
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of program outcomes						
Cohort 2006	45	77.0	41	76.1	-0.9	18.9
Cohort 2007	26	50.0	25	68.0	18.0	
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of executive director						
Cohort 2006	45	94.2	41	93.5	-0.7	8.3
Cohort 2007	26	88.5	25	96.0	7.5	
Board responsibilities include: Recruitment of new board members						
Cohort 2006	45	87.4	41	90.2	2.9	-11.0
Cohort 2007	26	96.2	25	88.0	-8.2	
Board responsibilities include: Provision of formal orientation to new board members						
Cohort 2006	45	72.5	41	89.0	16.5 *	-13.7
Cohort 2007	26	69.2	25	72.0	2.8	
At present, how many individuals are on your organization's board?						
Cohort 2006	46	12.7	42	12.6	-0.1	-1.3
Cohort 2007	26	13.1	25	11.6	-1.4	
In the past 12 months, how many individuals have served as executive director or your organization? ^a						
Cohort 2006	-	-	50	1.1	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	1.1	-	-
Organization has 501(c)3 status						
Cohort 2006	45	97.2	45	91.3	-5.9	-0.8
Cohort 2007	29	100.0	30	93.3	-6.7	

Exhibit 4.2: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Revenue Sources						
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total revenue? ^b						
Cohort 2006	50	1,700,000	50	1,000,000	-700,000 *	1,246,325
Cohort 2007	31	735,835	31	1,282,160	546,325	
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total expenditures? ^b						
Cohort 2006	50	1,741,000	50	939,962	-801,038 *	1,326,770
Cohort 2007	31	670,831	31	1,196,563	525,732 *	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from federal government agencies?						
Cohort 2006	50	63.9	50	50.1	-13.8	-2.3
Cohort 2007	31	71.0	31	54.8	-16.1	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from state or local government agencies?						
Cohort 2006	50	70.9	50	66.9	-4.1	-2.4
Cohort 2007	31	74.2	31	67.7	-6.5	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from institutional funding sources (e.g., corporations, foundations)?						
Cohort 2006	50	71.9	50	68.3	-3.6	-6.1
Cohort 2007	31	77.4	31	67.7	-9.7	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from individual donors or events?						
Cohort 2006	50	73.4	50	70.9	-2.5	-0.7
Cohort 2007	31	67.7	31	64.5	-3.2	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from Fees for Service?						
Cohort 2006	50	59.1	50	60.1	1.0	-7.5
Cohort 2007	31	51.6	31	45.2	-6.5	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from another organization?						
Cohort 2006	50	29.1	50	29.1	-0.1	-3.2
Cohort 2007	31	25.8	31	22.6	-3.2	
Funding Readiness						
Does your organization have a fundraising/fund development plan?						
Cohort 2006	50	46.9	50	66.2	19.4 **	-29.0 *
Cohort 2007	31	51.6	31	41.9	-9.7	
Does your organization have financial management procedures for ensuring expenditures are properly authorized?						
Cohort 2006	50	89.8	50	100.0	10.2 *	-7.0
Cohort 2007	31	90.3	31	93.5	3.2	
Does your organization have an individual, distinct from the executive director, who is responsible for financial management?						
Cohort 2006	50	100.0	50	100.0	0.0	6.5
Cohort 2007	31	93.5	31	100.0	6.5	
Human Resources Management						
How many paid staff are full-time employees?						
Cohort 2006	50	63.5	50	41.9	-21.5 *	23.9 *
Cohort 2007	30	47.6	31	50.0	2.4	
How many unpaid staff are full-time employees? ^c						
Cohort 2006	15	0.2	14	0.4	-	-
Cohort 2007	8	0.4	7	1.3	-	
How many paid staff are part-time employees?						
Cohort 2006	50	27.0	50	26.5	-0.5	-1.8
Cohort 2007	30	17.9	31	15.5	-2.3	
How many unpaid staff are part-time employees? ^c						
Cohort 2006	15	7.1	14	5.3	-	-
Cohort 2007	8	12.5	7	7.7	-	
How many volunteers are part-time employees?						
Cohort 2006	34	113.0	35	153.2	40.3	-104.5
Cohort 2007	24	146.6	18	82.4	-64.2	

Exhibit 4.2: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Is there a job description for paid staff?						
Cohort 2006	50	94.9	50	94.9	-0.1	0.1
Cohort 2007	31	96.8	31	96.8	0.0	
Is there a job description for unpaid staff? ^c						
Cohort 2006	21	58.4	14	81.3	-	-
Cohort 2007	9	55.6	7	42.9	-	
Is there a job description for volunteers?						
Cohort 2006	35	56.0	35	74.0	18.0	-27.8
Cohort 2007	26	65.4	18	55.6	-9.8	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of paid staff?						
Cohort 2006	50	72.9	50	75.6	2.6	-18.8
Cohort 2007	31	74.2	31	58.1	-16.1	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of unpaid staff? ^c						
Cohort 2006	18	36.0	14	44.6	-	-
Cohort 2007	9	33.3	8	62.5	-	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of volunteers?						
Cohort 2006	35	21.9	36	6.4	-15.5 *	23.3 *
Cohort 2007	25	8.0	19	15.8	7.8	
IT Management						
Does your organization regularly use computer software to keep financial records?						
Cohort 2006	50	97.4	50	100.0	2.6	0.7
Cohort 2007	31	96.8	31	100.0	3.2	
Do you have an adequate number of computers to meet your organization's needs?						
Cohort 2006	50	75.4	50	87.7	12.3	7.1
Cohort 2007	31	64.5	31	83.9	19.4 *	
Is the software on these computers adequate to meet your organization's needs?						
Cohort 2006	50	72.4	50	82.6	10.2	-0.5
Cohort 2007	31	64.5	31	74.2	9.7	
Does your organization have access to the Internet?						
Cohort 2006	50	100.0	50	100.0	0.0	0.0
Cohort 2007	31	100.0	31	100.0	0.0	
Does your organization use the Internet to support an organizational website?						
Cohort 2006	50	93.9	50	96.4	2.6	0.7
Cohort 2007	31	90.3	31	93.5	3.2	
Does your organization use the Internet for program email?						
Cohort 2006	50	100.0	50	100.0	0.0	6.5
Cohort 2007	31	93.5	31	100.0	6.5	
Does your organization use the Internet for research purposes?						
Cohort 2006	50	100.0	50	100.0	0.0	0.0
Cohort 2007	31	100.0	31	100.0	0.0	
Does your organization use the Internet for community outreach purposes?						
Cohort 2006	50	82.0	50	86.1	4.1	2.3
Cohort 2007	31	80.6	31	87.1	6.5	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a The question at baseline referenced a different timeframe so results are not shown.

^b The number reported in the "Average or % Yes" column represents the weighted median. Significance tests were performed on the unweighted medians using a signed rank test.

^c Significance tests were not performed due to small sample sizes.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. "Baseline vs. F1 Difference" denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). "Subgroup Difference" denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.3: Subgroup Changes in Program Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Service Delivery						
In a month of service delivery, total number of program participants organization serves						
Cohort 2006	37	2134.4	35	1400.0	-734.4	795.5
Cohort 2007	25	1056.0	23	1117.0	61.0	
In a month of service delivery, what is the total number of organizations for whom capacity building services are provided?						
Cohort 2006	50	22.3	50	18.0	-4.3	2.4
Cohort 2007	28	14.5	29	12.6	-1.9	
Program Evaluation						
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with (direct) services provided?						
Cohort 2006	37	87.4	34	91.4	4.0	-8.5
Cohort 2007	25	100.0	22	95.5	-4.5	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of (direct service) program participant outcomes?						
Cohort 2006	37	88.1	34	84.9	-3.1	-7.6
Cohort 2007	25	88.0	22	77.3	-10.7	
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with (capacity building) services provided?						
Cohort 2006	49	91.1	50	95.4	4.4	-0.4
Cohort 2007	27	92.6	29	96.6	4.0	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of (capacity building) program participant outcomes?						
Cohort 2006	48	71.1	50	62.2	-8.9	8.6
Cohort 2007	26	69.2	29	69	-0.3	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. –Baseline vs. F1 Difference” denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.4: Subgroup Changes in Community Engagement— Lead Organizations Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Partnerships						
Organization engaged in partnership arrangements with other organizations in its community/service area (not CEY)?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	100.0	50	97.4	-2.6	2.6
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	96.8	31	96.8	0.0	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: government?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	83.1	49	90.6	7.5	-10.8
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	30	83.3	30	80.0	-3.3	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: business/private?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	78.0	49	74.8	-3.2	16.6
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	30	63.3	30	76.7	13.3	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: educational institutions?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	86.8	49	93.3	6.5	-9.8
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	30	93.3	30	90.0	-3.3	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: faith-based nonprofit?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	90.8	49	93.2	2.4	-2.4
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	30	86.7	30	86.7	0.0	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: secular nonprofit?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	93.9	49	90.6	-3.2	6.6
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	30	90.0	30	93.3	3.3	
Community Outreach						
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it gains knowledge about the community it serves?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	87.1	50	89.3	2.1	-2.1
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	83.9	31	83.9	0.0	
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for gaining knowledge about the community it serves?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	79.4	50	81.2	1.8	4.7
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	67.7	31	74.2	6.5	
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it markets its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	92.3	50	93.4	1.1	15.1
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	80.6	31	96.8	16.1	
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for marketing its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	50	87.2	50	90.9	3.6	22.2
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	31	58.1	31	83.9	25.8 *	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. –Baseline vs. F1 Difference” denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.5: Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity— Lead Organizations Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Shared Mission and Objectives						
Does your CEY partnership have a mission statement?						
Cohort 2006	50	56.1	48	74.8	* 18.7	18.0
Cohort 2007	30	36.7	30	73.3	** 36.7	
Your organization fully understands the goals of your CEY partnership ^{a, b}						
Cohort 2006	-	-	50	96.4	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	96.8	-	-
Your organization was involved in setting the goals of your CEY partnership ^{a, b, c}						
Cohort 2006	-	-	50	95.4	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	96.8	-	-
Your CEY partnership's goals are well aligned with the goals of your organization ^{b, c}						
Cohort 2006	50	99.0	50	95.4	-3.6	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	90.3	-	-
Communication						
Participating in the CEY partnership led to better communication and working relationships among participating organizations than before ^{b, d}						
Cohort 2006	-	-	50	94.9	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	96.8	-	-
Action Plan						
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines tasks to be achieved? ^c						
Cohort 2006	50	90.3	50	87.2	-3.1	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	74.2	-	-
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines timeline by which these tasks are to be achieved? ^c						
Cohort 2006	50	77.4	50	73.9	-3.5	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	67.7	-	-
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines individuals or organizations responsible for completing each task? ^c						
Cohort 2006	50	74.9	50	74.4	-0.6	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	31	61.3	-	-
Sustainability Plan						
Does your partnership have a sustainability plan? ^c						
Cohort 2006	50	24.4	49	32.4	8.0	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	30	10.0	-	-
On a scale of 1-5 please describe your opinion as to how likely or unlikely it is that your CEY partnership will continue past the 3-year grant cycle. ^c						
Cohort 2006	47	80.2	48	79.3	-0.9	-9.1
Cohort 2007	30	86.7	30	76.7	-10.0	-

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a Question was asked only of partners at baseline.

^b The baseline, first follow-up, and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered –Strongly Agree” or –Agree” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being –Strongly Agree” and 5 being –Strongly Disagree.”

^c Question was asked only of the 2006 cohort at baseline.

^d Question was asked only at first follow-up and second follow-up.

^e The baseline, first follow-up, and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered –Highly Likely” or –Likely” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being –Highly Likely” and 5 being –Highly Unlikely.”

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. –Baseline vs. F1 Difference” denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

4.2 Partners by Cohort

Exhibit 4.6: Subgroup Changes in Leadership Development— Partners Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Executive Director Development						
Did the executive director participate in any training related to management and administration?						
Cohort 2006	306	84.2	332	87.3	3.1	2.9
Cohort 2007	130	76.9	144	82.9	6.0	
Did the executive director participate in any training related to fundraising?						
Cohort 2006	306	71.4	332	77.9	6.5 *	6.9
Cohort 2007	130	58.8	144	72.2	13.4 **	
Did the executive director participate in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
Cohort 2006	306	79.7	332	84.3	4.6	5.0
Cohort 2007	130	68.4	144	78.0	9.6	
Full- and Part-Time Staff Development						
How many paid staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
Cohort 2006	233	4.5	258	6.1	1.6	-3.7 *
Cohort 2007	103	6.8	129	4.8	-2.1	
How many paid staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
Cohort 2006	234	1.9	257	1.9	0.0	-1.2
Cohort 2007	102	2.4	128	1.2	-1.2	
How many paid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
Cohort 2006	235	16.1	260	8.7	-7.5	4.9
Cohort 2007	103	8.8	129	6.2	-2.6	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
Cohort 2006	120	2.8	149	2.3	-0.5	0.3
Cohort 2007	59	1.8	65	1.6	-0.2	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
Cohort 2006	118	0.9	149	1.1	0.1	-1.2
Cohort 2007	58	1.9	64	0.9	-1.1	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
Cohort 2006	119	3	149	2.6	-0.5	-0.6
Cohort 2007	59	3.2	65	2.1	-1.1	
Volunteer Development						
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
Cohort 2006	186	3.7	237	3.1	-0.6	-3.4
Cohort 2007	87	6.1	106	2.1	-4.0	
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
Cohort 2006	180	2.1	233	2.7	0.7	-4.4 *
Cohort 2007	85	4.3	105	0.6	-3.7	
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
Cohort 2006	202	10.5	245	14.7	4.2	3.5
Cohort 2007	93	15.9	117	23.5	7.7	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). –Baseline vs. F2 Difference” denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.7: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Partners Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Mission and Strategic Planning						
In the past 12 months, has your organization formally assessed its organizational needs/strengths?						
Cohort 2006	306	93.2	346	95.8	2.6	3.9
Cohort 2007	130	91.0	151	97.5	6.5 *	
Does your organization have a mission statement?						
Cohort 2006	306	94.7	346	97.7	3.0 *	0.2
Cohort 2007	130	93.9	151	97.1	3.3	
Does your organization have a strategic plan?						
Cohort 2006	306	63.6	346	73.2	9.6 **	3.1
Cohort 2007	130	57.0	151	69.7	12.7 *	
Governance and Organizational Structure						
Is your organization governed by a parent or umbrella organization's Board of Directors?						
Cohort 2006	306	20.5	346	18.3	-2.2	-1.1
Cohort 2007	130	22.7	151	19.4	-3.3	
Is your organization governed by an Advisory Panel?						
Cohort 2006	306	16.0	346	13.3	-2.7	3.0
Cohort 2007	130	16.4	151	16.8	0.3	
Is your organization governed by its own Board of Directors?						
Cohort 2006	306	85.0	346	85.4	0.4	1.0
Cohort 2007	130	77.6	151	79.0	1.5	
Board responsibilities include: Goal/Strategy development						
Cohort 2006	267	98.1	295	95.2	-2.9	5.1
Cohort 2007	102	92.3	121	94.5	2.2	
Board responsibilities include: Community/Stakeholder outreach						
Cohort 2006	267	84.3	295	87.2	2.8	8.5
Cohort 2007	102	77.3	121	88.6	11.3 *	
Board responsibilities include: Budget development						
Cohort 2006	267	81.5	295	82.7	1.2	3.3
Cohort 2007	102	78.7	120	83.1	4.5	
Board responsibilities include: Financial review						
Cohort 2006	267	96.5	295	96.9	0.4	3.8
Cohort 2007	102	94.9	121	99.0	4.1	
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of program outcomes						
Cohort 2006	266	84.4	295	81.8	-2.7	4.9
Cohort 2007	102	75.2	120	77.5	2.2	
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of executive director						
Cohort 2006	266	84.3	295	88.4	4.1	2.2
Cohort 2007	102	81.9	121	88.3	6.3	
Board responsibilities include: Recruitment of new board members						
Cohort 2006	266	89.7	295	91.8	2.1	9.6 *
Cohort 2007	102	83.4	121	95.1	11.7 **	
Board responsibilities include: Provision of formal orientation to new board members						
Cohort 2006	266	77.2	295	78.4	1.2	13.5 *
Cohort 2007	102	65.4	120	80.1	14.7 **	
At present, how many individuals are on your organization's board?						
Cohort 2006	267	9.6	297	9.8	0.2	-0.8
Cohort 2007	103	10.5	121	9.9	-0.6	
In the past 12 months, how many individuals have served as executive director or your organization? ^a						
Cohort 2006	-	-	346	1.0	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	150	1.0	-	-
Organization has 501(c)3 status						
Cohort 2006	287	78.9	328	87.4	8.5 **	-6.7
Cohort 2007	123	74.7	146	76.4	1.8	

Exhibit 4.7: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Partners Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Revenue Sources						
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total revenue? ^b						
Cohort 2006	305	123,374	344	121,850	-1,524	31,824
Cohort 2007	130	149,700	151	180,000	30,300	
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total expenditures? ^b						
Cohort 2006	305	111,962	344	121,850	9,888	-4,888
Cohort 2007	130	170,000	151	175,000	5,000	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from federal government agencies?						
Cohort 2006	306	24.7	346	23.9	-0.8	-7.8
Cohort 2007	130	34.0	151	25.4	-8.6 *	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from state or local government agencies?						
Cohort 2006	306	39.7	346	42.5	2.8	-3.4
Cohort 2007	130	46.9	151	46.3	-0.6	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from institutional funding sources (e.g., corporations, foundations)?						
Cohort 2006	306	44.6	346	43.7	-0.8	1.9
Cohort 2007	130	51.8	151	52.8	1.0	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from individual donors or events?						
Cohort 2006	306	60.3	346	58.1	-2.2	-4.7
Cohort 2007	130	64.7	151	57.8	-6.9	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from Fees for Service?						
Cohort 2006	305	30.8	346	26.5	-4.3	9.2
Cohort 2007	130	36.5	151	41.4	4.9	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from another organization?						
Cohort 2006	306	40.1	346	26.6	-13.6 **	10.7
Cohort 2007	130	29.3	151	26.5	-2.8	
Funding Readiness						
Does your organization have a fundraising/fund development plan?						
Cohort 2006	306	37.3	346	48.0	10.7 **	-2.6
Cohort 2007	130	33.2	151	41.3	8.1	
Does your organization have financial management procedures for ensuring expenditures are properly authorized?						
Cohort 2006	306	72.8	346	77.2	4.3	-5.1
Cohort 2007	130	76.1	151	75.3	-0.8	
Does your organization have an individual, distinct from the executive director, who is responsible for financial management?						
Cohort 2006	306	83.9	332	87.2	3.3	-1.7
Cohort 2007	130	82.6	144	84.2	1.6	
Human Resources Management						
How many paid staff are full-time employees?						
Cohort 2006	243	16.1	273	15.3	-0.8	-0.1
Cohort 2007	110	9.0	135	8.1	-0.9	
How many unpaid staff are full-time employees?						
Cohort 2006	118	0.7	152	1.0	0.3	-0.3
Cohort 2007	67	0.9	65	1.0	0.1	
How many paid staff are part-time employees?						
Cohort 2006	243	5.1	273	6.3	1.2	-2.0
Cohort 2007	110	8.7	135	7.9	-0.8	
How many unpaid staff are part-time employees?						
Cohort 2006	118	4.8	152	4.7	-0.1	1.8
Cohort 2007	67	2.8	65	4.5	1.7	
How many volunteers are part-time employees?						
Cohort 2006	217	31.7	268	49.7	18.0	-20.3
Cohort 2007	103	51.4	119	49.1	-2.3	

Exhibit 4.7: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Partners Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Is there a job description for paid staff?						
Cohort 2006	261	92.6	275	92.8	0.2	0.2
Cohort 2007	116	92.3	135	92.7	0.4	
Is there a job description for unpaid staff?						
Cohort 2006	145	55.6	153	65.0	9.4	2.9
Cohort 2007	78	49.2	67	61.5	12.3	
Is there a job description for volunteers?						
Cohort 2006	252	47.3	271	58.5	11.2 **	-3.9
Cohort 2007	118	48.4	120	55.7	7.3	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of paid staff?						
Cohort 2006	255	60.3	275	63.8	3.5	3.6
Cohort 2007	115	42.7	135	49.8	7.1	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of unpaid staff?						
Cohort 2006	143	21.5	154	36.6	15.1 **	-17.9 **
Cohort 2007	75	23.7	67	20.9	-2.8	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of volunteers?						
Cohort 2006	242	14.7	273	20.5	5.7	-11.4 *
Cohort 2007	113	16.7	120	11.0	-5.7	
IT Management						
Does your organization regularly use computer software to keep financial records?						
Cohort 2006	306	84.2	332	89.4	5.2 *	6.7
Cohort 2007	130	82.3	144	94.2	11.9 **	
Do you have an adequate number of computers to meet your organization's needs?						
Cohort 2006	306	48.5	332	66.5	17.9 **	16.5 **
Cohort 2007	130	32.7	144	67.1	34.4 **	
Is the software on these computers adequate to meet your organization's needs?						
Cohort 2006	306	52.0	332	75.0	23.0 **	5.5
Cohort 2007	130	40.6	144	69.1	28.5 **	
Does your organization have access to the Internet?						
Cohort 2006	306	95.7	332	97.6	1.9	1.6
Cohort 2007	130	92.4	144	95.8	3.5	
Does your organization use the Internet to support an organizational website?						
Cohort 2006	295	67.8	324	76.7	8.8 **	3.8
Cohort 2007	120	75.2	139	87.8	12.6 **	
Does your organization use the Internet for program email?						
Cohort 2006	295	95.3	324	95.4	0.1	3.4
Cohort 2007	120	94.3	139	97.8	3.5	
Does your organization use the Internet for research purposes?						
Cohort 2006	295	94.8	324	95.6	0.8	2.5
Cohort 2007	120	84.3	139	97.5	3.2	
Does your organization use the Internet for community outreach purposes?						
Cohort 2006	295	71.5	324	81.3	9.8 **	0.6
Cohort 2007	120	72.6	139	81.0	10.4 **	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a The question at baseline referenced a different timeframe so results are not shown.

^b The number reported in the –Average or % Yes” column represents the weighted median. Significance tests were performed on the unweighted medians using a signed rank test.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). –Baseline vs. F2 Difference” denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.8: Subgroup Changes in Program Development— Partners Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Service Delivery						
In a month of service delivery, total number of program participants organization serves						
Cohort 2006	267	423.8	319	353.6	-70.2	87.4
Cohort 2007	119	362.9	147	380.1	17.2	
In a month of service delivery, what is the total number of organizations for whom capacity building services are provided?						
Cohort 2006	140	14.7	161	6.3	-8.3	7.9
Cohort 2007	53	5.2	64	4.8	-0.5	
Program Evaluation						
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with (direct) services provided?						
Cohort 2006	261	82.4	313	88.9	6.5 *	9.2
Cohort 2007	114	74.9	146	90.6	15.7 **	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of (direct service) program participant outcomes?						
Cohort 2006	260	64.1	313	68.7	4.6	6.5
Cohort 2007	114	54.1	146	65.3	11.2 *	
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with (capacity building) services provided?						
Cohort 2006	136	80.0	156	88.5	8.6 *	15.8
Cohort 2007	48	70.7	63	95.0	24.3 **	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of (capacity building) program participant outcomes?						
Cohort 2006	134	56.1	156	59.9	3.8	19.8 *
Cohort 2007	46	36.9	63	60.4	23.5 **	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). –Baseline vs. F2 Difference” denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.9: Subgroup Changes in Community Engagement— Partners Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Partnerships						
Organization engaged in partnership arrangements with other organizations in its community/service area (not CEY)?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	305	83.9	346	86.4	2.4	6.5
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	130	88.5	151	97.5	9.0 **	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: government?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	262	53.6	306	61.5	7.9 *	-8.0
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	116	52.9	147	52.8	-0.1	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: business/private?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	262	60.6	306	63.3	2.7	1.9
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	116	53.1	147	57.7	4.6	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: educational institutions?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	262	79.7	306	80.9	1.2	5.6
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	116	77.9	147	84.7	6.8	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: faith-based nonprofit?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	262	71.0	306	78.2	7.2 *	-8.4
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	115	78.6	147	77.4	-1.2	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: secular nonprofit?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	261	80.6	306	78.3	-2.3	1.4
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	116	83.5	147	82.6	-0.9	
Community Outreach						
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it gains knowledge about the community it serves?						
<i>Small Partnership</i>	306	71.4	346	85.3	13.9 **	4.2
<i>Large Partnership</i>	130	69.5	151	87.6	18.1 **	
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for gaining knowledge about the community it serves?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	306	59.9	346	73.6	13.8 **	-3.6
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	130	65.0	151	75.1	10.1 *	
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it markets its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	306	91.1	345	92.3	1.2	11.7 **
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	130	81.8	151	94.8	12.9 **	
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for marketing its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?						
<i>Cohort 2006</i>	306	72.2	345	77.7	5.5	9.7
<i>Cohort 2007</i>	130	63.2	151	78.5	15.3 **	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). –Baseline vs. F2 Difference” denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.10: Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity— Partners Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Leadership Development						
Lead operates with the best interest of your organization in mind ^{a, b}						
Cohort 2006	294	88.9	324	85.6	-3.2	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	138	82.3	-	-
Lead is collegial. It respects your organization ^{a, b}						
Cohort 2006	294	91.8	327	88.9	-2.9	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	139	89.7	-	-
Lead is even-handed and ensures that project efforts are not skewed to a single party's interests ^{a, b}						
Cohort 2006	290	91.0	321	85.5	-5.4 *	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	136	86.8	-	-
Lead is competent. It is able to provide the capacity building assistance your organization wants or expects ^{a, b}						
Cohort 2006	292	86.4	329	81.8	-4.7	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	140	84.7	-	-
Lead is dependable. It follows through on commitments in a timely and efficient manner ^{a, b}						
Cohort 2006	294	87.5	328	82.4	-5.1 *	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	140	82.8	-	-
Shared Mission and Objectives						
Does your CEY partnership have a mission statement?						
Cohort 2006	242	86.2	280	86.1	-0.1	18.5 **
Cohort 2007	89	70.7	114	89.1	18.5 **	-
Your organization fully understands the goals of your CEY partnership ^a						
Cohort 2006	299	84.4	326	83.0	-1.4	17.7 **
Cohort 2007	126	69.6	140	85.8	16.3 **	-
Your organization was involved in setting the goals of your CEY partnership ^{a, b}						
Cohort 2006	280	69.7	306	71.6	1.8	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	137	73.7	-	-
Your CEY partnership's goals are well aligned with the goals of your organization ^{a, b}						
Cohort 2006	290	88.0	322	84.4	-3.6	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	136	83.7	-	-
Lead's mission and/or work is well aligned with your organization's mission ^a						
Cohort 2006	294	87.1	323	87.3	0.2	3.1
Cohort 2007	128	84.7	135	88.1	3.3	-
Communication						
Participating in the CEY partnership led to better communication and working relationships among participating organizations than before ^{a, c}						
Cohort 2006	-	-	327	86.0	-	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	141	90.8	-	-
Action Plan						
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines tasks to be achieved? ^b						
Cohort 2006	270	86.2	298	87.4	1.2	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	131	86.8	-	-
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines timeline by which these tasks are to be achieved? ^b						
Cohort 2006	256	80.5	282	83.0	2.5	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	126	83.2	-	-
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines individuals or organizations responsible for completing each task? ^b						
Cohort 2006	252	77.5	275	80.2	2.8	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	124	74.4	-	-
Sustainability Plan						
Does your partnership have a sustainability plan? ^b						
Cohort 2006	184	62.8	224	50.6	-12.1 **	-
Cohort 2007	-	-	88	43.4	-	-

Exhibit 4.10: Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity— Partners Belonging to Cohort 2006 Vs. Cohort 2007

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
On a scale of 1-5 please describe your opinion as to how likely or unlikely it is that your CEY partnership will continue past the 3-year grant cycle. ^d						
Cohort 2006	285	81.7	304	80.3	-1.4	-3.0
Cohort 2007	122	85.2	138	80.8	-4.4	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a The baseline and first follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being “Strongly Agree” and 5 being “Strongly Disagree.”

^b Question was asked only of the 2006 cohort at baseline.

^c Question was asked only at first follow-up and second follow-up.

^d The baseline and first follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered “Highly Likely” or “Likely” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being “Highly Likely” and 5 being “Highly Unlikely.”

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). “Baseline vs. F2 Difference” denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). “Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

4.3 Lead Organizations by Pre-existing Partnership

Exhibit 4.11: Subgroup Changes in Leadership Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Executive Director Development						
Did the executive director participate in any training related to management and administration?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	84.0	28	87.1	3.1	-2.5
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	87.3	53	87.9	0.6	
Did the executive director participate in any training related to fundraising?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	65.9	28	73.4	7.5	-6.2
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	74.4	53	75.7	1.3	
Did the executive director participate in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	79.7	28	79.7	0.0	-1.1
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	81.8	53	80.7	-1.1	
Full- and Part-Time Staff Development						
How many paid staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	27	29.8	28	15.1	-14.7	13.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	51	15.6	53	14.8	-0.8	
How many paid staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	7.1	26	8.4	1.3	-3.2
<i>New Partnership</i>	51	4.7	53	2.8	-1.9	
How many paid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	34.9	28	20.5	-14.4 *	-5.8
<i>New Partnership</i>	52	44.1	53	23.9	-20.1	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to management and administration? ^a						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	11	4.9	9	1.7	-	-
<i>New Partnership</i>	15	3.7	13	4.6	-	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to fundraising? ^a						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	11	1.4	9	1.4	-	-
<i>New Partnership</i>	15	1.3	12	2.5	-	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery? ^a						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	11	6.0	9	3.4	-	-
<i>New Partnership</i>	15	8.3	12	2.9	-	
Volunteer Development						
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	18	5.7	19	4.3	-1.3	1.3
<i>New Partnership</i>	25	5.4	30	5.3	0.0	
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	19	10.4	19	1.2	-9.2	6.3
<i>New Partnership</i>	24	4.4	31	1.5	-2.9	
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	20	87.8	21	26.3	-61.5	115.8
<i>New Partnership</i>	25	4.3	32	58.6	54.3	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a Significance tests were not performed due to small sample sizes.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. –Baseline vs. F1 Difference” denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.12: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Mission and Strategic Planning						
In the past 12 months, has your organization formally assessed its organizational needs/strengths?						
Pre-existing Partnership	28	94.6	28	100.0	5.4	-7.8
New Partnership	53	97.6	53	95.2	-2.4	
Does your organization have a mission statement?						
Pre-existing Partnership	28	97.9	28	100.0	2.1	4.1
New Partnership	53	93.8	53	100.0	6.2	
Does your organization have a strategic plan?						
Pre-existing Partnership	28	71.2	28	79.8	8.7	11.4
New Partnership	53	76.3	53	96.4	20.1 **	
Governance and Organizational Structure						
Is your organization governed by a parent or umbrella organization's Board of Directors?						
Pre-existing Partnership	28	11.7	28	11.7	0.0	13.6
New Partnership	53	15.3	53	28.8	13.6 **	
Is your organization governed by an Advisory Panel?						
Pre-existing Partnership	28	2.1	28	7.5	5.4	-1.2
New Partnership	52	5.6	53	9.8	4.2	
Is your organization governed by its own Board of Directors?						
Pre-existing Partnership	28	88.3	28	93.7	5.4	-22.0 **
New Partnership	53	84.7	53	68.1	-16.7 **	
Board responsibilities include: Goal/Strategy development						
Pre-existing Partnership	25	100.0	25	94.3	-5.7	6.3
New Partnership	46	94.3	41	94.9	0.6	
Board responsibilities include: Community/Stakeholder outreach						
Pre-existing Partnership	25	80.5	25	80.5	0.0	-12.2
New Partnership	46	85.6	41	73.5	-12.2	
Board responsibilities include: Budget development						
Pre-existing Partnership	25	78.3	25	75.0	-3.3	-14.8
New Partnership	46	72.7	41	54.6	-18.1 *	
Board responsibilities include: Financial review						
Pre-existing Partnership	25	100.0	25	100.0	0.0	0.0
New Partnership	46	100.0	41	100.0	0.0	
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of program outcomes						
Pre-existing Partnership	25	61.2	25	80.7	19.5 *	-27.3 *
New Partnership	46	77.1	41	69.2	-7.9	
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of executive director						
Pre-existing Partnership	25	92.0	25	94.3	2.2	-1.8
New Partnership	46	93.5	41	94.0	0.5	
Board responsibilities include: Recruitment of new board members						
Pre-existing Partnership	25	82.8	25	94.3	11.5	-18.8 *
New Partnership	46	93.5	41	86.2	-7.3	
Board responsibilities include: Provision of formal orientation to new board members						
Pre-existing Partnership	25	74.8	25	84.1	9.3	6.5
New Partnership	46	69.8	41	85.5	15.7	
At present, how many individuals are on your organization's board?						
Pre-existing Partnership	25	13.9	25	13.2	-0.7	0.4
New Partnership	47	12.1	42	11.8	-0.3	
In the past 12 months, how many individuals have served as executive director or your organization? ^a						
Pre-existing Partnership	-	-	28	1.1	-	-
New Partnership	-	-	53	1.1	-	
Organization has 501(c)3 status						
Pre-existing Partnership	27	100.0	27	97.8	-2.2	-6.3
New Partnership	47	96.5	48	88.1	-8.5	

Exhibit 4.12: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Revenue Sources						
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total revenue? ^b						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	2,420,566	28	1,302,935	-1,117,631	1,189,896
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	927,735	53	1,000,000	72,265 **	
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total expenditures? ^b						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	2,348,520	28	2,003,075	-345,445	501,771
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	783,636	53	939,962	156,326 **	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from federal government agencies?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	71.3	28	69.2	-2.1	-19.3
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	62.2	53	40.9	-21.4 **	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from state or local government agencies?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	71.2	28	74.4	3.3	-12.5
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	72.0	53	62.8	-9.2	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from institutional funding sources (e.g., corporations, foundations)?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	65.8	28	75.5	9.7	-23.2 *
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	77.4	53	63.9	-13.5	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from individual donors or events?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	77.6	28	80.9	3.3	-9.4
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	68.8	53	62.7	-6.1	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from Fees for Service?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	44.5	28	46.6	2.1	-4.5
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	64.6	53	62.2	-2.4	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from another organization?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	20.2	28	23.3	3.1	-6.2
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	33.0	53	30.0	-3.1	
Funding Readiness						
Does your organization have a fundraising/fund development plan?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	62.5	28	54.1	-8.4	32.8 **
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	39.7	53	64.1	24.5 **	
Does your organization have financial management procedures for ensuring expenditures are properly authorized?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	94.6	28	100.0	5.4	5.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	87.2	53	97.6	10.4 *	
Does your organization have an individual, distinct from the executive director, who is responsible for financial management?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	97.9	28	100.0	2.1	-0.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	98.8	53	100.0	1.2	
Human Resources Management						
How many paid staff are full-time employees?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	45.1	28	36.6	-8.5	-11.8
<i>New Partnership</i>	52	68.4	53	48.0	-20.4 *	
How many unpaid staff are full-time employees? ^c						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	8	0.5	9	0.3	-	-
<i>New Partnership</i>	15	0.1	12	0.9	-	
How many paid staff are part-time employees?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	41.5	28	47.0	5.5	-10.1
<i>New Partnership</i>	52	15.3	53	10.7	-4.6	
How many unpaid staff are part-time employees? ^c						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	8	9.9	9	6.8	-	-
<i>New Partnership</i>	15	7.2	12	5.0	-	
How many volunteers are part-time employees?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	22	128.4	21	102.1	-26.2	72.6
<i>New Partnership</i>	36	117.4	32	163.8	46.4	

Exhibit 4.12: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Is there a job description for paid staff?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	94.6	28	87.1	-7.5	11.7 *
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	95.8	53	100.0	4.2	
Is there a job description for unpaid staff? ^c						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	12	67.4	9	64.7	-	-
<i>New Partnership</i>	18	51.0	12	81.0	-	
Is there a job description for volunteers?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	23	52.3	21	69.9	17.6	-9.7
<i>New Partnership</i>	38	62.5	32	70.3	7.8	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of paid staff?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	73.2	28	76.5	3.3	-8.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	73.2	53	68.5	-4.7	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of unpaid staff? ^c						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	9	44.0	9	55.2	-	-
<i>New Partnership</i>	18	30.8	13	43.3	-	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of volunteers?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	23	10.4	22	12.0	1.6	-19.5
<i>New Partnership</i>	37	23.6	33	5.7	-17.9 *	
IT Management						
Does your organization regularly use computer software to keep financial records?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	94.6	28	100.0	5.4	-4.2
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	98.8	53	100.0	1.2	
Do you have an adequate number of computers to meet your organization's needs?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	68.0	28	77.6	9.6	6.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	75.6	53	92.1	16.5 *	
Is the software on these computers adequate to meet your organization's needs?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	72.2	28	77.6	5.4	7.4
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	69.6	53	82.4	12.8	
Does your organization have access to the Internet?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	100.0	28	100.0	0.0	0.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	100.0	53	100.0	0.0	
Does your organization use the Internet to support an organizational website?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	97.9	28	97.9	0.0	4.3
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	90.2	53	94.5	4.3	
Does your organization use the Internet for program email?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	97.9	28	100.0	2.1	-0.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	98.8	53	100.0	1.2	
Does your organization use the Internet for research purposes?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	100.0	28	100.0	0.0	0.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	100.0	53	100.0	0.0	
Does your organization use the Internet for community outreach purposes?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	74.3	28	88.3	14.1	-14.7
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	85.9	53	85.2	-0.7	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a The question at baseline referenced a different timeframe so results are not shown.

^b The number reported in the –Average or % Yes” column represents the weighted median. Significance tests were performed on the unweighted medians using a signed rank test.

^c Significance tests were not performed due to small sample sizes.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. –Baseline vs. F1 Difference” denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.13: Subgroup Changes in Program Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Service Delivery						
In a month of service delivery, total number of program participants organization serves						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	24	1674.4	24	1673.3	-1.1	-940.2
<i>New Partnership</i>	38	2014.9	34	1073.6	-941.3	
In a month of service delivery, what is the total number of organizations for whom capacity building services are provided?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	14.9	28	10.3	-4.6	1.2
<i>New Partnership</i>	50	24.0	51	20.6	-3.4	
Program Evaluation						
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with (direct) services provided?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	24	75.4	24	85.3	9.9	-11.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	38	100.0	32	98.1	-1.9	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of (direct service) program participant outcomes?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	24	79.1	24	80.5	1.4	-9.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	38	93.8	32	85.3	-8.6	
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with (capacity building) services provided?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	27	81.4	28	92.5	11.2	-11.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	49	97.4	51	97.5	0.1	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of (capacity building) program participant outcomes?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	26	65.6	28	59.5	-6.1	-1.3
<i>New Partnership</i>	48	73.6	51	66.2	-7.4	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. –Baseline vs. F1 Difference” denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.14: Subgroup Changes in Community Engagement— Lead Organizations Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Partnerships						
Organization engaged in partnership arrangements with other organizations in its community/service area (not CEY)?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	100.0	28	100.0	0.0	-3.1
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	98.8	53	95.7	-3.1	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: government?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	75.5	28	85.1	9.6	-7.3
<i>New Partnership</i>	52	87.7	51	90.0	2.3	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: business/private?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	77.6	28	80.7	3.1	-4.1
<i>New Partnership</i>	52	72.9	51	71.9	-1.0	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: educational institutions?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	92.5	28	94.6	2.1	3.3
<i>New Partnership</i>	52	85.8	51	91.2	5.4	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: faith-based nonprofit?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	97.9	28	90.4	-7.5	14.7
<i>New Partnership</i>	52	85.1	51	92.4	7.2	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: secular nonprofit?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	92.5	28	81.9	-10.6	14.3
<i>New Partnership</i>	52	93.2	51	96.9	3.6	
Community Outreach						
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it gains knowledge about the community it serves?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	90.4	28	81.9	-8.5	16.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	84.0	53	91.5	7.5	
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for gaining knowledge about the community it serves?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	75.5	28	77.7	2.2	1.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	77.3	53	80.6	3.3	
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it markets its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	81.8	28	84.0	2.2	3.8
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	94.0	53	100.0	6.0	
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for marketing its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	28	83.0	28	89.4	6.4	3.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	53	78.8	53	89.1	10.3	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. –Baseline vs. F1 Difference” denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.15: Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity— Lead Organizations Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Shared Mission and Objectives						
Does your CEY partnership have a mission statement?						
Pre-existing Partnership	28	40.5	28	72.3	31.8 **	-14.2
New Partnership	52	58.0	50	75.7	17.7 *	
Your organization fully understands the goals of your CEY partnership ^{a, b}						
Pre-existing Partnership	-	-	28	94.6	-	-
New Partnership	-	-	53	97.6	-	-
Your organization was involved in setting the goals of your CEY partnership ^{a, b, c}						
Pre-existing Partnership	-	-	28	92.5	-	-
New Partnership	-	-	53	97.6	-	-
Your CEY partnership's goals are well aligned with the goals of your organization ^{b, c}						
Pre-existing Partnership	20	100.0	28	100.0	0.0	-7.4
New Partnership	30	98.3	53	90.9	-7.4	
Communication						
Participating in the CEY partnership led to better communication and working relationships among participating organizations than before ^{b, d}						
Pre-existing Partnership	-	-	28	97.9	-	-
New Partnership	-	-	53	93.9	-	-
Action Plan						
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines tasks to be achieved? ^c						
Pre-existing Partnership	20	87.1	28	85.1	-2.0	-6.8
New Partnership	30	92.4	53	83.6	-8.8	
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines timeline by which these tasks are to be achieved? ^c						
Pre-existing Partnership	20	80.6	28	72.2	-8.4	5.7
New Partnership	30	75.3	53	72.6	-2.7	
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines individuals or organizations responsible for completing each task? ^c						
Pre-existing Partnership	20	80.6	28	68.9	-11.7	13.1
New Partnership	30	71.2	53	72.6	1.4	
Sustainability Plan						
Does your partnership have a sustainability plan? ^c						
Pre-existing Partnership	20	38.4	27	19.4	-19.0	35.5 *
New Partnership	30	15.2	52	31.6	16.4 *	
On a scale of 1-5 please describe your opinion as to how likely or unlikely it is that your CEY partnership will continue past the 3-year grant cycle. ^c						
Pre-existing Partnership	27	86.4	27	86.4	0.0	-4.7
New Partnership	50	79.1	51	74.3	-4.7	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value <0.01

^a Question was asked only of partners at baseline.

^b The baseline, first follow-up, and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered –Strongly Agree” or –Agree” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being –Strongly Agree” and 5 being –Strongly Disagree.”

^c Question was asked only of the 2006 cohort at baseline.

^d Question was asked only at first follow-up and second follow-up.

^e The baseline, first follow-up, and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered –Highly Likely” or –Likely” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being –Highly Likely” and 5 being –Highly Unlikely.”

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. –Baseline vs. F1 Difference” denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

4.4 Partners by Pre-existing Partnership

Exhibit 4.16: Subgroup Changes in Leadership Development— Partners Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Executive Director Development						
Did the executive director participate in any training related to management and administration?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	77.8	125	84.2	6.4	-4.2
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	85.3	351	87.5	2.2	
Did the executive director participate in any training related to fundraising?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	61.1	125	79.6	18.5 **	-15.7 **
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	73.0	351	75.8	2.8	
Did the executive director participate in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	75.8	125	86.1	10.3 *	-7.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	78.8	351	82.0	3.3	
Full- and Part-Time Staff Development						
How many paid staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	82	7.2	90	9.2	2.0	-1.4
<i>New Partnership</i>	254	4.1	297	4.6	0.6	
How many paid staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	82	3.1	92	2.7	-0.4	0.2
<i>New Partnership</i>	254	1.6	293	1.4	-0.2	
How many paid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	82	13.8	92	11.9	-1.8	-6.6
<i>New Partnership</i>	256	15.3	297	6.9	-8.4	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	51	2.1	54	1.8	-0.3	-0.2
<i>New Partnership</i>	128	2.9	160	2.3	-0.5	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	50	1.0	54	1.5	0.4	-0.8
<i>New Partnership</i>	126	1.2	159	0.8	-0.3	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	51	1.6	54	1.6	0.0	-0.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	127	3.7	160	2.8	-0.9	
Volunteer Development						
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	77	5.0	87	4.8	-0.2	-1.4
<i>New Partnership</i>	196	3.7	256	2.1	-1.6	
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	71	3.8	83	2.7	-1.2	1.4
<i>New Partnership</i>	194	1.9	255	2.2	0.3	
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	83	14.8	90	20.0	5.2	-0.2
<i>New Partnership</i>	212	10.0	272	15.0	5.0	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). –Baseline vs. F2 Difference” denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.17: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Partners Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Mission and Strategic Planning						
In the past 12 months, has your organization formally assessed its organizational needs/strengths?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	91.7	129	95.3	3.6	-0.6
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	93.4	368	96.4	3.0	
Does your organization have a mission statement?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	93.4	129	95.6	2.3	1.1
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	95.1	368	98.4	3.3 **	
Does your organization have a strategic plan?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	57.9	129	70.8	12.8 *	-4.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	64.6	368	73.4	8.8 **	
Governance and Organizational Structure						
Is your organization governed by a parent or umbrella organization's Board of Directors?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	13.7	129	11.9	-1.8	-1.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	24.1	368	21.3	-2.8	
Is your organization governed by an Advisory Panel?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	14.5	129	12.2	-2.3	0.2
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	16.7	368	14.6	-2.1	
Is your organization governed by its own Board of Directors?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	89.3	129	93.5	4.1	-4.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	81.3	368	80.5	-0.8	
Board responsibilities include: Goal/Strategy development						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	111	95.3	119	97.5	2.3	-6.6 *
<i>New Partnership</i>	258	98.2	297	93.9	-4.3 **	
Board responsibilities include: Community/Stakeholder outreach						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	111	83.9	119	87.1	3.2	1.4
<i>New Partnership</i>	258	83.0	297	87.6	4.6	
Board responsibilities include: Budget development						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	111	80.5	119	78.3	-2.2	5.8
<i>New Partnership</i>	258	81.4	296	84.9	3.6	
Board responsibilities include: Financial review						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	111	97.5	119	96.2	-1.3	3.4
<i>New Partnership</i>	258	95.6	297	97.7	2.1	
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of program outcomes						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	111	82.8	119	82.1	-0.7	-1.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	257	83.1	296	80.5	-2.6	
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of executive director						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	111	82.9	119	84.6	1.7	4.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	257	84.4	297	90.2	5.7 *	
Board responsibilities include: Recruitment of new board members						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	111	93.6	119	92.1	-1.5	7.7 *
<i>New Partnership</i>	257	86.3	297	92.5	6.1 **	
Board responsibilities include: Provision of formal orientation to new board members						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	111	80.6	119	81.3	0.7	3.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	257	72.8	296	77.4	4.6	
At present, how many individuals are on your organization's board?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	112	9.0	119	9.1	0.1	-0.1
<i>New Partnership</i>	258	10.1	299	10.1	0.0	
In the past 12 months, how many individuals have served as executive director or your organization? ^a						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	-	-	128	1.0	-	-
<i>New Partnership</i>	-	-	368	1.0	-	
Organization has 501(c)3 status						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	118	76.7	126	82.7	5.9	1.7
<i>New Partnership</i>	292	78.9	348	86.5	7.6 **	

Exhibit 4.17: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Partners Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Revenue Sources						
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total revenue? ^b						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	122	123,374	129	162,000	38,626	-43,822
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	130,000	366	124,804	-5,196	
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total expenditures? ^b						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	122	124,708	129	125,860	1,152	4,658
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	123,050	366	128,860	5,810	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from federal government agencies?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	23.3	129	21.5	-1.8	-0.4
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	27.6	368	25.3	-2.2	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from state or local government agencies?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	39.4	129	44.5	5.0	-3.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	41.5	368	42.7	1.2	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from institutional funding sources (e.g., corporations, foundations)?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	37.1	129	34.7	-2.4	2.5
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	49.6	368	49.7	0.2	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from individual donors or events?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	58.4	129	56.5	-1.9	-1.7
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	62.2	368	58.7	-3.6	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from Fees for Service?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	122	28.3	129	27.1	-1.2	-2.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	33.3	368	30.1	-3.2	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from another organization?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	39.1	129	27.2	-11.8 *	0.1
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	38.0	368	26.3	-11.8 **	
Funding Readiness						
Does your organization have a fundraising/fund development plan?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	25.6	129	41.5	15.9 **	-8.4
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	41.5	368	49.0	7.5 *	
Does your organization have financial management procedures for ensuring expenditures are properly authorized?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	65.3	129	73.9	8.6 *	-7.5
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	76.9	368	78.0	1.1	
Does your organization have an individual, distinct from the executive director, who is responsible for financial management?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	83.8	125	82.5	-1.3	6.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	83.7	351	88.4	4.7 *	
Human Resources Management						
How many paid staff are full-time employees?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	89	19.8	97	16.9	-2.8	2.4
<i>New Partnership</i>	264	13.1	311	12.7	-0.4	
How many unpaid staff are full-time employees?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	50	0.8	54	1.4	0.5	-0.3
<i>New Partnership</i>	135	0.7	163	0.9	0.2	
How many paid staff are part-time employees?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	89	6.8	97	8.1	1.3	-0.6
<i>New Partnership</i>	264	5.4	311	6.1	0.8	
How many unpaid staff are part-time employees?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	50	2.7	54	3.7	1.0	-1.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	135	5.1	163	5.0	0.0	
How many volunteers are part-time employees?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	88	28.8	101	34.7	5.9	11.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	232	38.2	286	56.1	17.8	

Exhibit 4.17: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Partners Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Is there a job description for paid staff?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	95	90.2	98	89.1	-1.1	1.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	282	93.4	312	94.1	0.8	
Is there a job description for unpaid staff?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	68	50.3	55	60.5	10.2	-0.7
<i>New Partnership</i>	155	56.5	165	65.9	9.4 *	
Is there a job description for volunteers?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	106	46.5	102	53.3	6.8	5.3
<i>New Partnership</i>	264	47.9	289	60.0	12.1 **	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of paid staff?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	94	65.8	98	61.5	-4.3	10.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	276	54.1	312	60.8	6.6 *	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of unpaid staff?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	67	22.8	55	40.4	17.6 *	-8.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	151	21.4	166	31.0	9.6 *	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of volunteers?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	102	18.6	102	23.9	5.3	-2.3
<i>New Partnership</i>	253	13.5	291	16.5	3.0	
IT Management						
Does your organization regularly use computer software to keep financial records?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	78.9	125	86.7	7.8 *	-2.2
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	86.1	351	91.8	5.6 **	
Do you have an adequate number of computers to meet your organization's needs?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	51.6	125	71.1	19.5 **	1.8
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	43.4	351	64.7	21.3 **	
Is the software on these computers adequate to meet your organization's needs?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	52.8	125	73.2	20.4 **	4.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	48.9	351	74.3	25.3 **	
Does your organization have access to the Internet?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	92.6	125	96.6	4.0	-2.8
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	96.3	351	97.6	1.2	
Does your organization use the Internet to support an organizational website?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	115	54.1	122	70.9	16.8 **	-10.4 *
<i>New Partnership</i>	300	75.4	341	81.8	6.4 **	
Does your organization use the Internet for program email?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	115	92.0	122	95.3	3.3	-3.8
<i>New Partnership</i>	300	96.5	341	96.0	-0.5	
Does your organization use the Internet for research purposes?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	115	94.5	122	98.5	4.0	-4.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	300	94.8	341	94.8	0.0	
Does your organization use the Internet for community outreach purposes?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	115	62.7	122	80.2	17.5 **	-10.9 *
<i>New Partnership</i>	300	75.5	341	82.1	6.7 **	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value <0.01

^a The question at baseline referenced a different timeframe so results are not shown.

^b The number reported in the –Average or % Yes” column represents the weighted median. Significance tests were performed on the unweighted medians using a signed rank test.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). –Baseline vs. F2 Difference” denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.18: Subgroup Changes in Program Development— Partners Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Service Delivery						
In a month of service delivery, total number of program participants organization serves						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	107	400.2	119	393.6	-6.6	-68.1
<i>New Partnership</i>	279	419.0	347	344.2	-74.7	
In a month of service delivery, what is the total number of organizations for whom capacity building services are provided?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	50	7.9	59	5.0	-2.9	-5.8
<i>New Partnership</i>	143	15.2	166	6.5	-8.7	
Program Evaluation						
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with (direct) services provided?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	104	73.4	114	87.0	13.6 **	-8.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	271	84.4	345	90.1	5.6 *	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of (direct service) program participant outcomes?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	104	57.7	114	64.0	6.2	-1.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	270	64.4	345	69.6	5.2	
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with (capacity building) services provided?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	48	79.5	56	86.1	6.6	6.0
<i>New Partnership</i>	136	78.4	163	91.0	12.6 **	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of (capacity building) program participant outcomes?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	46	47.2	56	58.2	11.0	-6.1
<i>New Partnership</i>	134	55.8	163	60.6	4.9	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). –Baseline vs. F2 Difference” denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.19: Subgroup Changes in Community Engagement— Partners Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Partnerships						
Organization engaged in partnership arrangements with other organizations in its community/service area (not CEY)?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	82.2	129	87.4	5.3	-2.3
<i>New Partnership</i>	312	85.8	368	88.7	2.9	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: government?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	103	56.0	117	54.1	-2.0	11.7
<i>New Partnership</i>	275	52.4	336	62.1	9.8 **	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: business/private?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	103	49.6	117	58.4	8.8	-8.5
<i>New Partnership</i>	275	63.5	336	63.8	0.3	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: educational institutions?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	103	79.7	117	78.9	-0.8	4.3
<i>New Partnership</i>	275	79.2	336	82.7	3.5	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: faith-based nonprofit?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	103	77.3	117	78.9	1.6	5.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	274	70.2	336	77.7	7.5 *	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: secular nonprofit?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	103	80.9	117	74.8	-6.1	5.9
<i>New Partnership</i>	274	81.2	336	80.9	-0.2	
Community Outreach						
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it gains knowledge about the community it serves?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	83.8	129	87.1	3.3	16.5 **
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	65.4	368	85.1	19.7 **	
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for gaining knowledge about the community it serves?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	68.8	129	72.6	3.8	13.5 *
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	57.2	368	74.5	17.3 **	
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it markets its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	89.0	129	93.4	4.4	-1.8
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	89.8	367	92.5	2.7	
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for marketing its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	123	61.1	129	78.9	17.8 **	-15.4 *
<i>New Partnership</i>	313	75.0	367	77.4	2.4	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). –Baseline vs. F2 Difference” denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.20: Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity— Partners Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Leadership Development						
Lead operates with the best interest of your organization in mind ^{a, b}						
Pre-existing Partnership	96	92.4	122	88.1	-4.2	0.9
New Partnership	198	87.1	340	83.8	-3.3	
Lead is collegial. It respects your organization ^{a, b}						
Pre-existing Partnership	96	93.5	124	89.2	-4.4	2.5
New Partnership	198	90.9	342	89.0	-1.9	
Lead is even-handed and ensures that project efforts are not skewed to a single party's interests ^{a, b}						
Pre-existing Partnership	94	89.5	121	90.2	0.6	-8.4
New Partnership	196	91.6	336	83.9	-7.8 **	
Lead is competent. It is able to provide the capacity building assistance your organization wants or expects ^{a, b}						
Pre-existing Partnership	95	84.5	124	83.3	-1.2	-4.4
New Partnership	197	87.4	345	81.9	-5.6 *	
Lead is dependable. It follows through on commitments in a timely and efficient manner ^{a, b}						
Pre-existing Partnership	97	82.6	124	85.5	2.9	-11.6 *
New Partnership	197	89.9	344	81.2	-8.8 **	
Shared Mission and Objectives						
Does your CEY partnership have a mission statement?						
Pre-existing Partnership	87	85.9	104	84.9	-1.0	5.3
New Partnership	244	83.1	290	87.3	4.2	
Your organization fully understands the goals of your CEY partnership ^a						
Pre-existing Partnership	119	83.7	122	83.4	-0.4	2.7
New Partnership	306	81.2	344	83.6	2.4	
Your organization was involved in setting the goals of your CEY partnership ^{a, b}						
Pre-existing Partnership	92	66.9	112	71.1	4.1	-2.9
New Partnership	188	71.1	331	72.3	1.2	
Your CEY partnership's goals are well aligned with the goals of your organization ^{a, b}						
Pre-existing Partnership	93	93.0	120	84.6	-8.4 *	7.0
New Partnership	197	85.6	338	84.2	-1.4	
Lead's mission and/or work is well aligned with your organization's mission ^a						
Pre-existing Partnership	118	88.3	121	89.6	1.3	-0.8
New Partnership	304	86.0	337	86.5	0.6	
Communication						
Participating in the CEY partnership led to better communication and working relationships among participating organizations than before ^{a, c}						
Pre-existing Partnership	-	-	124	86.3	-	-
New Partnership	-	-	344	87.1	-	-
Action Plan						
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines tasks to be achieved? ^b						
Pre-existing Partnership	85	87.7	112	86.3	-1.5	3.7
New Partnership	185	85.5	317	87.8	2.2	
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines timeline by which these tasks are to be achieved? ^b						
Pre-existing Partnership	83	82.1	110	83.9	1.8	1.2
New Partnership	173	79.7	298	82.7	3.0	
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines individuals or organizations responsible for completing each task? ^b						
Pre-existing Partnership	83	78.3	105	80.5	2.3	-0.8
New Partnership	169	77.1	294	78.6	1.5	
Sustainability Plan						
Does your partnership have a sustainability plan? ^b						
Pre-existing Partnership	59	61.5	86	56.2	-5.3	-11.5
New Partnership	125	63.4	226	46.6	-16.8 **	

Exhibit 4.20: Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity— Partners Belonging to Pre-existing Vs. New Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
On a scale of 1-5 please describe your opinion as to how likely or unlikely it is that your CEY partnership will continue past the 3-year grant cycle. ^d						
<i>Pre-existing Partnership</i>	113	89.5	118	83.0	-6.6	6.6
<i>New Partnership</i>	294	79.2	324	79.2	0.1	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a The baseline and first follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered –Strongly Agree” or “Agree” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being –Strongly Agree” and 5 being –Strongly Disagree.”

^b Question was asked only of the 2006 cohort at baseline.

^c Question was asked only at first follow-up and second follow-up.

^d The baseline and first follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered –Highly Likely” or “Likely” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being –Highly Likely” and 5 being –Highly Unlikely.”

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 459 partner organizations and represents the population of 809 partner organizations in 2008 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). The sample at first follow-up includes 513 partner organizations and represents the population of 880 partner organizations in 2009 (2006 & 2007 cohorts). –Baseline vs. F2 Difference” denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

4.5 Lead Organizations by Partnership Size

Exhibit 4.21: Subgroup Changes in Leadership Development—Lead Organizations Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Executive Director Development						
Did the executive director participate in any training related to management and administration?						
Small Partnership	34	92.6	34	80.8	-11.9	21.0 *
Large Partnership	47	82.4	47	91.5	9.2	
Did the executive director participate in any training related to fundraising?						
Small Partnership	34	65.9	34	66.9	1.1	3.9
Large Partnership	47	74.4	47	79.4	5.0	
Did the executive director participate in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
Small Partnership	34	93.7	34	90.5	-3.2	3.8
Large Partnership	47	73.8	47	74.5	0.7	
Full- and Part-Time Staff Development						
How many paid staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
Small Partnership	32	9.4	34	9.0	-0.5	-8.2
Large Partnership	46	27.0	47	18.3	-8.7	
How many paid staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
Small Partnership	33	2.9	33	2.1	-0.8	-0.2
Large Partnership	46	7.1	46	6.1	-0.9	
How many paid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
Small Partnership	34	30.9	34	19.8	-11.0	-11.0
Large Partnership	46	46.3	47	24.3	-22.0	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to management and administration? ^a						
Small Partnership	10	5.5	9	2.2	-	-
Large Partnership	16	3.7	13	3.9	-	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to fundraising? ^a						
Small Partnership	10	0.3	9	2.2	-	-
Large Partnership	16	1.8	12	1.9	-	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery? ^a						
Small Partnership	10	10.8	9	2.7	-	-
Large Partnership	16	5.8	12	3.3	-	
Volunteer Development						
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
Small Partnership	20	0.3	22	3.6	3.2	-6.2
Large Partnership	23	8.6	27	5.7	-3.0	
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
Small Partnership	21	1.3	22	1.2	-0.1	-9.3
Large Partnership	22	10.9	28	1.5	-9.4	
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
Small Partnership	23	29.6	25	33.4	3.9	-0.7
Large Partnership	22	49.8	28	52.9	3.1	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a Significance tests were not performed due to small sample sizes.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. –Baseline vs. F1 Difference” denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.22: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Mission and Strategic Planning						
In the past 12 months, has your organization formally assessed its organizational needs/strengths?						
Small Partnership	34	92.5	34	96.8	4.4	-6.2
Large Partnership	47	98.8	47	97.0	-1.8	
Does your organization have a mission statement?						
Small Partnership	34	100.0	34	100.0	0.0	7.4
Large Partnership	47	92.6	47	100.0	7.4	
Does your organization have a strategic plan?						
Small Partnership	34	66.9	34	84.1	17.1 *	-1.9
Large Partnership	47	78.7	47	93.9	15.2 *	
Governance and Organizational Structure						
Is your organization governed by a parent or umbrella organization's Board of Directors?						
Small Partnership	34	9.6	34	11.7	2.1	10.2
Large Partnership	47	16.4	47	28.7	12.3 *	
Is your organization governed by an Advisory Panel?						
Small Partnership	34	4.2	34	4.2	0.0	7.3
Large Partnership	46	4.3	47	11.6	7.3	
Is your organization governed by its own Board of Directors?						
Small Partnership	34	90.4	34	88.3	-2.1	-10.2
Large Partnership	47	83.6	47	71.3	-12.3 *	
Board responsibilities include: Goal/Strategy development						
Small Partnership	31	95.3	30	91.5	-3.9	3.4
Large Partnership	40	97.2	36	96.8	-0.5	
Board responsibilities include: Community/Stakeholder outreach						
Small Partnership	31	75.0	30	74.6	-0.4	-10.5
Large Partnership	40	88.7	36	77.8	-11	
Board responsibilities include: Budget development						
Small Partnership	31	74.2	30	63.9	-10.3	-1.9
Large Partnership	40	75.3	36	63.1	-12.3	
Board responsibilities include: Financial review						
Small Partnership	31	100.0	30	100.0	0.0	0.0
Large Partnership	40	100.0	36	100.0	0.0	
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of program outcomes						
Small Partnership	31	65.7	30	81.9	16.2	-21.3
Large Partnership	40	74.0	36	68.9	-5.1	
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of executive director						
Small Partnership	31	95.3	30	100.0	4.7	-6.1
Large Partnership	40	91.5	36	90.1	-1.4	
Board responsibilities include: Recruitment of new board members						
Small Partnership	31	89.4	30	100.0	10.6	-17.2
Large Partnership	40	89.3	36	82.7	-6.6	
Board responsibilities include: Provision of formal orientation to new board members						
Small Partnership	31	70.4	30	86.7	16.3 *	-5.2
Large Partnership	40	72.6	36	83.7	11.1	
At present, how many individuals are on your organization's board?						
Small Partnership	31	11.7	30	11.4	-0.3	-0.2
Large Partnership	41	13.4	37	13.0	-0.4	
In the past 12 months, how many individuals have served as executive director or your organization? ^a						
Small Partnership	-	-	34	1.1	-	-
Large Partnership	-	-	47	1.1	-	
Organization has 501(c)3 status						
Small Partnership	31	97.6	32	91.6	-6.0	-0.1
Large Partnership	43	98.0	43	91.9	-6.1	

Exhibit 4.22: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Revenue Sources						
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total revenue? ^b						
Small Partnership	34	916,809	34	972,103	55,294 *	-255,294
Large Partnership	47	1,700,000	47	1,500,000	-200,000	
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total expenditures? ^b						
Small Partnership	34	727,853	34	939,962	212,109 *	-553,109
Large Partnership	47	1,741,000	47	1,400,000	-341,000 **	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from federal government agencies?						
Small Partnership	34	63.8	34	41.4	-22.4 **	12.7
Large Partnership	47	66.6	47	56.8	-9.8	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from state or local government agencies?						
Small Partnership	34	80.9	34	62.7	-18.2	21.3
Large Partnership	47	66.5	47	69.5	3.1	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from institutional funding sources (e.g., corporations, foundations)?						
Small Partnership	34	77.4	34	60.5	-17.0 *	18.8
Large Partnership	47	70.7	47	72.5	1.8	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from individual donors or events?						
Small Partnership	34	71.1	34	63.8	-7.4	7.4
Large Partnership	47	72.5	47	72.5	0.0	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from Fees for Service?						
Small Partnership	34	67.1	34	52.0	-15.0	22.4
Large Partnership	47	51.8	47	59.1	7.4	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from another organization?						
Small Partnership	34	21.2	34	22.3	1.1	-2.9
Large Partnership	47	32.4	47	30.5	-1.9	
Funding Readiness						
Does your organization have a fundraising/fund development plan?						
Small Partnership	34	37.0	34	53.2	16.2	-5.9
Large Partnership	47	54.2	47	64.6	10.4	
Does your organization have financial management procedures for ensuring expenditures are properly authorized?						
Small Partnership	34	88.3	34	95.8	7.5	1.6
Large Partnership	47	90.8	47	100.0	9.2 *	
Does your organization have an individual, distinct from the executive director, who is responsible for financial management?						
Small Partnership	34	97.9	34	100.0	2.1	-0.9
Large Partnership	47	98.8	47	100.0	1.2	
Human Resources Management						
How many paid staff are full-time employees?						
Small Partnership	34	54.1	34	45.1	-9.0	-11.0
Large Partnership	46	63.1	47	43.1	-20.0	
How many unpaid staff are full-time employees? ^c						
Small Partnership	10	0.3	9	0.6	-	-
Large Partnership	13	0.2	12	0.6	-	
How many paid staff are part-time employees?						
Small Partnership	34	8.8	34	4.7	-4.1	4.7
Large Partnership	46	34.2	47	34.9	0.7	
How many unpaid staff are part-time employees? ^c						
Small Partnership	10	11.3	9	2.8	-	-
Large Partnership	13	6.6	12	7.7	-	
How many volunteers are part-time employees?						
Small Partnership	25	46.5	25	94.4	47.9	-45.2
Large Partnership	33	164	28	166.7	2.7	

Exhibit 4.22: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Is there a job description for paid staff?						
Small Partnership	34	92.5	34	92.5	0.0	-0.1
Large Partnership	47	97.0	47	96.9	-0.1	
Is there a job description for unpaid staff? ^c						
Small Partnership	11	71.8	9	57.6	-	-
Large Partnership	19	51.6	12	83.3	-	
Is there a job description for volunteers?						
Small Partnership	27	50.6	25	67.0	16.4	-7.5
Large Partnership	34	63.2	28	72.1	8.9	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of paid staff?						
Small Partnership	34	68.0	34	61.8	-6.2	6.8
Large Partnership	47	76.2	47	76.9	0.7	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of unpaid staff? ^c						
Small Partnership	9	68.4	9	34.8	-	-
Large Partnership	18	24.0	13	56.7	-	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of volunteers?						
Small Partnership	26	18.3	25	3.0	-15.4	8.6
Large Partnership	34	18.3	30	11.6	-6.7	
IT Management						
Does your organization regularly use computer software to keep financial records?						
Small Partnership	34	94.6	34	100.0	5.4	-4.2
Large Partnership	47	98.8	47	100.0	1.2	
Do you have an adequate number of computers to meet your organization's needs?						
Small Partnership	34	74.4	34	82.0	7.5	10.1
Large Partnership	47	71.9	47	89.6	17.6 *	
Is the software on these computers adequate to meet your organization's needs?						
Small Partnership	34	63.6	34	64.8	1.2	13.9
Large Partnership	47	74.5	47	89.6	15.1 *	
Does your organization have access to the Internet?						
Small Partnership	34	100.0	34	100.0	0.0	0.0
Large Partnership	47	100.0	47	100.0	0.0	
Does your organization use the Internet to support an organizational website?						
Small Partnership	34	97.9	34	97.9	0.0	4.3
Large Partnership	47	90.2	47	94.5	4.3	
Does your organization use the Internet for program email?						
Small Partnership	34	97.9	34	100.0	2.1	-0.9
Large Partnership	47	98.8	47	100.0	1.2	
Does your organization use the Internet for research purposes?						
Small Partnership	34	100.0	34	100.0	0.0	0.0
Large Partnership	47	100.0	47	100.0	0.0	
Does your organization use the Internet for community outreach purposes?						
Small Partnership	34	75.3	34	77.4	2.1	4.1
Large Partnership	47	85.3	47	91.4	6.2	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a The question at baseline referenced a different timeframe so results are not shown.

^b The number reported in the "Average or % Yes" column represents the weighted median. Significance tests were performed on the unweighted medians using a signed rank test.

^c Significance tests were not performed due to small sample sizes.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. "Baseline vs. F1 Difference" denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). "Subgroup Difference" denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.23: Subgroup Changes in Program Development— Lead Organizations Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Service Delivery						
In a month of service delivery, total number of program participants organization serves						
<i>Small Partnership</i>	26	1083.3	23	1232.9	149.7	-1080.5
<i>Large Partnership</i>	36	2315.0	35	1384.2	-930.8	
In a month of service delivery, what is the total number of organizations for whom capacity building services are provided?						
<i>Small Partnership</i>	32	9.8	33	9.0	-0.8	-4.5
<i>Large Partnership</i>	46	26.6	46	21.2	-5.3	
Program Evaluation						
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with (direct) services provided?						
<i>Small Partnership</i>	26	93.1	22	88.8	-4.3	9.7
<i>Large Partnership</i>	36	88.8	34	94.2	5.3	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of (direct service) program participant outcomes?						
<i>Small Partnership</i>	26	85.1	22	71.4	-13.8	13.4
<i>Large Partnership</i>	36	89.6	34	89.3	-0.4	
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with (capacity building) services provided?						
<i>Small Partnership</i>	30	92.8	33	90.2	-2.7	10.8
<i>Large Partnership</i>	46	90.6	46	98.8	8.1	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of (capacity building) program participant outcomes?						
<i>Small Partnership</i>	29	64.2	33	56.5	-7.7	1.7
<i>Large Partnership</i>	45	73.8	46	67.8	-6.0	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. –Baseline vs. F1 Difference” denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.24: Subgroup Changes in Community Engagement— Lead Organizations Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Partnerships						
Organization engaged in partnership arrangements with other organizations in its community/service area (not CEY)?						
Small Partnership	34	97.9	34	97.9	0.0	-3.1
Large Partnership	47	100.0	47	96.9	-3.1	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: government?						
Small Partnership	33	76.0	33	90.3	14.3	-14.6
Large Partnership	47	87.2	46	86.8	-0.3	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: business/private?						
Small Partnership	33	65.1	33	60.5	-4.6	8.4
Large Partnership	47	79.9	46	83.7	3.8	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: educational institutions?						
Small Partnership	33	81.4	33	89.1	7.7	-5.4
Large Partnership	47	92.1	46	94.4	2.3	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: faith-based nonprofit?						
Small Partnership	33	74.8	33	88.0	13.2	-17.7
Large Partnership	47	98.2	46	93.7	-4.5	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: secular nonprofit?						
Small Partnership	33	84.6	33	81.4	-3.2	2.5
Large Partnership	47	97.6	46	96.9	-0.7	
Community Outreach						
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it gains knowledge about the community it serves?						
Small Partnership	34	86.2	34	85.1	-1.1	4.2
Large Partnership	47	86.5	47	89.6	3.2	
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for gaining knowledge about the community it serves?						
Small Partnership	34	74.4	34	72.3	-2.1	7.8
Large Partnership	47	77.9	47	83.7	5.7	
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it markets its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?						
Small Partnership	34	93.7	34	94.6	0.9	5.9
Large Partnership	47	87.2	47	93.9	6.8	
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for marketing its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?						
Small Partnership	34	76.5	34	87.1	10.5	-2.6
Large Partnership	47	82.5	47	90.4	8.0	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. –Baseline vs. F1 Difference” denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.25: Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity— Lead Organizations Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		First Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F1 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Shared Mission and Objectives						
Does your CEY partnership have a mission statement?						
Small Partnership	34	34.0	32	57.2	23.3 *	-1.2
Large Partnership	46	61.7	46	83.8	22.0 **	
Your organization fully understands the goals of your CEY partnership ^{a, b}						
Small Partnership	-	.	34	90.4	-	-
Large Partnership	-	.	47	100.0	-	-
Your organization was involved in setting the goals of your CEY partnership ^{a, b, c}						
Small Partnership	-	.	34	95.8	-	-
Large Partnership	-	.	47	95.7	-	-
Your CEY partnership's goals are well aligned with the goals of your organization ^{b, c}						
Small Partnership	16	100.0	34	88.3	-11.7	10.8
Large Partnership	34	98.6	47	97.6	-1.0	
Communication						
Participating in the CEY partnership led to better communication and working relationships among participating organizations than before ^{b, d}						
Small Partnership	-	-	34	97.9	-2.1	-2.5
Large Partnership	-	-	47	93.9	-4.7	
Action Plan						
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines tasks to be achieved? ^c						
Small Partnership	16	91.3	34	80.9	-10.4	6.5
Large Partnership	34	89.9	47	86.0	-3.9	
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines timeline by which these tasks are to be achieved? ^c						
Small Partnership	16	91.3	34	73.4	-17.9	18.2
Large Partnership	34	71.6	47	71.9	0.3	
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines individuals or organizations responsible for completing each task? ^c						
Small Partnership	16	79.2	34	76.5	-2.6	-2.3
Large Partnership	34	73.2	47	68.3	-4.9	
Sustainability Plan						
Does your partnership have a sustainability plan? ^c						
Small Partnership	16	18.9	32	22.1	3.2	-0.1
Large Partnership	34	26.7	47	29.9	3.2	
On a scale of 1-5 please describe your opinion as to how likely or unlikely it is that your CEY partnership will continue past the 3-year grant cycle. ^c						
Small Partnership	33	90.2	34	75.5	-14.7	18.7
Large Partnership	44	76.6	44	80.6	4.0	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value <0.01

^a Question was asked only of partners at baseline.

^b The baseline, first follow-up, and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered –Strongly Agree” or –Agree” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being –Strongly Agree” and 5 being –Strongly Disagree.”

^c Question was asked only of the 2006 cohort at baseline.

^d Question was asked only at first follow-up and second follow-up.

^e The baseline, first follow-up, and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered –Highly Likely” or –Likely” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being –Highly Likely” and 5 being –Highly Unlikely.”

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and first Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline and first follow-up includes 81 lead organizations (2006 & 2007 cohorts) and represents the population of 131 lead organizations in 2008 and 2009. –Baseline vs. F1 Difference” denotes baseline versus first follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

4.6 Partners by Partnership Size

Exhibit 4.26: Subgroup Changes in Leadership Development—2007 Partners Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F2 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Executive Director Development						
Did the executive director participate in any training related to management and administration?						
Small Partnership	47	77.1	40	100.0	22.9 ^{n/a}	-5.9 ^{n/a}
Large Partnership	83	76.8	85	93.9	17.0 ^{n/a}	
Did the executive director participate in any training related to fundraising?						
Small Partnership	47	54.9	40	88.1	33.3**	-16.2
Large Partnership	83	61.0	85	78.1	17.0**	
Did the executive director participate in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
Small Partnership	47	64.6	40	92.3	27.7**	-13.6
Large Partnership	83	70.6	85	84.6	14.1*	
Full- and Part-Time Staff Development						
How many paid staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
Small Partnership	36	8.9	40	4.1	-4.7	3.0
Large Partnership	67	5.8	80	4.0	-1.7	
How many paid staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
Small Partnership	36	4.2	40	3.6	-0.6	1.1
Large Partnership	66	1.4	79	1.8	0.5	
How many paid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
Small Partnership	36	6.9	41	6.1	-0.7	-1.5
Large Partnership	67	9.9	80	7.7	-2.2	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
Small Partnership	19	2.4	26	2.3	-0.1	-0.7
Large Partnership	40	1.5	49	0.7	-0.8	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
Small Partnership	19	4.5	27	1.0	-3.5	3.6
Large Partnership	39	0.6	49	0.7	0.1	
How many unpaid staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
Small Partnership	19	6.5	28	2.0	-4.5	5.1
Large Partnership	40	1.6	49	2.2	0.6	
Volunteer Development						
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to management and administration?						
Small Partnership	28	1.9	33	3.1	1.2	-6.2
Large Partnership	59	8.1	67	3.1	-5.0	
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to fundraising?						
Small Partnership	27	2.5	35	3.8	1.3	-5.3
Large Partnership	58	5.2	68	1.2	-4.0	
How many volunteer staff participated in any training related to service and/or technical assistance delivery?						
Small Partnership	28	10.3	36	22.9	12.6	-0.5
Large Partnership	65	18.3	73	30.4	12.1	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^{n/a} Significance tests could not be performed due to lack of variance in one of the subgroups at one or more time points.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and second Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 130 partner organizations and represents the population of 130 partner organizations from the 2007 cohort in 2008. The sample at second follow-up includes 158 partner organizations and represents the population of 158 partner organizations from the 2007 cohort in 2010. –Baseline vs. F2 Difference” denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.27: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development—2007 Partners Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F2 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Mission and Strategic Planning						
In the past 12 months, has your organization formally assessed its organizational needs/strengths?						
Small Partnership	47	93.8	54	93.7	-0.1	7.2
Large Partnership	83	89.4	95	96.5	7.1 *	
Does your organization have a mission statement?						
Small Partnership	47	95.8	54	98.3	2.4 ^{n/a}	3.7 ^{n/a}
Large Partnership	83	92.8	95	98.9	6.1 ^{n/a}	
Does your organization have a strategic plan?						
Small Partnership	47	46.5	54	79.7	33.2 **	-18.5
Large Partnership	83	63.0	95	77.7	14.7 *	
Governance and Organizational Structure						
Is your organization governed by a parent or umbrella organization's Board of Directors?						
Small Partnership	47	12.5	54	10.3	-2.2	-7.3
Large Partnership	83	28.4	95	19.0	-9.5	
Is your organization governed by an Advisory Panel?						
Small Partnership	47	15.3	54	12.8	-2.4	-0.2
Large Partnership	83	17.1	95	14.5	-2.6	
Is your organization governed by its own Board of Directors?						
Small Partnership	47	81.3	54	85.9	4.6	-1.0
Large Partnership	83	75.5	95	79.1	3.6	
Board responsibilities include: Goal/Strategy development						
Small Partnership	38	92.3	46	100.0	7.7 ^{n/a}	-4.3 ^{n/a}
Large Partnership	64	92.3	75	95.7	3.4 ^{n/a}	
Board responsibilities include: Community/Stakeholder outreach						
Small Partnership	38	81.2	46	92.0	10.8	-0.5
Large Partnership	64	74.9	75	85.2	10.2	
Board responsibilities include: Budget development						
Small Partnership	38	79.5	46	85.9	6.5	-0.7
Large Partnership	64	78.2	75	84.0	5.8	
Board responsibilities include: Financial review						
Small Partnership	38	100.0	46	98.0	-2.0 ^{n/a}	7.7 ^{n/a}
Large Partnership	64	91.8	75	97.5	5.7 ^{n/a}	
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of program outcomes						
Small Partnership	38	70.1	46	80.5	10.4	-7.4
Large Partnership	64	78.3	75	81.3	3.0	
Board responsibilities include: Performance review of executive director						
Small Partnership	38	78.6	46	81.8	3.2	0.6
Large Partnership	64	83.9	75	87.7	3.8	
Board responsibilities include: Recruitment of new board members						
Small Partnership	38	88.9	46	94.6	5.8	10.1
Large Partnership	64	80.1	75	95.9	15.9 **	
Board responsibilities include: Provision of formal orientation to new board members						
Small Partnership	38	65.0	46	79.4	14.5	0.7
Large Partnership	64	65.7	75	80.9	15.2 **	
At present, how many individuals are on your organization's board?						
Small Partnership	39	9.4	46	9.8	0.3	-0.8
Large Partnership	64	11.2	75	10.7	-0.5	
In the past 12 months, how many individuals have served as executive director or your organization? ^a						
Small Partnership	-	-	54	0.9	-	-
Large Partnership	-	-	95	1.0	-	
Organization has 501(c)3 status						
Small Partnership	41	78.4	50	81.3	2.9	10.4
Large Partnership	82	72.8	90	86.2	13.3 *	

Exhibit 4.27: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development—2007 Partners Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F2 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Revenue Sources						
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total revenue? ^b						
Small Partnership	47	126,386	54	126,200	-186 *	35,186
Large Partnership	83	175,000	94	210,000	35,000	
In the last completed fiscal year, what was your organization's total expenditures? ^b						
Small Partnership	47	111,816	54	96,000	-15,816	19,612
Large Partnership	83	196,304	94	200,100	3,796	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from federal government agencies?						
Small Partnership	47	38.9	54	18.1	-20.8 **	21.3 *
Large Partnership	83	31.2	95	31.7	0.5	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from state or local government agencies?						
Small Partnership	47	47.2	54	31.3	-15.9 *	14.0
Large Partnership	83	46.8	95	44.8	-2.0	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from institutional funding sources (e.g., corporations, foundations)?						
Small Partnership	47	50.0	54	50.4	0.4	-2.2
Large Partnership	83	52.7	95	50.9	-1.8	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from individual donors or events?						
Small Partnership	47	68.8	54	53.1	-15.6	18.6
Large Partnership	83	62.5	95	65.4	2.9	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from Fees for Service?						
Small Partnership	47	35.4	54	40.7	5.3	1.8
Large Partnership	83	37.1	95	44.2	7.1	
Excluding CEY, over the past 12 months, has your organization sought or obtained revenue from grants/contracts from another organization?						
Small Partnership	47	25.7	54	21.5	-4.2	4.3
Large Partnership	83	31.3	95	31.4	0.1	
Funding Readiness						
Does your organization have a fundraising/fund development plan?						
Small Partnership	47	23.6	54	44.3	20.7 **	-5.8
Large Partnership	83	38.6	95	53.5	14.9 *	
Does your organization have financial management procedures for ensuring expenditures are properly authorized?						
Small Partnership	47	72.2	54	82.1	9.8	-7.8
Large Partnership	83	78.3	95	80.3	2.0	
Does your organization have an individual, distinct from the executive director, who is responsible for financial management?						
Small Partnership	47	79.2	49	88.5	9.4	-5.4
Large Partnership	83	84.5	90	88.5	4.0	
Human Resources Management						
How many paid staff are full-time employees?						
Small Partnership	41	7.6	46	9.0	1.4	-1.8
Large Partnership	69	9.9	84	9.5	-0.4	
How many unpaid staff are full-time employees?						
Small Partnership	23	0.5	30	0.4	0.0	-0.3
Large Partnership	44	1.2	52	0.9	-0.3	
How many paid staff are part-time employees?						
Small Partnership	41	9.2	46	8.2	-1.0	-1.0
Large Partnership	69	8.4	83	6.4	-2.0	
How many unpaid staff are part-time employees?						
Small Partnership	23	3.1	30	3.5	0.4	1.4
Large Partnership	44	2.6	52	4.4	1.8	
How many volunteers are part-time employees?						
Small Partnership	35	23.4	38	48.9	25.4	-26.2
Large Partnership	68	65.9	78	65.2	-0.8	

Exhibit 4.27: Subgroup Changes in Organizational Development—2007 Partners Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F2 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Is there a job description for paid staff?						
Small Partnership	43	90.8	46	88.5	-2.4	-0.5
Large Partnership	73	93.1	83	90.3	-2.8	
Is there a job description for unpaid staff?						
Small Partnership	26	51.9	29	71.3	19.4	5.4
Large Partnership	52	47.8	53	72.6	24.8 **	
Is there a job description for volunteers?						
Small Partnership	41	46.0	40	55.9	9.9	2.3
Large Partnership	77	49.7	78	61.9	12.3	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of paid staff?						
Small Partnership	41	36.0	46	42.1	6.1	2.7
Large Partnership	74	46.4	83	55.2	8.7	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of unpaid staff?						
Small Partnership	23	20.8	29	34.7	13.9 ^{n/a}	-0.8 ^{n/a}
Large Partnership	52	24.9	53	38.0	13.0 ^{n/a}	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted performance reviews of volunteers?						
Small Partnership	38	10.3	40	11.8	1.6	-3.2
Large Partnership	75	20.0	78	18.3	-1.7	
IT Management						
Does your organization regularly use computer software to keep financial records?						
Small Partnership	47	82.6	49	88.4	5.8	5.1
Large Partnership	83	82.2	90	93.0	10.8 **	
Do you have an adequate number of computers to meet your organization's needs?						
Small Partnership	47	33.3	49	69.8	36.5 **	7.7
Large Partnership	83	32.3	90	76.6	44.2 **	
Is the software on these computers adequate to meet your organization's needs?						
Small Partnership	47	31.3	49	71.3	40.0 **	-5.5
Large Partnership	83	45.9	90	80.4	34.5 **	
Does your organization have access to the Internet?						
Small Partnership	47	89.6	49	93.1	3.5 ^{n/a}	2.5 ^{n/a}
Large Partnership	83	93.9	90	100.0	6.1 ^{n/a}	
Does your organization use the Internet to support an organizational website?						
Small Partnership	42	66.7	46	81.4	14.7	-2.5
Large Partnership	78	79.8	90	92.0	12.2 **	
Does your organization use the Internet for program email?						
Small Partnership	42	90.7	46	89.7	-1.0	1.3
Large Partnership	78	96.2	90	96.6	.03	
Does your organization use the Internet for research purposes?						
Small Partnership	42	88.4	46	95.9	7.5 ^{n/a}	-7.2 ^{n/a}
Large Partnership	78	97.5	90	97.8	0.3 ^{n/a}	
Does your organization use the Internet for community outreach purposes?						
Small Partnership	42	71.3	46	83.1	11.8	2.5
Large Partnership	78	73.3	90	87.5	14.2 **	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^{n/a} Significance tests could not be performed due to lack of variance in one of the subgroups at one or more time points.

^a The question at baseline referenced a different timeframe so results are not shown.

^b The number reported in the "Average or % Yes" column represents the weighted median. Significance tests were performed on the unweighted medians using a signed rank test.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and second Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 130 partner organizations and represents the population of 130 partner organizations from the 2007 cohort in 2008. The sample at second follow-up includes 158 partner organizations and represents the population of 158 partner organizations from the 2007 cohort in 2010. "Baseline vs. F2 Difference" denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). "Subgroup Difference" denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.28: Subgroup Changes in Program Development—2007 Partners Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F2 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Service Delivery						
In a month of service delivery, total number of program participants organization serves						
<i>Small Partnership</i>	45	364.2	54	546.3	182.2	-29.9
<i>Large Partnership</i>	74	362.2	91	514.4	152.2	
In a month of service delivery, what is the total number of organizations for whom capacity building services are provided?						
<i>Small Partnership</i>	18	6.8	20	5.9	-0.9	1.5
<i>Large Partnership</i>	35	4.4	41	5.0	0.6	
Program Evaluation						
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with direct services provided?						
<i>Small Partnership</i>	44	62.2	54	86.0	23.8 **	-12.5
<i>Large Partnership</i>	70	82.8	91	94.1	11.3 *	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of direct service program participant outcomes?						
<i>Small Partnership</i>	43	55.3	54	53.4	-1.9	24.0 *
<i>Large Partnership</i>	71	53.4	91	75.5	22.1 **	
In the past 12 months, has your organization obtained feedback from program participants about satisfaction with capacity building services provided?						
<i>Small Partnership</i>	17	76.9	20	89.5	12.5 ^{n/a}	3.8 ^{n/a}
<i>Large Partnership</i>	31	67.2	41	83.6	16.3 ^{n/a}	
In the past 12 months, has your organization conducted formal measurements of capacity building program participant outcomes?						
<i>Small Partnership</i>	15	45.7	20	67.6	22.0	14.6
<i>Large Partnership</i>	31	32.7	41	69.2	36.5 **	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^{n/a} Significance tests could not be performed due to lack of variance in one of the subgroups at one or more time points.

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and second Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 130 partner organizations and represents the population of 130 partner organizations from the 2007 cohort in 2008. The sample at second follow-up includes 158 partner organizations and represents the population of 158 partner organizations from the 2007 cohort in 2010. –Baseline vs. F2 Difference” denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.29: Subgroup Changes in Community Engagement—2007 Partners Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F2 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Partnerships						
Organization engaged in partnership arrangements with other organizations in its community/service area (not CEY)?						
Small Partnership	47	87.5	54	93.7	6.2	-0.7
Large Partnership	83	89.1	95	94.5	5.5	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: government?						
Small Partnership	41	52.4	51	52.5	0.2	8.5
Large Partnership	75	53.2	90	61.8	8.6	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: business/private?						
Small Partnership	41	47.6	51	74.4	26.7 **	-16.3
Large Partnership	75	56.2	90	66.6	10.4	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: educational institutions?						
Small Partnership	41	71.4	51	72.0	0.6	5.0
Large Partnership	75	81.5	90	87.0	5.6	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: faith-based nonprofit?						
Small Partnership	41	76.2	51	85.3	9.1	-11.8
Large Partnership	74	79.9	90	77.2	-2.7	
Partnership arrangements with organizations in: secular nonprofit?						
Small Partnership	41	88.1	51	84.9	-3.2	5.4
Large Partnership	75	81.0	90	83.2	2.2	
Community Outreach						
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it gains knowledge about the community it serves?						
Small Partnership	47	72.9	54	90.2	17.3 *	0.7
Large Partnership	83	67.5	95	85.5	18.0 **	
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for gaining knowledge about the community it serves?						
Small Partnership	47	75.0	54	81.3	6.3	9.3
Large Partnership	83	59.3	95	74.9	15.6 *	
In the past 12 months has your organization rethought the way in which it markets its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?						
Small Partnership	47	72.9	54	97.1	24.2 **	-17.5 *
Large Partnership	83	86.9	95	93.6	6.7	
In the past 12 months has your organization implemented new or improved methods for marketing its services or expands awareness about its mission to individuals, families, funders, or potential partners?						
Small Partnership	47	61.8	54	86.4	24.5 **	-11.4
Large Partnership	83	64.0	95	77.2	13.2 *	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and second Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 130 partner organizations and represents the population of 130 partner organizations from the 2007 cohort in 2008. The sample at second follow-up includes 158 partner organizations and represents the population of 158 partner organizations from the 2007 cohort in 2010. –Baseline vs. F2 Difference” denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). –Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

Exhibit 4.30: Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity—2007 Partners Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F2 Difference	Subgroup Difference
Leadership Development						
Lead operates with the best interest of your organization in mind ^{a, b}						
Small Partnership	-	-	49	89.2	-	-
Large Partnership	-	-	90	85.8	-	-
Lead is collegial. It respects your organization ^{a, b}						
Small Partnership	-	-	49	92.4	-	-
Large Partnership	-	-	90	89.3	-	-
Lead is even-handed and ensures that project efforts are not skewed to a single party's interests ^{a, b}						
Small Partnership	-	-	47	92.7	-	-
Large Partnership	-	-	89	86.9	-	-
Lead is competent. It is able to provide the capacity building assistance your organization wants or expects ^{a, b}						
Small Partnership	-	-	49	93.0	-	-
Large Partnership	-	-	90	90.2	-	-
Lead is dependable. It follows through on commitments in a timely and efficient manner ^{a, b}						
Small Partnership	-	-	49	89.2	-	-
Large Partnership	-	-	90	86.8	-	-
Shared Mission and Objectives						
Does your CEY partnership have a mission statement?						
Small Partnership	34	73.1	46	93.4	20.3 **	3.9
Large Partnership	55	69.2	78	93.5	24.2 **	
Your organization fully understands the goals of your CEY partnership ^a						
Small Partnership	46	71.4	49	96.2	24.7 **	-4.6
Large Partnership	80	68.5	90	88.7	20.2 **	
Your organization was involved in setting the goals of your CEY partnership ^{a, b}						
Small Partnership	-	-	49	80.7	-	-
Large Partnership	-	-	88	79.4	-	-
Your CEY partnership's goals are well aligned with the goals of your organization ^{a, b}						
Small Partnership	-	-	49	88.7	-	-
Large Partnership	-	-	90	83.8	-	-
Lead's mission and/or work is well aligned with your organization's mission ^a						
Small Partnership	47	86.1	49	93.0	6.9	-0.1
Large Partnership	81	83.9	88	90.7	6.8	
Communication						
Participating in the CEY partnership led to better communication and working relationships among participating organizations than before ^{a, c}						
Small Partnership	-	-	49	91.1	-	-
Large Partnership	-	-	89	85.7	-	-
Action Plan						
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines tasks to be achieved? ^b						
Small Partnership	-	-	49	91.1	-	-
Large Partnership	-	-	87	83.4	-	-
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines timeline by which these tasks are to be achieved? ^b						
Small Partnership	-	-	49	86.8	-	-
Large Partnership	-	-	81	74.1	-	-
Does your partnership have a plan that outlines individuals or organizations responsible for completing each task? ^b						
Small Partnership	-	-	48	86.0	-	-
Large Partnership	-	-	82	76.5	-	-
Sustainability Plan						
Does your partnership have a sustainability plan? ^b						
Small Partnership	-	-	42	40.4	-	-
Large Partnership	-	-	64	38.8	-	-

Exhibit 4.30: Subgroup Changes in Partnership Capacity—2007 Partners Belonging to Small Vs. Large Partnerships

	Baseline		Second Follow-Up		Significance Tests	
	Number of respondents (N)	Average or % Yes	N	Average or % Yes	Baseline vs. F2 Difference	Subgroup Difference
On a scale of 1-5 please describe your opinion as to how likely or unlikely it is that your CEY partnership will continue past the 3-year grant cycle. ^d						
<i>Small Partnership</i>	44	83.7	44	88.0	4.3	-16.4
<i>Large Partnership</i>	78	86.0	84	74.0	-12.0 *	

* p-value < 0.05

** p-value < 0.01

^a The baseline and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being “Strongly Agree” and 5 being “Strongly Disagree.”

^b Question was asked only of the 2006 cohort at baseline.

^c Question was asked only at first follow-up and second follow-up.

^d The baseline and second follow-up averages indicate the percentage of respondents that answered “Highly Likely” or “Likely” on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being “Highly Likely” and 5 being “Highly Unlikely.”

Source: CEY Outcome Study Baseline and second Follow-Up Surveys

Note: The sample at baseline includes 130 partner organizations and represents the population of 130 partner organizations from the 2007 cohort in 2008. The sample at second follow-up includes 158 partner organizations and represents the population of 158 partner organizations from the 2007 cohort in 2010. “Baseline vs. F2 Difference” denotes baseline versus second follow-up changes for each subgroup (or from one row). “Subgroup Difference” denotes the difference between the change scores of two groups (or between two rows).

References

- Abt Associates, Inc. and Branch Associates, Inc. (2007). *Compassion Capital Fund Communities Empowering Youth Evaluation: Evaluation Design*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- Abt Associates, Inc. and Branch Associates, Inc. (2010). *Improving Capacity among Non-Profits - An Impact Study of the Compassion Capital Fund Demonstration Program*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- Bass, B. M., & Norton, F. M. (1951). Group size and leaderless discussions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35, 397-400.
- Benjamini, Y., & Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A new and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 57, 1289-1300.
- Kish, L. (1965), *Survey Sampling*, New York: Wiley.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2007). *Essentials of Organizational Behavior* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2008). *Organizational Behavior* (13th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Schochet, P. Z. (2008). *Technical Methods Report: Guidelines for Multiple Testing in Impact Evaluations*. Washington D.C.: Institute for Education Sciences.
- Weick, K. E. (1993). The Collapse of Sensemaking in Organizations: The Mann Gulch Disaster. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 628-652.