The Mockingbird Society Evaluation Plan

Karolynn Tom

YDP 8040: Assessment and Evaluation of Youth Programs

April 23rd, 2018

Clemson University

Table of Contents

Program Structure and Context

There is a great need to improve the systems serving youth and young adults in Washington State. Nearly 9,000 youth were in out of home placement in Washington in 2017 (Partners for Our Children, 2015). Approximately 28% of youth who age out of foster care will experience homelessness within the first year of their exit from foster care (Ford Shah et al., 2015). In addition, there were over 13,0000 unaccompanied youth and young adults (ages 12-24) experiencing homelessness throughout Washington state (Noble, 2016). Multiple systems changes would benefit children, youth, and young adults who are experiencing the child welfare or homelessness response systems.

The Mockingbird Society is a non-profit advocacy agency in Washington State with a mission to improve the foster care system and end youth homelessness (The Mockingbird Society, 2018a). The Mockingbird Society was founded in 2000 by Jim Theofilis under the philosophy that young people with lived experiences are truly the experts in what needs to change in the child welfare system (The Mockingbird Society, 2018a). Today, Mockingbird's Youth Programs has a dual focus on advocacy and youth development. The programming consists of seven regional chapters across the state including in Seattle, Everett, Tacoma, Olympia, Yakima, Spokane, and the Youth Advocates Ending Homelessness (YAEH) chapter based in Seattle (The Mockingbird Society, 2018a). Each chapter is supported by a partner organization, or host agency. In a collaborative effort host agency staff work with Mockingbird staff to recruit, engage, and support program participants in Mockingbird activities.

The Youth Program's goals are divided into three categories, Connection and Empowerment, Community Education, and Systems Reform. Overall, the programming is designed to help young people feel connected to their peers, improve their communication skills,

and become educated and active participants in state level systems changes. See Appendix A for

a complete logic model (The Mockingbird Society, 2018b). In 2017, approximately 400 young

people between the ages of 13-25 years old participated in Mockingbird activities through the

regional chapters (The Mockingbird Society, n.d.). These activities include attending monthly

leadership team and chapter meetings, quarterly State Leadership Council meetings, and annual

events including the Youth Leadership Summit and Youth Advocacy Day. In addition,

participants submit written articles, poetry, and other art work to a youth authored newspaper,

The Mockingbird Times, and the Mockingbird Blog. Finally, Mockingbird Network members

participate in a variety of speaking engagements. Many of these speaking engagements involve

sharing personal stories with various policymakers. To date, Mockingbird participants and allies

have helped advocate the passage of over 25 legislative asks (The Mockingbird Society, 2018a).

Description of the Problem

Over the last three years the overall youth and young adult engagement in Mockingbird

programming has declined. However, the decrease in program engagement has not been equal

across all regions. It is important to understand the factors that may be impacting the various

levels of participant engagement. Two aspects of the regional chapter programming that have

been previously identified by program leadership as potentially influencing participant

engagement are the state of the collaborative relationship with the partner organizations and the

various programming staffing models. Mockingbird's Youth Programs partners with local youth

serving organizations as host agencies for each regional chapter. In addition, Mockingbird

utilizes three separate staffing models to support the program regions. The first staffing model

utilizes one full-time staff for one chapter. The second staffing model utilizes one full-time staff

to support two nearby chapters, with the staff ideally splitting their time equally between the

chapters. The third staffing model utilizes a combined staff position with the partner organization. These individuals ideally work 20 hours supporting the Mockingbird regional chapter and 20 hours for the partner organization as a case manager or in another youth serving role. There is a need to better understand how the collaboration strength between the partner organization and Mockingbird as well as the various staffing models impact effective program participant engagement.

Purpose of Evaluation and Guiding Questions

The purpose of this evaluation of The Mockingbird Society's Youth Programs will be to determine the ideal staffing model and partner organization collaboration characteristics to effectively engage program participants. The following are the guiding questions for this evaluation.

- What characteristics of partner organization collaboration are most effective for engaging participants in Mockingbird programming?

- What Regional Engagement Coordinator staffing models contribute most to effective participant engagement in Mockingbird programming?

To answer these questions a process evaluation will be utilized as process evaluations are used when the evaluator is interested in understanding how well a program is functioning (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004). This will be a formative evaluation with the results providing guidance for program improvement. Potential consequences of the evaluation could be changes in staffing models, funding, and partner organization agreements and relationships.

Literature Review

The impacts of two main concepts will be explored in this evaluation plan. The first concept is partner organization collaboration characteristics and strength. Collaborations with

partner organizations as hosts of programming and partners for policy work are essential for The

Mockingbird Society to be successful in its endeavors. The second concept is the characteristics,

strengths, and weaknesses of the three different staffing models utilized to support the regional

chapters. One challenge will be to operationalize the characteristics of the ideal collaborative

relationship. This is made especially complex considering the various social and environmental

contexts in which each partnership exists, including the staffing model utilized.

Collaboration

Collaborations between organizations have become increasingly important over the last

few decades across multiple sectors including the nonprofit sector (Woodland & Hutton, 2012).

Indeed, collaboration is now seen as essential for organizations to succeed, thrive, and

appropriately serve communities and individuals (Gajda, 2004). Funders also see the value in

organizational collaborations. As an example, nonprofits that collaborate are more likely to get

government funding (Suárez, 2010). However, even as the emphasis on collaboration has

increased, managing and evaluating the effectiveness of collaborations remains difficult (Gajda,

2004; Woodland & Hutton, 2012).

Successful collaborations have several key characteristics. The foundation of a

successful collaboration is a shared purpose or shared priority (Byrne & Hansberry, 2007;

Woodland & Hutton, 2012). Organizations come together when there is a need or a vision that

could be better done together. Other characteristics of a successful collaboration include

institutional support and political will from those in power, shared and combined resources, and

clear expectations of collaboration roles and responsibilities (Byrne & Hansberry, 2007). In

addition, organizational characteristics can impact the collaboration strength and the overall

program outcomes for non-profits (Arya & Lin, 2007). Collaborations are dynamic and need

ongoing evaluation to maintain high effectiveness (Bryne & Hansberry, 2007; Gajda, 2004; Woodland & Hutton, 2012).

Multiple models for evaluating community collaborations exist. Woodland and Hutton (2012) proposed the Collaboration Evaluation and Improvement (CEIF) Framework that describes five phases in the dynamic cycle of creating and maintaining a collaboration. The five phases include: 1- operationalize collaboration, 2 – identify and map communities of practice, 3 – monitor stage(s) of development, 4 – assess levels of integration, and 5 – assess cycles of inquiry (Woodland & Hutton, 2012). The authors suggest different actions and tasks that can be done by the evaluator to determine steps for improvement at each phase. In the first phase, the collaborative effort needs to be operationalized into specific items that can be observed, quantified, and measured (Woodland & Hutton, 2012). While the first phase focuses on what the collaboration will do, the second phase evaluates who will fulfills each role within the collaboration. This is important, not only to help maintain clear expectations, but also to ensure efficient work load balance (Woodland & Hutton, 2012). The third through the fifth stages describe the "how" of the collaboration. The third phase recognizes the cyclical characteristic of collaborations which has been described by Tuckman and Jenson (1977) as form, storm, norm, perform, and adjourn. In this phase evaluators can help determine if there are resources or needs to move the collaboration to the next stage in the cycle (Woodland & Hutton, 2012). The forth phase determines the level of integration the collaboration has, which depending on the goal of collaboration can vary from independent (no integration) to unifying (high integration) (Woodland & Hutton, 2012). Finally, phase five evaluates the quality of the personal interactions within the collaboration. While organizations may enter a strategic alliance, it is the

people who perform the collaboration and this phase introduces strategies to increase effective interprofessional collaborations (Woodland & Hutton, 2012).

The Collaboration Evaluation and Improvement (CEIF) Framework described above guides evaluators on determining the who, what, and how of a collaboration. This framework will be useful in the current evaluation of The Mockingbird Society's Youth Programs collaborations with its partner host agencies throughout the state. It is likely that each of the partnerships will vary in the needs, strengths, and plan for improvement.

Alternative Staffing Models

Limited literature exists that explores different staffing models. Most of the literature explores alternatives to full-time staffing models such as a shared staffing model (for example, Davidson & Kline, 1979; Duncan, 1983; Wood & Wattus, 1987). A shared staffing model is where one full-time position is completed, or shared, by two separate individuals (Wood & Wattus, 1987). Shared staffing models have been utilized to meet the demand for flexible schedules and reduce layoffs (Davidson & Kline, 1979). Shared staffing can be found extensively in the health and education fields, especially in rural communities (Davidson & Kline, 1979; Wood & Wattus, 1987; Woodhouse, Johnson-De Wit, & Finn, 2013). While proponents of shared staffing models highlight the flexibility in the positions, especially around creating a work and home-life balance, McDonald, Bradly, and Brown (2009) describe potential negative impacts of part-time work. Specifically, part-time employees tend to have less responsibility, less access to higher stakes projects and promotions, and less workplace support while having increased work intensity (McDonald et al., 2009). It is unknown whether staff that maintain two part-time positions that are combined into a full-time position will align more with full-time or part-time employee outcomes.

Data Gathering Techniques

The complete evaluation plan will be conducted in several phases. The first phase of the evaluation plan will aim to operationalize the characteristics of the ideal partner organization collaboration and understand the impact of the various Regional Engagement Coordinator staffing models on the collaboration relationship. The second phase will evaluate each partner organization collaboration strength based on the characteristics identified in the first phase. The third phase will involve methods to explore the relationship between the partner organization collaboration strength and regional program participant engagement.

The following discussion will focus on Phase 1 of the evaluation. Data collection will be through qualitative methods using semi-structured interviews and focus groups. All interviews and focus groups will be conducted by an external evaluator. Data will be collected from program managers from The Mockingbird Society, program managers from each partner organization, Regional Engagement Coordinators, and partner organization program allies. The goal will be to collect information about the experiences and understanding of each partner organization collaboration.

Phase 1 – Operationalize characteristics of ideal collaboration.

Interviews. Interviews will be conducted in person at The Mockingbird Society headquarters, via telephone, or video conferences. All interviews will be completed within a six-week period in the summer of 2018. The interviews will be semi-structured with specific questions that will be used for prompts with the freedom for respondents to focus on themes they deem important. It is anticipated that each interview will last between 45 – 60 minutes. A total of 22 interviews will be completed consisting of the entire targeted population.

- **Program Managers:** Program managers from The Mockingbird Society (3 individuals) and each partner organization (7 individuals) will be interviewed about their perceptions of the purpose, resources, and organizational roles in the collaboration.

- **Regional Engagement Coordinators:** Regional Engagement Coordinators (5 individuals) who are the staff in charge of programming in each region will be interviewed about their perceptions of the purpose, resources, and organizational roles in the collaboration. Additional questions will be asked about the impact of the staffing model they work under on their work performance.

- **Program Allies:** Program allies, who are employees of the partner organization and assigned to support the functions of the regional chapter program (7 individuals) will be interviewed about their perceptions of the purpose, resources, and roles in the collaboration.

    Focus Groups. Once initial interviews are completed and initial data analysis complete, at least three focus groups will be conducted to elicit feedback on the categories of characteristics of ideal collaboration, including Regional Engagement Coordinator staffing model, that have been identified. The focus groups will be conducted either in person or through telephone or video conferencing. Each focus group is anticipated to last 60-90 minutes and will occur in a four-week period in the fall of 2018.

- **Mockingbird Youth Program Staff:** Program Managers and Regional Engagement Coordinators (8 individuals) will participate in an in-person focus group during one of the staff trainings at Mockingbird headquarters.

- **Partner Organization Staff:** Program Managers and Program Allies at the host agencies (14 individuals) will be invited to participate in one of two focus groups. The focus groups will be held in-person at Mockingbird headquarters or other partner organization office with optional telephone or video conferencing capabilities for staff located across the state.

Measurement Instruments

A script will be followed for both the interviews and the focus groups. The interview script questions are modified from the Collaboration Evaluation and Improvement (CEIF) Framework proposed by Woodland and Hutton (2012). Additional questions were added to elicit perceptions around the Regional Engagement Coordinator staffing models. A complete interview script can be found in Appendix B. The focus group questions center on ensuring the categories identified by the evaluator through the data analysis of the interview responses are applicable and relevant. In addition, the questions aim to understand the impact of the collaboration characteristics on engaging participants in Mockingbird programming. See Appendix C for a template focus group discussion script. Questions were formed following guidelines outlined by Barker (2010). Specifically, interview and focus group questions should be open ended and avoid dichotomous, and one-word answers (Barker, 2010). In addition, "why" questions should be avoided (Barker, 2010).

Data Analysis

Data analysis will be conducted using a general inductive approach. The procedures outlined by Thomas (2006) will be followed. Briefly, the raw data from the interviews and focused groups will be compiled and formatted. Next, a closed reading of the text will be conducted by the external evaluator followed by the creation of categories or themes. The coded

categories will be cross-checked by the internal evaluator. Then the external and internal

evaluators will work together to consolidate the categories to reduce overlapped coding and

redundancy. Finally, the evaluators will create a model using three to eight categories. The

resulting categories will then be validated by initial stakeholder members for accuracy.

Measurement Reliability and Validity

The evaluation design includes several aspects to increase reliability and validity. In

qualitative research reliability and validity are often associated with the "trustworthiness" of the

study (Noble &Smith, 2015; Thomas, 2006). One strategy identified by Thomas (2006) that

increases trustworthiness is coding consistency checks. The evaluation design includes coding

consistency checks through two methods. First, the coding is validated by a second evaluator.

The second method is through including respondent validation to the characteristic categories

identified, which is done in the follow-up focus groups. Noble and Smith (2015) identified

respondent validation as a key strategy to increase trustworthiness. Furthermore, triangulation of

data collection can increase reliability (Shenton, 2004). One type of triangulation of data

collection is to use a wide range of types of respondents (Shenton, 2004). While the evaluation

population is small, it does collect data from a wide perspective of stakeholders including

managers and front-line staff on both sides of the collaborative relationship.

The use of an external evaluator to conduct the interviews, focus groups, and data

analysis is another strength to the evaluation design. To obtain credible data, evaluation designs

need to include methods to ensure respondent honesty (Shenton, 2004). In utilizing an external

evaluator, the respondents can be reminded of the neutral position of the evaluator. In addition,

the scripts for the both the interviews and focus groups explicitly ask for open and honest

answers. Finally, Noble and Smith (2015) argue that acknowledging and working to limit

evaluator bias is important in increasing study trustworthiness. In utilizing an external evaluator, the internal evaluator acknowledges the potential biases they may have on the topic and aims to limit the effects of the bias.

Evaluation Stakeholders

Involvement of various stakeholders will be essential to the successful completion of the evaluation plan. The internal evaluator currently holds a middle management position at The Mockingbird Society and will serve to provide programming information, coordinate data collection, and as a convener of the stakeholders. The following stakeholder groups will be asked to participate at different points of the evaluation and will be informed of the results.

- **Mockingbird Staff/Board of Directors**
    - *Youth Programs Staff* – Youth Programs staff will be active participants in each phase of the evaluation. In Phase 1, Youth Programs staff will participate in individual interviews and focus groups. In subsequent phases, the staff will be involved in the design and implementation of the evaluation. Critically, Regional Engagement Coordinators will be charged with ensuring data collection for their chapters.
    - *Other Staff/Upper Management/Board of Directors* – Mockingbird staff from other departments and the Board of Directors will be asked to give feedback on the overall direction of the evaluation. They will also participate in disseminating the evaluation results to other stakeholder groups.
- **Partner Organizations** –Partner organization management and staff allies will primarily be involved in Phase 1 of the evaluation. They will be informed of the evaluation results and be impacted by any collaboration or staffing adjustments due to the findings.

- **Mockingbird Network Participants:** Program participants will be involved in the later phases of the evaluation. They will be informed of the results of the evaluation and impacted by any collaboration or staffing adjustments due to the findings.

- **External Audiences** – Organizations and other community members that request Mockingbird youth presentations will be asked to participate in later phases of the evaluation.

- **Funders** – Funders will be informed of the results of the evaluation, especially highlighting the strengths identified and the adjustments made due to the evaluation results.

Resources Needed

Several resources will be needed to complete this evaluation. The first and most important resources is staff time. Dedicated meeting space will also be needed. Additionally, remote conference capabilities will be needed to conduct the interviews and focus groups for the staff and program managers from the external regions. Ideally this will be through an online video conferencing application such as GoToMeeting™ or Skype™. In addition, to ensure complete data collection, a recording device will be needed for each of the interviews and focus groups. Finally, an external facilitator will be required to ensure an unbiased and neutral environment for the data collection.

Barriers to Completion

The largest barrier to completion is the allocation of appropriate resources. Importantly, staff will need to be given the time and capacity to fully participate in the evaluation. Stakeholder support will be needed at The Mockingbird Society and each of the seven host agencies to ensure staff are available for participation. In addition, funding for the external

evaluator will be critical. The use of an external evaluator adds credibility, reliability, and

validity to the evaluation design. Without appropriate funding for the external evaluator, the

evaluation trustworthiness diminishes, and the evaluation implementation is at risk.

Conclusion

It is necessary for The Mockingbird Society's Youth Programs to explore the factors that

are impacting the inconsistent participant engagement decline across the regional chapters. A

critical part of this exploration will be the evaluation of the several partner organization

collaborative relationships as well as the optimal Regional Engagement Coordinator staffing

model described above. The results of the complete evaluation will serve to inform program and

organizational leadership to optimize collaboration agreements and regional chapter staffing.

References

Aray, B., & Lin Z. (2007). Understanding collaboration outcomes from an extended resource-based view perspective: The roles of organizational characteristics, partner attributes, and network structures. *Journal of Management,* 33(5), 697-723.

Barker, W. (2010). *Developing 4-H needs assessment through "focus group" interviewing*. University of Nevada Cooperative Extension. Retrieved from http://www.orgwise.ca/sites/osi.ocasi.org.stage/files/resources/Developing%204-H%20Needs%20Assessment%20through%20'Focus%20Group'%20Interviewing.pdf

Byrne, A. & Hansberry, J. (2007). Collaboration: Leveraging resources and expertise. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 114, 75-84.

Davidson, W., & Kline, S. (1979). Job sharing in education. *The Clearing House,* 52(5), 226-228.

Duncan, V.A. (1983). *Staffing alternatives: Use of retired persons, flex-time, job sharing and other suggestions.* Salem, OR: Oregon Department of Education.

Ford Shah, M., Liu, Q., Mancuso, D., Marshall, D., Felver, B.E.M., Lucenko, B., & Huber, A. (2015). *Youth at risk of homelessness: Identifying key predictive factors among youth aging out of foster care in Washington State*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Social and Health Services.

Gajda, R. (2004). Utilizing collaboration theory to evaluate strategic alliances. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 25(1), 65-77.

McDonald, P., Bradley, L., & Brown, K. (2009). 'Full-time is a given here': Part-time versus full-time job quality. *British Journal of Management,* 20, 143-157.

Noble, C. (2016). *Youth homelessness in Washington: Landscape scan*. Olympia, WA: A Way

Home Washington and the Washington State Office of Homeless Youth Prevention and

Protection. Retrieved from http://www.awayhomewa.org/wp-

content/uploads/2016/09/YouthHomelessnessWA_LandscapeScan_August-2016.pdf

Noble, H., & Smith, J. (2015). Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research. *Evidence-

Based Nursing,* 18(2), 34-35.

Partners for Our Children. (2015). *The child well-being data portal: Children in out-of-home

care (count)*. Retrieved March 10, 2018 from http://pocdata.org/visualizations/ooh-counts

Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach, 7th

E*d. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Suárez, D. (2010). Collaboration and professionalization: The contours of public sector funding

for nonprofit organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21,

307-326.

Shenton, A.K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research

projects. *Education for Information*, 22, 63-75

The Mockingbird Society. (2018a). *About us*. Retrieved on March 10th, 2018 from

http://www.mockingbirdsociety.org

The Mockingbird Society. (2018b). *Mockingbird Youth Programs Logic Model.* Seattle, WA:

Author.

The Mockingbird Society. (n.d.). *Mockingbird Youth Programs: Q4 Report Final*. Seattle, WA:

Author.

Thomas, T.R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation

data. *American Journal of Evaluation, 27*(2), 237-246.

Tuckman, B., & Jensen, M. (1977). Stages of small group development revisited. *Group and Organizational Studies,* 2, 419-427.

Wood, J.M., & Wattus, G. (1987). The attitudes of professionals towards job sharing. *Australian Journal of Management,* 12, 103-122.

Woodhouse, G., Johnson-De Wit, K., & Finn, T. (2013). To investigate the concerns and benefits of job sharing a community based Clinical Nurse Consultant role. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing,* 30(3), 33-40.

Woodland, R.H., & Hutton, M.S. (2012). Evaluating organizational collaborations: Suggested entry points and strategies. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 33(3), 366-383.

Appendix A: The Mockingbird Society Youth Program's Logic Model

INPUTS	PROGRAM GOALS	ACTIVITIES	OUTCOMES

Youth Programs | Chapter Structure
▪ 400+ Foster and homeless youth/alumni participants annually
▪ 7 regional Chapters across WA State
▪ 14 youth Chapter Leaders (2 / Chapter)
Staff
▪ Program Director
▪ Two Managers
▪ Three FTE Engagement Specialists
▪ Two .5 FTE Engagement Specialists
▪ 5 Youth Network Representatives (HQ)
 	
Partners/Advisors/Policymakers
▪ Catholic Family & Child Service – Yakima
▪ Community Youth Services – Olympia
▪ The REACH Center & Pierce County Alliance – Tacoma
▪ Volunteers of America – Spokane
▪ YMCA – Seattle
▪ YouthNet – Everett
▪ New Horizons Ministry- YAEH
▪ Community Stakeholders / Volunteers
▪ State Leadership Council Advisors
▪ Government and Nonprofit Partners
▪ Funders
Resources
▪ 2100 Building – Headquarters Facility
Youth Development Philosophy & Values
▪ Positive Youth Development Model
▪ Youth and Adult Partnership Continuum
▪ Meaningful Youth Voice in Policy Reform
	Connection & Empowerment
	▪ Youth learn *leadership* and *self-advocacy* skills
	▪ Youth feel:
	   ○ *Accepted by their peers and Mockingbird staff*
	   ○ Positively *connected* to the foster care and youth homelessness community
	   ○ E*mpowered* to improve systems that affect them
	Community Education
	▪ Youth learn effective *communication* skills with a focus on *writing* and *public speaking*
	▪ Youth develop more *interest* and *confidence* in *effectively* and *purposefully* sharing their personal story
	▪ Youth help *educate* the public about issues related to foster care and youth homelessness, and *increase public will to act*
	
	Systems Reform
	▪ Youth will learn how Washington state is *governed*
	▪ Provide youth with opportunities to *organize*, develop *relationships with policymakers*, and become *civically engaged*
	▪ Engage youth in *policy development* and *systems advocacy* to bring about lasting improvements to foster care and homeless youth serving systems
		Connection & Empowerment
		▪ Monthly Chapter Meetings
		▪ Monthly Leadership Team Meetings
		▪ Individual Development Activities
		
		Community Education
		▪ The *Mockingbird Times* – 4 issues per year
		▪ Digital Stories & Blogs
		▪ Speakers' Bureau Activities
		▪ Public Speaking Trainings: *Storytelling for Advocacy*
		▪ Community Trainings:
		   ○ *Culture of Foster Care*
		   ○ *Stories of Youth Homelessness*
		   ○ *Custom Trainings*
		
		Systems Reform.
		▪ Systems Reform Trainings: *Legislative Advocacy, Voice Development,* and *The Power of Voting*
		▪ Issue Development → Advocacy Agenda
		▪ Issue research and strategic relationship building meetings
		▪ State Leadership Council
		▪ Youth Leadership Summit
		▪ Youth Advocacy Day
		▪ Direct Advocacy/Testimony
		▪ Participation on Work Groups
		▪ Representation on Coalitions
			Connection & Empowerment
			Youth Benefit:
			▪ Increased Connectedness – youth develop a sense of community and peer connections
			▪ Feeling of Empowerment – awareness of rights, voice, and an ability to create change
			▪ Increased Sense of Normalcy – feelings that participants are not so different than others
			▪ Develop advocacy & leadership skills
			▪ Develop group skills, including problem solving, conflict resolution, facilitation, etc.
			▪ Basic work readiness and job skills
			Community Benefit:
			▪ Youth are seen as leaders and contributors
			▪ High-risk behaviors are reduced
			
			Community Education
			Youth Benefit:
			▪ Youth learn to share their personal stories in a safe and effective manner
			▪ Increase in public speaking, writing, and communications skills
			Community Benefit:
			▪ Improved perceptions of youth who have experienced foster care and homelessness
			▪ Increased awareness of issues and desire to act
			
			Systems Reform
			Youth Benefit:
			▪ Youth understand democratic process and build strategic relationships with decision makers
			▪ Active in policy decisions/development
			▪ Youth are heard and understood
			Community Benefit:
			▪ Policymakers hear directly from systems consumers
			▪ Improved laws and policies, and right-sized budgets, to address systems gaps
			▪ Long-term costs savings for society

Appendix B**:** Interview Script

Opening

Thank you for participating in this discussion today. The Mockingbird Society relies on community collaborations to effectively work in each program region. We would like to know about your understanding of the host agency collaborations. For our purposes, the host agency is the organization that partners with The Mockingbird Society in each of the regions. The information you provide will be used in a larger evaluation of Mockingbird program implementation. Please speak honestly and openly. The session will be recorded so that we can ensure all ideas are captured in the report.

Questions

1. What is your understanding of the Mockingbird and host agency collaboration's purpose?

    Potential Follow-Up – How does the collaboration purpose align with the host agency program mission?

2. Key members of the collaboration include Regional Engagement Coordinators, Program Allies, and Program Managers.

    a. What is your understanding of the role and responsibilities of the Regional Engagement Coordinator?

    b. What is your understanding of the role and responsibilities of the Program Allies?

    c. What is your understanding of the role and responsibilities of the Mockingbird Program Managers?

    d. What is your understanding of the role and responsibilities of the host agency Program Managers?

3. How do these different members work together to engage participants in Mockingbird programming?

4. What benefits and costs does Mockingbird and the host agency accrue because of the collaboration?

5. How are requirements for additional or different resources identified and communicated?

6. What strengths do you see in the current collaboration?

7. What weaknesses do you see in the current collaboration?

8. What benefits and disadvantages do you see in the Regional Engagement Coordinator staffing model utilized in your region?

    Question for Regional Engagement Coordinators Only

    a. *What do you like about the structure of your position?*

    b. *What aspects of the structure of your position do you struggle with?*

9. Are there any other comments or concerns you would like to share about the collaboration relationship?

Closing

Again, thank you for sharing this information. You will be invited to participate in a follow-up focus group about the collaboration characteristics identified in the interviews conducted.

Appendix C: Focus Group Template Script

Opening

Thank you for participating in this discussion today. The Mockingbird Society relies on community collaborations to effectively work in each program region. Each of you participated in an interview concerning the collaboration between The Mockingbird Society and the host agency partners. Today we will discuss the key characteristics that were identified in the initial interviews. The goal for today is to obtain feedback on these characteristics and whether they seem applicable to your situation. The information you provide will be used in a larger evaluation of Mockingbird program implementation. Please speak honestly and openly. The session will be recorded so that we can ensure all ideas are captured in the report.

Introduce characteristic #1

1. How is this characteristic applicable or not applicable to your work with Mockingbird?

2. How does this characteristic impact the collaboration relationship?

3. In what ways does this characteristic affect the ability to engage participants in Mockingbird programming?

Introduce characteristic #2

1. How is this characteristic applicable or not applicable to your work with Mockingbird?

2. How does this characteristic impact the collaboration relationship?

3. In what ways does this characteristic affect the ability to engage participants in Mockingbird programming?

Introduce characteristic #3

1. How is this characteristic applicable or not applicable to your work with Mockingbird?

2. How does this characteristic impact the collaboration relationship?

3. In what ways does this characteristic affect the ability to engage participants in

Mockingbird programming?

Introduce characteristic #4

1. How is this characteristic applicable or not applicable to your work with Mockingbird?

2. How does this characteristic impact the collaboration relationship?

3. In what ways does this characteristic affect the ability to engage participants in

Mockingbird programming?

Introduce characteristic #5

1. How is this characteristic applicable or not applicable to your work with Mockingbird?

2. How does this characteristic impact the collaboration relationship?

3. In what ways does this characteristic affect the ability to engage participants in

Mockingbird programming?

Closing Question

Is there any characteristic that is missing from this list that you believe is critical for the

collaboration relationship?

Closing

Thank you for your time and feedback today. The information gathered today will play a

valuable role in the current evaluation. You will receive a copy of the final evaluation report

once it is completed.