

146467

**CENTER FOR YOUTH DEVELOPMENT AND POLICY RESEARCH**  
Academy for Educational Development  
1255 23rd Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
(202) 862-8820

**TOWARDS A COMMUNITY-WIDE SYSTEM OF DELIVERING CORE TRAINING  
TO YOUTH WORKERS:  
LESSONS LEARNED FROM TRAINING ORGANIZATIONS**

146467

**U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/OJP/OJJDP

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

Shepherd Zeldin  
Director of Research

Suzanne Tarlov  
Program Officer

June 1993

This project is supported by Cooperative Agreement No. 92-MU-CX-K002 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

#### The Center for Youth Development and Policy Research

In 1990, the Academy for Educational Development established the **Center for Youth Development and Policy Research** in response to a compelling need to define and promote national and community strategies for positive youth development. The chief goal of the Center is to create and advance a vision of youth development that specifies not only outcomes but strategies as well. Karen Pittman, formerly with the Children's Defense Fund, is the Center's founding director and a Senior Vice President of the Academy.

The Center seeks to direct growing concern about youth problems into a public and private commitment to youth development. Our work is characterized by distinctive activities and services which include: conducting and synthesizing youth research and policy analyses; distributing information about exemplary youth programs and policies; initiating and strengthening discussion and coalition-building among those committed to the well-being and development of youth; and providing technical assistance to organizations, governments and institutions wishing to improve their youth development efforts.

We have also undertaken a major, five-year, public education initiative. Supported by core funding from the Ford Foundation and the Lilly Endowment, **Mobilization for Youth Development** is aimed at increasing America's understanding of and investment in establishing a cohesive infrastructure of community supports for youth. The effort is intentionally complex, encouraging dialogue and debate among youth organizations and communities and planning and testing strategies to address service gaps.

The Academy for Educational Development is an independent, non-profit organization dedicated to addressing human development needs throughout the world. Since its founding in 1961, AED has conducted projects throughout the United States and in more than 100 countries in the developing world.

**CENTER FOR YOUTH DEVELOPMENT AND POLICY RESEARCH**

Academy for Educational Development

1255 23rd Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20037

(202) 862-8820

**TOWARDS A COMMUNITY-WIDE SYSTEM OF DELIVERING CORE TRAINING  
TO YOUTH WORKERS:  
LESSONS LEARNED FROM TRAINING ORGANIZATIONS**

Shepherd Zeldin  
Director of Research

Suzanne Tarlov  
Program Officer

June 1993

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many individuals and organizations have made important contributions to this report and accompanying directory. Foremost, this study was made possible by funding from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and by the thoughtful direction and guidance provided by Emily Martin and Lois Brown in that office.

We would like to acknowledge the significant contributions made by Geeta S. Tate, CYD Program Associate, both in her perseverance in conducting nearly 100 interviews, and her diligence and patience in developing the directory.

This project builds on work begun by Bill Treanor, Executive Director of the American Youth Work Center for the Center for Youth Development in 1991. Bill provided a foundation for this project through his identification of key trainers in the field, and through his nominations of organizations making significant contributions to staff development of youth workers. Bill's knowledge of the issues and willingness to share information made our work that much easier.

We want to thank the many people associated with community justice centers, regional affiliates of the National Network of Runaway and Youth Services, and the University of Northern Iowa who provided nominations and recommendations on the many organizations that provide youth worker training to be included in this study.

Finally, we are grateful to the many trainers around the country who participated in the interviews for this project, and who provided a context in which to understand training systems and the needs of youth workers.

Shepherd Zeldin, Director of Research  
Suzanne Tarlov, Program Officer  
Center for Youth Development and Policy Research  
Academy for Educational Development  
1255 23rd Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C 20037  
(202) 862-8820

## INTRODUCTION

In September 1992, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) contracted with the Center for Youth Development and Policy Research (CYD) and CYD's subcontractor, The National Network of Runaway and Youth Services, Inc. (NNRYS) to conduct a project entitled "Professional Development for Youth Workers." The ultimate goal of this project is to assist OJJDP in developing and implementing community-wide systems of training to youth workers on a national basis. Clearly, much background and development work must be completed to attain this ambitious and important goal. This report summarizes activities and findings of the first step in the process.

Over a three-year period, CYD and NNRYS have been charged with designing, piloting, and evaluating a community-wide system of training that effectively delivers a "core" set of knowledge and skills to those who work with "high risk" youth -- that is, youth who are at risk for sustained involvement with the criminal justice system and youth who reside in disadvantaged family or community environments<sup>1</sup>. This training system, as envisioned by OJJDP, must be appropriate for all service providers who work with such youth, independent of the specific program or setting where the providers work.

CYD and NNRYS are particularly pleased to have been selected to conduct this project because we share with OJJDP a common set of assumptions that undergird the project:

- 1) Issues of youth delinquency and violence are not the sole domain of the juvenile justice and correctional system. Preventing delinquency will require leadership from OJJDP, but an effective response necessitates coordination and the active involvement of all youth-serving organizations, public and private.
- 2) Strengthening the professional development and training opportunities of youth workers is an essential strategy for preventing delinquency. Community-wide

---

<sup>1</sup> Youth come under the "high risk" definition if they have not reached the age of 21 years and have one or more of the factors listed: 1) identified child of a substance abuser; 2) a victim of physical, sexual, or psychological abuse; 3) dropped out of school; 4) become pregnant; 5) economically disadvantaged; 6) committed a violent or delinquent act; 7) experienced mental health problems; 8) attempted suicide; 9) disabled by injuries; 10) runaways; 11) homeless; 12) throwaways; 13) street youth; and 14) youth who are or have been taken into custody by the state.

systems of training provide a potent vehicle not only for strengthening the abilities of youth workers, but also for sparking organizational collaborations.

- 3) One of the most powerful local strategies to prevent delinquency is to engage young people and to provide them with opportunities to gain the skills necessary for adulthood. This "youth development" perspective, one that guides youth workers towards successfully meeting the psychosocial needs of youth and helping them build a full range of competencies, is the engine that should drive the creation of training programs and delivery systems.

Building on these assertions, each year of the project has specific purposes and activities. Year 1 of the project is focused on information collection and synthesis. CYD and NNRYS have been collecting and analyzing information from trainers, youth workers, project advisors, and the research literature<sup>2</sup>. These efforts are oriented directly towards informing OJJDP and project staff as we seek to make specific recommendations and plans for the subsequent years of the project. Year 2 is focused on development and planning. Specifically, we will develop and test a core "youth development" training module that will be applicable to a broad spectrum of youth workers and will begin to set the stage for implementation, selecting pilot sites and seeking key endorsements. In Year 3, we will pilot and evaluate both the training module and the delivery system. Our final report will focus on strategies for institutionalizing the proven products and strategies that emerge from the project.

### **This Report**

The present report is the first of three that will emerge from the Year 1 research. It presents initial findings from interviews with over 95 training organizations that specialize in delivering training to youth workers (not included in the 95 are government agencies or national organizations that offer training to their affiliate members). The interviews were conducted for two reasons:

- To compile an overview of trainers. First, we present an overview of these

---

<sup>2</sup> During this year, we have 1) conducted over 95 interviews with training organizations, 2) conducted ten focus groups with youth workers (N=70) and personal interviews with over 130 youth workers, 3) convened a group of project advisors with a broad range of individual and collective expertise on project issues, and 4) reviewed written information on "best practice" in training.

organizations, how they operate, who they serve, what they offer, and what they perceive as the training needs of youth workers. Interview responses are not fully reflected in the directory for reasons of confidentiality, but are analyzed in this report. Again, it is hoped that this report is useful to those conducting training and using training organizations. It is enormously useful to us because it sheds light on some of the issues that will have to be addressed when developing a community-wide training system.

- To collect concrete information for a directory. Second, we present a directory of training organizations that specialize in delivering service to youth workers. We hope it is a useful resource for the field, and in addition, the information collected will be used to have a ready document to draw upon as we begin planning and module development in Years 2 and 3.

The descriptive data in this report will provide a context for the second project report, "The Professional Needs of Youth Workers: Lessons Learned from Focus Groups and Personal Interviews." Finally, all of this information, plus that derived from a literature review of "best practice" in training, will form the basis for the third project report, "Recommendations for Developing a Community-Wide System for Delivering Core Training to Youth Workers."

## OVERVIEW OF TRAINING ORGANIZATIONS

Between November 1992 and May 1993, CYD staff solicited nominations of organizations that provide training to youth serving organizations. The purpose was to be neither exhaustive, nor representative. In selecting the organizations to be interviewed as part of this project, we sought to gain as broad a range of organizations as possible in terms of their "specialties." For example, we contacted community justice centers in various states to solicit nominations of training organizations that provided service to justice-related programs. From the regional affiliates of NNRYS, nominations focused on training organizations that were experienced in working with shelters, child welfare, and other programs oriented towards "high risk" youth. From the University of Northern Iowa and the American Youth Work Center, nominations focused on training organizations equipped to work with staff from a range of community-based youth programs.

When soliciting nominations, project staff set few parameters. Our basic question was, "What are the three or four training organizations with whom you are familiar that provide excellent services and are able to serve staff from a variety of youth programs?" Ultimately, 100 organizations were selected, and 95 participated by agreeing to be interviewed by project staff. It is evident, therefore, that this is not a "statistically representative" sample (as the universe of training organizations is unknown, a representative sample is impossible to acquire). However, as seen below, there is much diversity among the training organizations, and hence, the sample is more than adequate for beginning to understand the orientations and services of training organizations, and the opinions of trainers.

### Who Are They?

A wide variety of organizations engage in training for youth workers. In this survey, 63 percent of the organizations are private non-profit organizations, 25 percent are public organizations, and 11 percent are private for-profit organizations. The private non-profits include a range of organizations. While most are "independent," over fifteen of them reported



being affiliated with larger organizational entities: religious organizations, national youth-serving organizations, and quasi-governmental training organizations.

The fact that training is not always the sole focus of an organization was reflected clearly in the data. When asked, 52 percent of the trainers reported that training was the primary service that they provided. Yet, it should be stressed that "training" was viewed broadly. For example, many of the organizations also provide "consultation" to youth-serving organizations, with the difference being that training was viewed as "time-limited" and consultation was seen as "ongoing."

The remaining trainers (48 percent) reported that training was not the primary service provided by their organization. Some of these organizations, such as the membership entities or associations, provide a range of service to their constituencies, including public education and advocacy. Other organizations, in addition to training, provide specialized products such as newsletters, books, and curriculum. In the latter case, technical assistance is typically offered for using the curriculum. Finally, many of the trainers work for organizations that provide direct services to youth. These staff always provide training to their own organizations, and on occasion, they will work for other youth-serving organizations.

### **How Do They Operate?**

The majority of the organizations also allow their trainers to have a "long reach." A perusal of the training directory, for example, reveals that a substantial number of the organizations have a national constituency. This finding was reinforced when the trainers were asked "where do you most often provide your training?" It quickly became evident that the training organizations provide a range of options in terms of the settings in which training can be delivered. For example, 73 percent of the organizations provide training "off-site," typically at a centralized location, such as a college, community meeting hall, or hotel conference space. These services are most often geared to specific regions and are designed to accommodate the needs of staff from a wide variety of youth-serving organizations. Most (63 percent) of these organizations will also send staff to specific organizations to provide training. Such training reflects the basic orientation and expertise of the training organization, but is tailored to meet the needs and expectations of individual youth-serving organizations. Additionally, 36 percent

of the organizations reported that they offered training within their own facilities. In this case, the training may be generic or tailored to specific programs, but the expressed benefit is that this approach gives youth workers an opportunity to learn in a setting "away" from the daily demands of their jobs.

In sum, when a youth-serving organization forms an agreement with a "training organization," a range of services are often available, or can be made available, to them. These supplemental services can be mobilized to ensure ongoing assistance to the youth-serving organizations, in the forms of membership, consultation, curriculum, and information. Further, the youth-serving organization is offered flexibility in terms of where the training is delivered. In most cases, trainers are able to accommodate the specific "location" needs of the youth organizations.

### **Widely Varied Costs**

For the youth-serving organization, an essential "bottom line" is cost. It is not surprising that all of the diversity highlighted above is reflected in great variations in cost. Such variation is most strongly determined by 1) the type of organization that delivers the training, and its sources of financial support, and 2) the nature of the relationship between the training organization and the youth-serving organization.

The most inexpensive training is provided by organizations that receive federal or state monies. These organizations include university "centers," private businesses, and public/private coalitions that have received support to deliver a certain type of training often targeted to a certain population (e.g., substance abuse training to educators, crisis management to child services workers, diversion strategies to those in the justice system). In related cases, these types of organizations may also be charged with providing training and related services to grantees of federal or foundation grants. When these relationships exist, the training is most often free. If there is a cost, it rarely exceeds \$20.00 per person trained.

Training provided by membership organizations and professional or "field-oriented" associations is more expensive, and rates vary depending on conditions. When the youth-serving organization, for example, buys a specific curriculum or program package, training for those materials is often included in the cost, or provided at a nominal amount. Otherwise, most

associations charge for training when it is not directly related to a curriculum. While some of the cost may be covered through membership fees, many of the organizations in our survey charged between \$40.00 to \$60.00 per person. It should be stressed that for a single youth-serving organization, this fee is still high. Sending ten staff to such a training can easily cost an organization \$500.00. Some professional organizations will provide training to non-members at a cost ranging from a third to a half higher than members.

It is impossible to make generalizations about the cost of training provided by independent organizations that are not supported by public, foundation or membership monies. In general, training is more expensive, but there is wide variation. For example, when such organizations provide an "open" training for persons from a particular region, the cost can be minimal (\$3.00 to \$40.00 per person). When a training organization contracts with a specific youth-serving organization, costs are always open to negotiation, yet tend to be somewhat expensive. When staff come to the training organizations' facility, for example, costs range from \$50.00 to \$150.00 per person for a day of instruction. When the trainers come to an organization, the costs are typically higher. Other training organizations charge by the day, not by the number of participants. In such cases, contracting with a single trainer will range from \$200.00 to \$700.00 a day, but again, there is always negotiation. Typically, training organizations charge substantially higher rates for professional (for profit) organizations than they may ask from consumer (non-profit) organizations. It is important to stress that the above rates do not include travel. Be it trainers coming to an organization, or staff going to a training organization or a conference, it is the youth-serving organization that almost always pays expenses.

In sum, it is apparent that the cost of training depends on a number of conditions. Clearly, youth-serving organizations that are fortunate enough to be part of a membership organization, association, or demonstration project or those that link up with government-supported training organizations can receive training for free or at a reduced cost. (Even in many of these cases, however, training all staff is expensive). "Non-affiliated" youth organizations pay the highest costs, as they must rely on independent trainers. And, as often noted in the literature, many are forced to forego available training opportunities because of cost. Unless the training organization is in the same general locality as the youth organization, or

unless multiple programs "pool" their training funds or engage in "training the trainer programs," it remains difficult for program managers to provide quality training to their staff.

### **Who Do They Train?**

As a part of the interview we asked organizations about the level of staff that are targeted by specifically designed training programs, and which level of staff was most likely to attend their training. "Levels" were defined by job description, such as board member, or direct service provider. The same questions were asked regarding professions or fields. Overall, it was clear that the training organizations are driven by the needs and requests of their constituents. While they may "target" certain types of staff or professions, they are responsive in their services and can accommodate anyone that attends their training or requests training. Nonetheless, certain levels of staff and professions seem to gain the most benefit from training offered by these organizations.

As seen in Table 1, training organizations are most likely to develop specific training programs for full-time staff, with some preference given to direct service providers (88 percent) as compared with managers and supervisors. However, direct service providers are much more likely to actually attend training provided by these organizations than any other level of staff. Seventy-one percent of the trainers responded that direct service providers were their primary audience, for example, while only 33 percent reported that their primary audience was administrators. This may reflect the "staff pyramid." Direct service workers would be most likely to attend training simply because there are more of them out there than any other level of staff. Or it may reflect a reluctance on the part of administrators to attend training sessions.

Nonetheless this information is reassuring, since our previous research with national membership youth serving organizations found that they identify training for direct service providers as a key unmet need. Instead executive directors tend to be targeted and most often attend training workshops, seminars, or conferences. The current findings are also reassuring because direct service workers are at a level within the organization where they have the most direct influence over the lives of young people, and therefore benefit greatly from training that can improve their interactions with youth.

**Table 1:  
Types of Staff Targeted and Receiving Training Services**

	Specific Training Offered*	Most Likely To Attend**
Board Members	36%	8%
Administrators	69%	33%
Managers/Supervisors	79%	46%
Direct Service Staff	88%	71%
Volunteer Providers	32%	6%

\* To what level of staff do you offer specific training programs?

\*\* What level of staff is most likely to attend your training?

Few organizations surveyed offer specifically designed training for board members and volunteers. Even fewer report that these groups attend their training. Reasons for this are unclear. Low attendance rates for these groups may reflect a need for specifically designed and marketed training sessions that are applicable to board members and volunteers.

It is more likely that other factors operating within the youth-serving organizations account for these findings. For example, youth serving organizations are operating under scarce resources and board members and volunteers may not be given priority for training. Both are unpaid staff. Board members may be seen as veterans in the field or community leaders who don't need training and service volunteers may lack legitimacy or status within an organization (i.e., they are not worth the investment, particularly for service volunteers who may not stay

with an organization for the training to be cost effective). Finally, being volunteers (both service volunteers and board members), these groups are least likely to be willing to incur the cost of training themselves. There are implications for the lack of attendance by board and service volunteers. Community based organizations operating with limited resources often rely heavily on volunteers. This group has direct and frequent contact with youth and are in a position to greatly influence their lives. While there are barriers, it is nonetheless important that they receive the benefits of training.

In addition, for a community wide training system to be successful and sustained there has to be a degree of buy-in from the community. This will require strong support from board members, who are often formal or informal community leaders. This is true also for the organization administrators. It is somewhat surprising that they are not "targeted" for specific training more than they are. If a community is to engage in a shared training delivery system, and adopt components of a "core" training program, emphasis will also have to be placed on administrators. In sum, it is unclear if these groups will be supportive of a community wide system of training that requires collaboration with other organizations and a certain degree of organizational change in philosophy and management if they do not receive and gain the benefits of training themselves.

Eighty-eight percent of the training organizations reported that they target one or more professions for receipt of their services, a finding that reflects that training is either a "product for sale" or, in other cases, a service offered to designated recipients because of membership or funding requirements.

As seen in Table 2, child care workers (23 percent), juvenile justice workers (20 percent), and educators (20 percent) are most frequently targeted for training services. In part, these data may reflect the sampling strategy used to identify training organizations. Nonetheless, these results also indicate that training organizations target the systems that traditionally have had:

- resources allocated for training (often public dollars)
- regulations and standards for training that are part of licensure requirements, and

- public expectations or mandate for training.

Other youth-serving professions were targeted by less than 15 percent of the training organizations. The reasons are unknown. However, in some cases, it is likely that these professions may be perceived as being different enough to need specialized youth worker training (e.g., health care providers), not requiring specialized training (e.g., recreation workers), not having the funds to afford training (e.g. runaway services providers), or not having sufficient demand for training (e.g., religious workers).

In any case, a broad array of professions or fields, from recreation workers to child welfare workers, attend training offered by these organizations. For example, many of the training organizations have served staff from community youth organizations (84 percent), health care organizations (74 percent), recreation organizations (56 percent), and social workers (3 percent). Thus, it is not just professions that are licensed or that have mandated dollars that are in need of training. While the exact magnitude of their presence is unknown, it is clear that training organizations have a substantial and diverse constituency. Whether "targeted" or not, youth workers from all disciplines do choose to attend "cross-professional" training.

This information has implications for the content of training needed by youth workers. If such a wide variety of professions are being served by these organizations, there may be training that is appropriate and universal for anyone working with youth. That is, there may be core youth worker training that is useful for all individuals who work with youth and that can be applied across fields and professions, populations, and settings.

**Table 2:**  
**Types of Professions Targeted and Receiving Training Services**

	Targeted*	Trained**
Child Care Workers	23%	72%
Child Welfare Workers	16%	68%
Community Youth Organizations	18%	84%
Educators	20%	73%
Health Professionals	5%	74%
Juvenile Justice Workers	22%	85%
Religious Organizations	4%	49%
Social Workers	15%	73%
Mental Health Workers	15%	12%
Law Enforcement/Corrections	18%	12%
Substance Abuse Prevention	11%	4%
Recreation	0%	56%

\* What fields or professions do you target?

\*\* What fields or professions have you trained?

### What Do They Offer?

As part of the interview, we asked trainers if their organization had a specific area of expertise, an area in which they thought they had a high level of skill and reputation. Foremost,



analysis of this question indicated that the organizations felt that they had a breadth of expertise. For example, 29 percent of the organizations listed two or more areas of expertise. An additional 14 percent reported that they did not specialize. Instead, they reported that they were well equipped to serve all youth-serving agencies.

These findings can be interpreted in at least two ways. First, training is a business. It is not always prudent for a training organization to have only one area of expertise. Yet, it is also evident that the trainers keenly recognize that youth workers need a variety of skills to both strengthen their organizations and, concurrently, to effectively serve youth. Put simply, it is not appropriate or financially prudent to focus on one type of population or one type of service. Both youth and services need to be viewed in broader contexts -- family, program, organization, community -- and the responses of the trainers reflect that realization.

For those organizations that did identify areas of expertise, the responses again reflected the full range of needs faced by youth serving organizations and their staff. Importantly, the identified areas of expertise are generally consistent with what the training organizations identify as the priority needs of youth workers:

- Seventeen training organizations (18%) specialize in training youth workers about prevention programs, usually programs that focus on substance abuse and HIV/AIDS, with some attention to violence and abuse. It may be noteworthy that no organizations identified pregnancy prevention.
- Twenty-one organizations (22%) specialize in helping youth workers gain the ability to promote positive competencies among youth. Specifically, twelve organizations reported their expertise to center around youth development and empowerment. Other organizations, often those working with residential programs, reported their expertise to be independent living, transitional living, and life skills training.
- Eighteen training organizations (19%) specialize in organizational development. Responses generally fell equally into two categories. Twelve of the organizations focused on management, administration, and planning, while the others specialized in training on supervision, leadership, and teamwork.
- Reflecting the current awareness regarding the needs of "minority" populations, 15 organizations (16%) reported an expertise in assisting youth workers to address diversity issues. About half of the organizations focused on racial and

ethnic diversity, while the others concentrated on gender diversity and sexual orientation.

- Not surprisingly, 32 organizations (34%) reported an expertise in working with publicly-financed systems: juvenile justice, child welfare, and social services. This emphasis reflects the high risks faced by such youth, the availability of "training dollars" in these systems, as well as the fact that such systems serve a high number of young people.

## PERCEPTIONS OF TRAINING NEEDS

To be successful, a training organization must provide services requested by youth serving organizations. In doing so, training organizations do research. They not only examine the "market," they also independently study what it is that youth workers need in order to effectively do their jobs. Hence, in order to gain insight into the possible foci of a "core" training module for youth workers, we asked the training organizations what they felt were the most pressing needs of youth workers.

Findings fell fairly neatly into five categories, as highlighted below. First, the trainers stressed that youth workers need fundamental information about the emotional and behavioral problems of youth, and about youth development in general. Second, they stressed that youth workers need assistance in translating this information into practical strategies. At the same time, however, the training organizations reported the need to look beyond the youth worker-youth dyad. Many trainers, for example, stressed that youth workers need organizational skills in order to help their organization, as a whole, best serve young people. And finally, others stressed that youth workers need skills to influence family and community systems for the benefit of youth.

Reflecting that many youth are manifesting significant emotional and behavioral problems, 28 trainers (30 percent) stressed that youth workers need the fundamental knowledge and skills to work with these troubled young people. Reported needs that relate to working with troubled youth include:

- Understanding causes of deviant behavior
- Dealing with aggressive behavior
- Crisis management and intervention techniques

At the same time, there was a clear recognition among seventeen of the trainers (18

percent) that a fundamental knowledge of youth development was necessary for all youth workers. This knowledge, it was stated, provided the foundation for effective service, independent of the specific type of program. Reported needs that relate to youth development include:

- Knowledge of the multiple needs of youth
- Knowledge of the stages of adolescent development

Ultimately, the issue for 39 of the training organizations (41 percent) was that youth workers needed not only the theoretical basis, but moreover a practical understanding, of how to apply their knowledge in meeting the needs of young people and help them build necessary skills. Such a perspective was reflected in different ways by the youth-serving organizations. Reported needs that relate to meeting the needs of young people include:

- How to be positive and proactive, rather than reactive
- How to encourage youth participation and empowerment
- How to develop positive relations with youth
- Communication skills and how to effectively relate to youth
- Understanding primary prevention, with the practical knowledge and skill to apply this concept

Twenty-five trainers (26 percent) stressed that in order to be effective, youth workers need the knowledge and skills to work in the larger environments that effect young people, such as families, communities, and public systems. Strengthening such abilities of youth workers was seen as a necessary step to ensuring that all young people had legitimate opportunities, in all aspects of their lives, to meet their psychosocial needs and build competencies necessary for adulthood. Reported needs that relate to the larger environment include:

- Dealing with youth and their families in a community context
- How to be an effective advocate of youth
- How to work against systemic issues existing in communities and public systems

Twenty-one trainers (22 percent) stressed that youth workers required basic and advanced organizational skills in order to help their agencies as a whole, as well as individual workers, adapt to the needs of young people. Organizational skills included program planning, administration, and development, but this was not seen alone as being sufficient. Specifically, it was felt that youth workers needed to learn how to work with colleagues within the organizations and learn to manage their own stress. Cross-cutting all of the above were issues of diversity. Many training organizations stressed that youth workers needed the skills to work effectively with diverse service providers and diverse youth. Reported needs that relate to organizational skills include:

- Program evaluation and administration
- Program planning, development and implementation
- Supervision, leadership and teamwork
- Stress management and personal strengths/limits
- Learning about cultural diversity

## CONCLUSIONS

This is the first of three reports regarding the professional development of youth workers CYD and NNRYS will produce in the first year of this three year project. It highlights findings from a survey of 95 training organizations which, by reputation, offer effective training services to youth workers. It is important to clarify that though the term "training organization" is often used in this report many of the organizations included in this study are divisions of larger organizations whose primary business is something other than training. The attached "Directory of Training Organizations" and the summary provided in this report clearly indicate that there is a range of available training available for youth workers, regardless of their profession or field.

Available data suggests, however, that training is not delivered to all youth workers, and that this variation depends on many factors. Cost is always a barrier to securing the services of a training organization, and it is likely that the "independent" youth programs are less likely to receive training because of cost. However, it should be stressed that training is a significant investment for all organizations, regardless of type. Overall, it appears that the organizations which do receive training are those funded by public monies (or the trainers are funded by public monies), such as is the case in child welfare, juvenile justice and education. If a community-wide delivery system is to be developed, there will need to be explicit strategies to broaden the use of these monies.

Within these parameters, it was reassuring that direct service providers are most likely to receive training that is targeted to their specific needs. At the same time, volunteers, both service volunteers and board members, appear least likely to receive training. This limitation is important. Board members, for example are often formal or informal community leaders. If community-wide training systems are developed, their endorsement will be important, and hence they could benefit from the reflection and skill-building opportunities that training affords. Direct service volunteers are also not typically afforded training. The consequences are evident in that such persons are essential workers in many youth-serving programs.

The opinions and programs of the training organizations provide illumination regarding the "content" options available in creating a core training module for youth workers. There was strong agreement that youth workers needed basic information about youth problems, but also, about how youth develop positive trajectories of growth. Moreover, the trainers stressed that training needed to have explicit practical applications that could be immediately used by youth workers. Finally, the trainers remind us that youth work does not occur in a vacuum. Unless training programs provide youth workers the ability to work effectively within their organizations and communities, their productivity will ultimately be diminished.