SCAN AND REVIEW OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT MEASUREMENT TOOLS

SCAN AND REVIEW OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT MEASUREMENT TOOLS

Table of Contents

Introduction

In 2012, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) launched its Policy on Youth in Development that strengthens and expands high-quality youth programming by the Agency, as well as calls for increased rigor in the evaluation of such programs (USAID, 2012a). To support better research on youth development, USAID's Education Office asked JBS International, Inc. to scan and review tools designed to measure developmental assets,[1] workforce readiness skills, and life skills – all areas identified as key stepping stones for young people to achieve positive life outcomes (USAID, 2013a; USAID, 2013b; USAID 2013c).

The search included identifying measurement tools through outreach to youth serving organizations and researchers, as well as a scan of organization websites and resource repositories. As a result, the JBS research team examined 47 measurement tools covering multiple concept areas, including: communication, daily living, and work/study skills; home life; self-care; social relationships; housing/money management; career planning; and work life. Assets also measured by the tools included: self-confidence, managing emotions, personal responsibility, respecting self and others, team work, creative thinking, problem solving, decision making, and conflict management. This set of tools was reduced down to a list of 15 based on a number of factors including the tool's relevancy to the main topic areas of interest to USAID (e.g., positive youth development, workforce readiness, conflict mitigation), expected ease of implementation, previous history of use in developing countries, etc.

An expert panel was then brought together to formally review the top 15 tools. They ranked the tools based on a set of questions posed to help think about issues such as validity, reliability, user-friendliness, cost, and availability. After the panel thoroughly discussed their feedback, five top tools were identified for consideration by USAID as possible measurements to be used in their youth programming, assessment, and evaluation activities.

A meeting that included the expert panel and staff from the USAID Office of Education was then held to discuss the top recommended tools, as well as to consider the challenges of measuring youth development outcomes in developing countries. The group deliberated on the pros and cons of USAID making additional investments in existing tools (e.g., reliability and validity testing) and/or developing or adapting components of existing tools to measure an identified set of core developmental assets, workforce readiness skills, and life skills of importance across Agency youth programs. The meeting led to a discussion of possible next steps for USAID as they continue to work toward the goal of improved research and evaluation in youth development. At this point, USAID is meeting internally and with stakeholders to discuss the best steps forward for a new measurement approach.

This briefer summarizes the process of the measurement tool scan and review; offers background and reviewer feedback on the top five tools; discusses challenges facing USAID and others interested in measuring youth development; and presents recommendations for next steps.

Measurement Tool Scan

The collection of measurement tools began with a search of numerous different domestic and international organization's websites and online resource repositories focused on youth development such as the Center for Education Innovations, Forum for Youth Investment, National Institutes of Health (NIH) Toolbox for Assessment of Behavioral and Neurological Function,[2] the Centers' for Disease Control and Prevention Compendium of Youth Assessment Tools, the Harvard Family Research Project

---

[1] A set of skills, experiences, relationships, and behaviors that enable young people to develop into successful and contributing adults ([Search Institute](#), 2013)

2. The NIH Toolbox includes standard sets of instruments to assess cognitive, sensory, motor, and emotional function in U.S. study participants between the ages of 3 and 85. It includes 45 brief, royalty-free measures in English and Spanish that evaluate functions as diverse as language, memory, executive function, vision, smell, pain, strength, movement, and psychological well-being.

Out-of-School Time publications and resources, Brookings' Learning Metrics Task Force, United Way's 'Toolfind' website, and the 'Perform Well' website, which provides a searchable database of survey and assessment tools.

An outreach email was also sent to over 40 organizations either implementing programs or conducting research in youth development in order to gather unpublished tools. The email asked each organization to recommend one or more tools for review, and also asked for background information, including concepts measured, age group targeted, previous uses, cost, etc. (see Appendix 1 for list of organizations and questions). As necessary, follow-up calls were held with organizations to ask questions or gather more in-depth information about any recommended tools.

In total, 47 tools were gathered as a result of the search and classified as either 1) yes, definitely worth consideration for review; 2) maybe worth consideration; 3) interesting, but not worth consideration for this purpose or at this time; or 4) no, not worth consideration (see Table 1) (see Appendix 2 for names of tools reviewed). Factors that affected on a tools classification included:

- Whether the tool measured the concept areas of high interest to USAID;

- The relative ease of implementation and analysis as determined either by the length of the tool or the ability to use a sub-set of the tools items;

- Whether the tool had been used in developing country contexts;

- Whether the tool had been used for youth assessments or evaluations; and

- Whether the tool was recommended specifically by an implementer or researcher.

Table 1: Number of Tools as Classified for Consideration

Classification	Number of Tools
Yes	15
Maybe	8
No, but interesting	14
No	10

The 23 tools classified as either 'yes' or 'maybe' were then shared with USAID for feedback. At that time it was decided to characterize each tool by whether it measured concepts related to three main areas of interest to USAID youth programming: positive youth development, workforce readiness, or conflict mitigation, since a mix of these was desired. Tools were also to be prioritized for review if they had a specific gender focus. As such, a final 15 tools were selected for formal review that covered the mix of topic areas (see Table 2) (see Appendix 3 for tool descriptions).

Table 2: Coverage of Topic Areas by Tools Recommended for Review

Topic Area	Number of Tools[3]
Positive Youth Development[4]	11

---

3. A tool could be characterized as measuring more than one of the three topic areas.

Workforce Readiness	8
Conflict Mitigation	8
Gender-Specific	2

Expert Review and Top 15 Measurement Tools

An expert panel was convened to review the top 15 measurement tools (see Appendix 3 for a list and descriptions of the top 15 tools, and Appendix 4 for list of reviewers). This panel was made up of two academic experts in youth development and two monitoring and evaluation experts who have evaluated USAID and other donor-funded youth development projects on the ground. This combination of reviewers brought diversity of experience that reflected both academic rigor and on-the-ground practical experience.

Reviewers were presented with background information so that they could answer a set of questions posed to help prioritize the tools that would be of highest interest to USAID. In all, reviewers answered a set of 17 questions aimed at evaluating each tool's clarity of purpose, ease of use, reliability, validity, adaptability to different contexts, scalability, effectiveness in rapid assessment situations, etc. (see Appendix 5 for questions). Most of the questions were posed on a 5 point scale, with a few being open-ended. Because the ranking exercise was seen as a first step in the process, no specific criteria were identified for answering the questions posed – reviewers were asked to use their best judgment.

After completing the individual reviews, the panel came together via telephone to discuss their rankings and develop consensus on the top set of tools to recommend to USAID. Rankings from the individual review of each tool were compiled by JBS and presented back for discussion. Initial rankings showed a clustering of seven tools with the highest scores, four in the middle, and four at the bottom. After discussion of each reviewer's feedback, five tools were selected for recommendation. Not all of the tools in the final recommended list were in the top seven from the ranking exercise. Discussion and consensus took precedence over the ranking. Issues such as usefulness to USAID, topics covered by the tools, feasibility of field implementation, etc. influenced the decision-making process. During the conversation, the panel also shared thoughts on the review process and potential issues and challenges USAID and others will face when measuring youth development in USAID-funded countries. Themes from this discussion are shared later in this brief.

Five Tools for Consideration

Among the top 15 measurement tools identified, the panel recommended that USAID consider five as particularly relevant to its programs; summaries of these tools are presented here. Information provided includes the developer of the tool, the number of total items, what topic area of interest it covers, the specific concepts measured, the target age group, any information on the availability of the tool, locations and languages in which it has been used, possible uses identified by the literature or reviewers, and overall reviewer feedback. The tools are listed in the order that they showed up in the ranking exercise.[5] USAID staff has not necessarily given a final endorsement of these tools; indeed, this list is intended to serve as a jumping-off point for further discussion by a broader group of stakeholders.

---

[4] An intentional, pro-social approach that engages youth within their communities, schools, organizations, peer groups, and families in a manner that is productive and constructive; recognizes, utilizes, and enhances youths' strengths; and promotes positive outcomes for young people by providing opportunities, fostering positive relationships, and furnishing the support needed to build on their leadership strengths (Interagency Working Group on Youth Programs, 2013).

[5] Please note, not all of the tools listed here were in the top five from the ranking exercise.

Tool: [Jamaica Youth Survey](#)

Developer: Nancy Guerra, Kirk Williams, Julie Meeks-Gardener, Ian Walker – University of Delaware

Number of Items: 15-107 (can be used as a full scale or in sub-scales)

Topic Areas: Positive youth development and conflict mitigation.

Concepts Measured: Measures youth knowledge, attitudes, behaviors and practices in life skill areas, including: positive sense of self; self-control; moral system of beliefs; pro-social connectedness; and decision making skills.

Targeted Age Group: Youth aged 12-18.

Availability of Tool: Publicly available at no cost.

Locations and Languages: The tool has been used in Jamaica and is available in English.

How to Administer: Self-report questionnaire administered directly to youth – developers recommend it be administered in person by a trained interviewer.

Possible Uses: The tool has been used to evaluate a conflict mitigation program in Jamaica. It can be used as a full instrument or in parts to measure individual constructs. It could be used for assessment or evaluation purposes.

Expert Reviewer Feedback:
Reviewers indicated the following strengths and challenges of the tool:

Strengths	Challenges
• Purpose is clear and understandable	• Unclear whether it might be effective in rapid assessment situations
• Data collection methods are clear and understandable	• Unclear whether it would be easy to translate into different languages
• Evidence that the tool has been tested for reliability and validity	
• Appears to be adaptable to different contexts	
• Can be administered in developing countries	
• Lends itself to scaling with larger samples	

A few illustrative quotes from reviewers on their feedback include:

- "The tool is asking a lot of very sensitive questions - data capture, processing and analysis require highly trained staff."

- "This tool should be used sensitively. In vulnerable youth it would be very important to ensure that the respondent is comfortable and feels secure. In addition, asking about gender violence can also be traumatic for respondents, and care should be taken in all situations."

- "This tool seems well designed for a developing country context and could be delivered through paper questionnaire or through an electronic device, such as an Android phone. Given the sensitivity of questions, I would recommend that the survey be administered in person so that the respondent can be reassured of confidentiality and encouraged to be truthful as often as necessary. The survey should be administered by a same sex enumerator."

Tool: [Flourishing Children Positive Indicators](#)

Developer: Child Trends

Number of Items: 3-74 (can be used as a full set or in sub-sets)

Topic Areas: Positive youth development.

Concepts Measured: Indicators fall within one of 19 concept areas, including:

- Gratitude
- Forgiveness
- Goal orientation
- Hope
- Integrity

- Diligence & reliability
- Spirituality
- Initiative taking
- Thrift
- Positive relationships with parents

- Social competence
- Altruism
- Helping family & friends
- Empathy
- Positive friendships

- Life satisfaction
- Purpose
- Trustworthiness
- Environmental stewardship

Targeted Age Group: Youth 12-17 years old.

Availability of Tool: Publicly available at no cost.

Locations and Languages: Indicators were piloted tested in the U.S. and are available in English.

How to Administer: Self-report questionnaire administered directly to youth, along with another for their parents/caregivers/teachers. They can be done by hand, during an interview, or via a web-based.

Possible Uses: Indicators have been used for both assessment and evaluation purposes.

Expert Reviewer Feedback:
Reviewers indicated the following strengths and challenges of the tool:

Strengths	Challenges
• Purpose is clear and understandable	• Unclear whether it is adaptable to different contexts
• Data collection methods are clear and understandable	• Unclear whether it would be easy to translate into different languages
• Evidence that tool has been tested for validity and reliability (in the U.S.)	• Unclear whether it would be easy to administer in developing countries
• Appears to be useful for rapid assessment situations	
• Lends itself to scaling with larger samples	

A few illustrative quotes from reviewers on their feedback include:

- "As a general comment: the tool seems to have clearly defined sections that can be administered together or separately. Some sections are more applicable to international development work than others."

- "Translating concepts and self-evaluations may be difficult in some cases, but of scales reviewed, this is one of the better situated for that."

- "With adaptation and translation, the tool could be used in developing country contexts, since many of the characteristics measured are universal. Translating into other languages is very possible, but would be resource-intensive."

Tool: Short Measures of the Five C's of Positive Youth Development

Developer: Richard M. Lerner – Institute for Applied Research in Youth Development, Eliot-Pearson Department of Child Development, Tufts University

Number of Items: 17 or 34 (can be used in short form or very short form)

Content Areas: Positive youth development.

Concepts Measured: Levels of positive youth development in the areas of confidence, competence, character, caring, and connection.

Targeted Age Group: Youth aged 10-18.

Availability of Tool: The tool is available for use with permission from Richard Lerner.

Locations and Languages: The tool has been tested in the U.S. and is available in English.

How to Administer: Self-report questionnaire administered directly to youth. For younger adolescents, it is recommended to be administered in person by a trained interviewer.

Possible Uses: The tool has been used for evaluation purposes, but could also be used for assessment.

Expert Reviewer Feedback:

Reviewers indicated the following strengths and challenges of the tool:

Strengths	Challenges
• Data collection methods are clear and understandable	• Purpose of the tool is less clear, due to abstract nature of concepts being measured
• Evidence that tool has been tested for validity and reliability (in the U.S.)	• Unclear whether it is adaptable to different contexts
• Appears to be useful for rapid assessment situations	• Unclear whether it would be easy to translate into different languages
• Lends itself to scaling with larger groups	• Unclear whether it would be easy to administer in developing countries

A few illustrative quotes from reviewers on their feedback include:

- "The validity of the tool seems such that it would be very adaptable. It's worth stating that without testing in all contexts it is impossible to know this, but it does seem likely given the extensive testing that this would be useful."

- "Conceptual translation may be challenge."

- "This tool is quite narrow. It would be useful, but in conjunction with other tools to understand the development of children and adolescents in the context of USAID programs, perhaps relating to other non-cognitive skills or employment or other similar aspects."

- "May not be appropriate for high conflict or high stress/low resource settings."

Tool: Passport to Success (PTS)

Developer: International Youth Foundation (IYF)

Number of Items: 54

Content Areas: Work readiness and conflict mitigation.

Concepts Measured: Measures youth knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors and practices in specified life skill areas, including:

- Cooperation/Team Work
- Communication/Interpers. Skills
- Personal Responsibility
- Self-Confidence

- Respecting Self and Others
- Critical Thinking/Problem Solving
- Conflict Management
- Managing Emotions

- Decision Making
- Interview Skills
- Employment Skills

Targeted Age Group: Youth aged 13-29.

Availability of Tool: Currently, the tool is only available to programs using PTS. The tool is not considered applicable to general life skills programs without the context of the PTS model. However, IYF would be open to sharing with organizations on a requested basis.

Locations and Languages: The tool has been used in 18 countries and is available in 14 languages plus dialects, including Arabic, Bahasa, English, French, Spanish, several Indian languages, Ki-Swahili, Kyrgyz, Mandarin, Urdu, and Uzbek.

How to Administer: Self-report questionnaire administered directly to youth. Trained intake officers or life skills facilitators administer the survey via interview for low literacy youth.

Possible Uses: The tool has been used for evaluation purposes.

Reviewer Feedback:
Reviewers indicated the following strengths of and challenges to using the tool:

Strengths	Challenges
• Purpose is clear and understandable	• Little to no publicly available evidence that it has been tested for validity and reliability
• Data collection methods are clear and understandable	• Unclear whether it would be useful in rapid assessment situations
• Has been adapted to various country contexts, but is specific to one program	• Unclear whether it lends itself to scaling with larger groups
• Has been translated into multiple languages	
• Has been administered in developing countries	

A few illustrative quotes from reviewers on their feedback include:

- "Seems like it focuses a lot on items that might have different meaning and acceptability across cultures--or differ in importance for respondents."

- "This tool may have some difficulty in translating to some contexts where work customs are different, but in general there do not appear to be major challenges for implementation widely."

- "I like the guidelines for the analysis upfront. The interpretation is easy if the tool is used along with the curriculum; if used outside of the curriculum framework it might be much harder to interpret the results."

Tool: Learn, Earn, and Save

Developer: David Chapman & Joan DeJaeghere - University of Minnesota

Number of Items: 45 for youth questionnaire; 26 for youth interview

Topic Areas: Workforce readiness and positive youth development.

Concepts Measured: Youth questionnaire measures financial literacy, entrepreneurship, employment, savings, and life skills. Youth interview measures future aspirations, opportunities for working, saving, and borrowing money, and additional factors that may affect the future.

Targeted Age Group: Youth aged 15-25.

Availability of Tool: Available at no cost, but source acknowledgement required.[6]

Locations and Languages: Tools have been used in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda. They are available in English, Swahili, and to a lesser extent Luganda.

How to Administer: The youth questionnaire is self-report administered directly to youth – read aloud in a group setting. The youth interview is done one-on-one with a trained researcher.

Possible Uses: The tool has been used for evaluation purposes, but could also be used for assessment.

Reviewer Feedback:
Reviewers indicated the following strengths of and challenges to using the tool:

Strengths	Challenges
• Purpose is fairly clear and understandable	• Youth questionnaire has not been tested for reliability
• Data collection methods fairly easy to understand	• Unclear whether it would be effective in rapid assessment situations
• Has been adapted to various countries in Africa	• Unclear whether it lends itself to scaling with larger samples
• Has been translated into a couple of languages	
• Has been administered in developing countries	
• Youth questionnaire and interview have been reviewed for content validity	

A few illustrative quotes from reviewers on their feedback include:

- "These topics are the right ones to be asking about in USAID topics. However, they could and should be strengthened."

- "Some gender questions might be sensitive. IRB review of procedures might be useful."

- "The tool would generally be easy to administer. My only concern would be the availability of skilled qualitative researchers to administer the [youth interview] part."

---

6. Suggested format: Earn, Learn, Save project team (2012). Department of Organizational Policy, Leadership, and Development, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota (project contacts: David Chapman, Joan DeJaeghere, Nancy Pellowski Wiger). Email Joan DeJaeghere deja0003@umn.edu

Measurement Issues and Challenges

In addition to discussing their review of the measurement tools, the expert panel identified a number of issues and challenges faced by USAID and others interested in measuring youth development, including:

1. **The lack of youth development measurement tools applied and tested in international settings.**

Of the 47 tools scanned, only 10 had actually been applied in developing country settings and less than a handful had publicly available reliability and validity testing data. Reviewers discussed that because many internationally applied measurement tools are 'homegrown' or developed for use specifically by organizations implementing programs, they may not have been formally tested or if they were, the results may not be publicly available.

For the five recommended tools, clear testing data is available on three of them. One other has been reviewed for content validity, but not tested for reliability.[7] And information on the fifth tool has not been provided by the developer.[8] The challenge for USAID then in adopting these new tools would be to decide whether and how they would need to be vetted through a formal validation process.

Members of the expert panel suggest being clear about the types of reliability and validity one is interested in by having well-defined reasons for testing the tool. For example, if the idea is to use the tool for assessment purposes only, then it could simply be reviewed by a panel of experts and practitioners for construct validity purposes or even tested using a one-time cross-sectional study design. However, if the intention is to understand whether to the tool has predictive validity (e.g., do the concepts/skills measured predict future outcome attainment), then this type of testing would require more time and effort through a longitudinal design study of say four or five years.

The bottom line is that validity is highly context- and population-specific: what's been found valid in one context (or population) may not be so in another. In addition, testing a tool for reliability often depends greatly on how it is implemented. In order to get similar results each time the tool is administered can be influenced by whether or not the methods of administration were exactly the same on each occasion.

2. **The tension between adapting measurement tools to various cultures, while trying to maintain comparability.**

Most of the tools scanned and reviewed for this study were developed and used only in the U.S. During discussions with the expert panel it was noted that those tools may have items that are difficult to adapt to developing country settings. Some of the items may not translate well culturally in terms of meaning and others could be considered as 'sensitive' topic-wise. Even adapting a tool used in one developing country for use in another is not always easy, as meaning and interpretations differ. Unfortunately, adjusting items on measurement tools to adapt to local country contexts may limit the amount of comparison that can be made in an aggregate data analysis – which would likely be of interest to an organization like USAID.

In a recently published report discussing use of the Developmental Assets Profile (originally developed in the U.S. in English) in four developing countries, the authors say this about tool adaptation:

> "The approved items were sent to the four countries for translation and cultural re-versioning, and some further wording modifications were made to make the items more validly translatable to the indigenous languages (such as using examples that resonated with the local cultural

---

[7] This is the Learn, Earn, and Save tool.
[8] JBS has requested reliability/validity information or confirmation that no testing was done on Passport to Success tool, but we have not received a reply yet.

context, or phrasing that captured local idiomatic usage more accurately) or to conform to cultural norms around acceptable or appropriate content (for example, questions about sexual behavior ended up not being able to be asked in any of the four countries) (USAID, 2012b, p. 25).

In this scenario, the researchers did their best to adapt items to meet cultural context, which may have in fact made interpretation at an aggregate level more difficult. In addition, they had to completely eliminate items about sexual behavior because of the sensitivity of the topic in at least one of the countries. It is not clear from the report whether these questions could have potentially been asked in any of the other countries being studied.

3. **The fact that most youth development measurement tools rely only on youth self-report.**

While a couple of the measurement tools scanned for this study had separate instruments for parents/caregivers or teachers/staff to also provide their observations, the majority of the questionnaires relied only on youth to report their perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors. In an article discussing youth self-report of health risk behaviors in the U.S., the authors state that the accuracy of this data is compromised because of difficulty in recalling specific behaviors and the likelihood that youth may not report negatively viewed perceptions or behaviors (Brener, Billy, & Grady, 2003). They go on to say that while youth self-report data are *not always inaccurate*, researchers should still find various ways to triangulate or verify data if possible.

The expert reviewers noted that, in addition to gathering data from parents, caregivers, or teachers, one way to triangulate information is to collect both quantitative data (via implementation of the selected measurement tool) and qualitative data (normally collected via interview or focus group) from youth. Comparing perceptions from both methods will help get a more accurate picture of reality. Likewise, depending on what concepts/skills are being measured, researcher observation or other objective measures can be used (e.g., documentation such as a paycheck or test report). Newer techniques with youth include using interactive games that document young people's reactions and behaviors in response to prompts.

4. **The difficulty of measuring economic outcomes for youth in developing countries.**

During the meeting of the expert panel, two reviewers specifically discussed the difficulties in measuring economic outcomes for youth. One reviewer stated that from their experience, "even when asked, youth do not always know how much they make or if they make more now than they did before." Another reviewer also said that, "youth also don't consistently understand the concept of 'quality' of employment" or the notion of a job that has benefits, support, and training. This is why some researchers are now more interested in measuring consumption than economic outcomes. In fact in one recent study, Blattman and Annan (2011) states, "Income is volatile, and can be a noisy and unreliable measure of poverty. A person's "consumption"—all the goods they use and own and consume—is typically considered a better measure of poverty than income, since it is more stable."

Considerations for Future Work

The expert review panel noted some recommendations for USAID to consider as they move forward in thinking about measuring youth development outcomes. First, members of the panel suggested that USAID identify a set of key developmental assets, workforce readiness skills, and life skills that the Agency would like to impact through their youth programs and create a tool or system that specifically measures these skills. One reviewer said it this way, "Any intervention needs to identify its objectives and intended outcomes first, then select or develop a measurement tool that is tailored to measuring its theory of change."

Reviewers agreed that while USAID may want to maintain some flexibility across programs in terms of expected outcomes (and therefore measurement), it would be beneficial to identify six or seven main developmental assets, workforce readiness skills, and life skills that they want all funded youth programs to influence. Some of the challenges of developing a system of measurement around specific assets and skills for USAID-funded youth programs include:

1. The need to come to consensus on the most important assets and skills for a variety of programs that can include multiple and differing intervention components;

2. The fact that youth assets and skills can be defined and prioritized differently in varying contexts; and

3. The need to verify that any instruments developed or adapted can be considered valid and reliable.

To address these issues, collaboration with other donors and organizations focused on measuring youth development is recommended, as a similar exercise is currently being undertaken by the World Bank and others focused on life skills measurement (USAID, 2013a), as well as the Education Testing Service (ETS), among others.

Once a set of skills is decided upon, one tool or a set of tools could then be developed specifically for USAID or existing tools (such as the top five recommended here) could be adapted to meet the need. One suggestion is to identify the specific constructs or skills measured by the recommended tools and develop a 'toolbox' of measures or questionnaire items which could be used by program staff and/or researchers. At some point it would also be helpful to include a decision tree function whereby users of the toolbox could input information like age of youth being served, location, languages, and expected skills or outcomes in order to get a listing of tools or items that might be appropriate for use.

Conclusions

In its recent *State of the Field Report: Holistic, Cross-sectoral Youth Development*, USAID acknowledged that having a clear set of useful measures that can be used in developing country contexts is needed to move the research forward in this area (USAID, 2013a). While there are certainly issues and challenges to be thought through with regards to measurement, there are also clearly a number of strong tools available which measure concepts of interest to USAID that could be considered for use or adaptation in its assessment and evaluation work. Not all of the tools recommended for consideration in this report have been used in developing country contexts, but those that have not do seem promising.

USAID will have to decide whether its takes the recommendations of the expert panel in identifying a set of important developmental assets, workforce readiness skills, and life skills for youth as a goal and measurement focus. The Agency will also need to consider how approved or vetted measurement tools and items are made available to staff and researchers – possibly through a 'toolbox' approach. Whatever the next steps are, they should be taken with careful thought and planning in coordination with other stakeholders.

Continued work in this area would benefit from collaboration with implementers and researchers, since both types of organizations are developing and using measurement tools on youth development. It would also be worthwhile to work closely with other donors on this topic to prevent duplication of efforts and encourage consistency. Because of its continued work on issues of importance to youth, USAID has the opportunity to take a leadership role in moving the field forward to fill in the gaps on measuring youth development outcomes.

References

Blattman, C. & Annan, J. (2011c). Reintegrating and employing high risk youth in Liberia: Lessons from a randomized evaluation of a Landmine Action an agricultural training program ex-combatants. New Haven, CT: Innovations for Poverty Action.

Brener, N., Billy, J., & Grady, W. (2003). Assessment of factors affecting the validity of self-reported health-risk behavior among adolescents: Evidence from the scientific literature. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 33, 436-457.

Interagency Working Group on Youth Programs (IWGYP). (2013). Positive youth development. Retrieved from: http://www.findyouthinfo.gov/youth-topics/positive-youth-development

Search Institute. (2013). Developmental assets. Retrieved from: http://www.search-institute.org/research/developmental-assets

USAID (2012a). Youth in development: Realizing the demographic opportunity. Washington, D.C.: USAID.

USAID (2012b). Do developmental assets make a difference in majority-world contexts? A preliminary study of the relationships between developmental assets and selected international development priorities. Washington, D.C.: USAID.

USAID. (2013a). State of the field report: Holistic, cross-sectoral youth development. Prepared by Aguirre Division, JBS International, Inc. Washington, D.C.: USAID.

USAID. (2013b). State of the field report: Examining the evidence in youth education in crisis and conflict. Prepared by Aguirre Division, JBS International, Inc. Washington, D.C.: USAID.

USAID. (2013c). State of the field report: Examining the evidence in youth workforce development. Prepared by Aguirre Division, JBS International Inc. Washington, D.C.: USAID.

Appendix 1:

List of Organizations for Outreach

Brandeis University
Carana
Catholic Relief Services
Center for Universal Education at Brookings
Child Trends
Claremont Graduate University
Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of American
Cornell University
Creative Associates
Education Development Center
International Rescue Committee
IREX
International Youth Foundation
Innovations in Civic Participation
Making Cents
ManPower
Mercy Corps
Michigan State University
MIT/JPAL
Oregon State, Youth Focused Evaluation TIG
Plan USA
Population Council
Results for Development
Save the Children
Search Institute
Social Impact
Thrive Foundation
Tufts University
University of Delaware
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of North Carolina
University of Pittsburgh
University of Virginia
University of Wisconsin
Winrock
World Bank
World Vision
Youth Development Strategies
YMCA, Silicon Valley
YouthBuild

Outreach Questions

1. Have you or your organization ever used a tool to measure youth developmental assets (e.g., self-esteem, family support, adult role models), life skills, or workforce readiness "soft skills"?

   o Yes

   o No

   o Not sure

2. What is the name of the tool?

3. Who developed the tool (name of institution and individuals if possible)?

4. Why did you choose this particular tool?

5. How did you find the tool (e.g., did someone recommend it, did you find it online, did you develop it)?

6. Can you tell us if the tool is:

   o Available to the public for free

   o Available to the public at a cost

   o Not available to the public

   o Not sure

   o Other (please specify): _____

7. Can you tell us if the tool is available:

   o Online only

   o Online and hard copy

   o Hard copy only

   o Not sure

   o Other (please specify): _____

8. If you can, please share a website address where information on the tool can be found:

   _____

9. If you can, please list the languages in which the tool is available:

   _____

10. How have you used the tool (check all that apply)?

    o In a needs assessment

    o As part of an evaluation/research study

    o Other (please specify): _____

11. Did you make any adaptations to the tool before you used it? If yes, please describe.

    o The tool was developed specifically for me

- o No
- o Yes: _____

12. In what countries and settings (e.g., domestic/international, rural/urban, peaceful/conflict/post-conflict) have you used the tool?

13. What what age youth did you implement the tool?

14. Do you feel the tool accurately measured what you wanted it to measure?

15. What were the main challenges in implementing the tool (if any)?

16. How easy was it to analyze the data being collected by the tool?

- o Extremely easy
- o Easy
- o Difficult
- o Extremely difficult

Comments: _____

17. How user-friendly did you find the tool?

- o Extremely user-friendly
- o User-friendly
- o Somewhat user-friendly
- o Not at all user-friendly

Comments: _____

Appendix 2: List of all Tools Reviewed

Adolescent-Coping Orientation for Problem Experiences (A-COPE) by Joan Patterson & Hamilton McCubbin, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Adolescent Self-Regulatory Inventory by Kristin Moilanen from West Virginia University

Advancing Youth Livelihoods by Educational Development Center

Arizona Self Sufficiency Matrix by ABT Associates

Assessment & Teaching of 21st Century Skills by the University of Melbourne

Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale by Michael Epstein at University of Nebraska

Casey Life Skills Assessment by the Casey Foundation (formerly the Ansell-Casey Life Skills Assessment)

Child Traumatic Stress Questionnaire by Kenardy, Spence, and Macleod

Communities that Care Youth Survey by Pearson

Coping Responses Inventory – Youth by Rudolph Moos

Defining Minimum Life skills Standards for International Youth Foundation Programs by International Youth Foundation

Developmental Assets Profile by Search Institute

Early Childhood Home Inventory by Bettye Caldwell and Robert Bradley

Education Longitudinal Study Student Questionnaire by U.S. Department of Labor

Evolving Men: Initial Results from the International Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES)

Family Relationships Scale by Patrick Tolan

Flourishing Children Positive Indicators Development Project by Child Trends

Girls for a Change Toolkit by EMpower

Index of Self-Esteem by Walter Hudson

Individual Protective Factors Index by J. Fred Springer and Joel Phillips at EMT Associates

Jamaica Youth Survey by Nancy Guerra, Kirk Williams, Julie Meeks-Gardener, Ian Walker from University of Delaware

Job Performance Personality Inventory by ManPower

Learn, Earn and Save Project by University of Minnesota for MasterCard Foundation

Lebanon Hope tool by the International Youth Foundation and the World Bank

Michigan Adolescent and Adult Life Transitions Survey by University of Michigan

Monitoring and Evaluation of Life Skills for Youth Development Toolkit by Jacobs Foundation

Most Significant Change Technique by Rick Davies and Jess Dart

National Longitudinal Survey on Adolescent Health by University of North Carolina

New Basic Skills Rubric by Citizen Schools

Orphans and Vulnerable Children Well-being Tool by Catholic Relief Services

Passport To Success by International Youth Foundation

Positive Youth Development Inventory by Oregon State University

Pre, Post, Follow-up Camper Surveys by the American Camping Association

Profiles of Student Life Attitudes and Behaviors Survey by Search Institute

Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies by Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale by Manny Rosenberg

Safe and Smart Savings Products for Adolescent Girls in Kenya and Uganda, Baseline and Endline surveys by Population Council

Short Measures of Positive Youth Development by Tufts University

Social Skills Improvement System by Frank Gresham and Stephen Elliott (sold by Pearson)

Step-it-up-2- Thrive by Thrive Foundation

Student Leadership Practices Inventory by Jossey-Bass

Support Functions Scale by Carol Trivette & Carl Dunst

The Afterschool Program Assessment System by The National Institute on Out-of-School Time

The Youth Connections Scale by University of Minnesota

Work Readiness by Educational Development Center

Young Men's Initiative (YMI) Participant Survey by International Center for Research on Women

2013 Youth Risk Behavior Study by the Center for Disease Control

Appendix 3: Top 15 Tool Descriptions

NAME OF TOOL/ DEVELOPER	RECOMMENDED BY	WHAT THE TOOL MEASURES	# OF ITEMS	Foundational Youth Dev.	Work Read-iness	Conflict Mitigation
1. Adolescent Self-Regulatory Inventory by Moilanen (West Virginia University)	JBS	Self-reported questionnaires focused on self-regulation, parenting behaviors, and psychological adjustment	36	x		x
2. Advancing Youth Livelihoods by EDC	EDC	Work, finances, self-confidence, communication skills Youth livelihoods for out-of-school youth	44		x	
3. Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale by Epstein (University of Nebraska)	JBS	Strengths and competencies in: Interpersonal strength, family involvement, intrapersonal strength, school functioning, affective strength	52	x		x
4. Casey Life Skills Assessment by Casey Family Services	JBS	Communication, daily living, work/study skills, home life, self-care, social relationships, housing/money management, career planning, work life	20-121	x	x	
5. Developmental Assets Profile by Search Institute	Gene Roehlkepartain	40 developmental assets based on 8 categories: support, empowerment, boundaries/expectations, constructive use of time, commitment to learning, positive values, social competencies, positive identity	64	x	x	x
6. Flourishing Children Positive Indicators Development Project by Child Trends	JBS	Personal flourishing in: school/work, relationships, relationship skills, helping others	1-15	x		
7. Lebanon Hope Tool by IYF and the World Bank (incorporates the Hope Scale)	IYF	Education and employment status levels of satisfaction with the services intended to prepare you for success in school, the workplace, and the community	100	x	x	
8. Jamaica Youth Survey by Guerra, Williams, Meeks-Gardener, & Walker (University of Delaware)	Nancy Guerra	Positive sense of self, self-control, decision-making skills, moral system of belief, prosocial connectedness.	107	x		x

9. Job Performance Personality Inventory by ManPower	ManPower	Personality and soft-skill competencies that include adaptability, problem solving, stress tolerance, communication skills, cooperation	350 (14 items per 25 independent scales)		x	x
10. Safe and Smart Savings Products for Adolescent Girls in Kenya and Uganda, Baseline and Endline surveys* by Population Council	Population Council	Girls' education, home life, financial situation, work and savings activities, financial goals, perceptions of neighborhood (safety, friendship, trust), self-esteem, community and parental support, perspectives on gender roles, work and money issues, reproductive/sexual health issues, future planning and life goals.	2404	x		x
11. Learn, Earn and Save Project by University of Minnesota for MasterCard Foundation	David Chapman	Measures impact of entrepreneurship training through finances, employment, savings, life savings	26-45	x	x	
12. Passport To Success by International Youth Foundation	IYF	Changes in life skills: self-confidence, managing emotions, personal responsibility, respecting self and others, cooperation/Team work, communication/ Interpersonal skills, creative thinking, critical thinking/ problem solving, decision making, conflict management	54		x	x
13. Short Measures of Positive Youth Development by Tufts University	Richard Lerner	Measures changes in levels of PYD: confidence, competence; character; caring; connection	17-34	x		
14. Work Readiness Tool by EDC	EDC	Thinking skills and strategies, collaboration skills, interpersonal communication skills, work habits and conduct	18		x	
15. Young Men's Initiative (YMI) Participant Survey* by ICRW	ICRW	Health and well-being, issues in society, health, peer and social network, relationships	60	x		x
			Total	11	8	8

*These two tools were developed specifically for use with female or male populations.

Appendix 4:

<u>List of Reviewers</u>

Philip Blue, Independent Consultant

Dr. Nancy Guerra, Institute for Global Studies, University of Delaware

Dr. Patrick Tolan, University of Virginia Center to Promote Effective Youth Development

Dr. Elena Vinogradova, Research Scientist, Education Development Center

Appendix 5: Review Matrix

QUESTION	RATING					RATIONALE
Is the purpose of the tool clear and understandable to all potential users?	0: Unknown or not enough information to offer rating	1: Difficult for user to understand	2: Somewhat difficult for user to understand	3: Understandable to most users (especially experienced researchers/adults)	4: Very clear, regardless of user	
Are the data collection methods clear and understandable to all potential users?	0: Unknown or not enough information to offer rating	1: Difficult for user to understand	2: Somewhat difficult for user to understand	3: Understandable to most users (especially experienced researchers/adults)	4: Very clear, regardless of user	
How strong is the evidence that the tool has been tested for validity and reliability?	0: Unknown or not enough information to offer rating	1: There is no validity or reliability information on the tool	2: Minimal evidence of validity and reliability testing	3: Some evidence of validity and reliability testing with limited reporting of information	4: Validity & reliability have been tested and formally reported	
Does the tool appear to be reliable (can measure scores be reproduced in repeated administrations)?	0: Unknown or not enough information to offer rating	1: Evidence/appearance of reliability not positive	2: Evidence/appearance of reliability somewhat positive	3: Evidence/appearance of reliability is positive	4: Evidence/appearance of reliability is excellent	
Does the tool appear to be valid (measure the concepts it intends to measure)?	0: Unknown or not enough information to offer rating	1: Evidence/appearance of validity not positive	2: Evidence/appearance of validity somewhat positive	3: Evidence/appearance of validity is positive	4: Evidence/appearance of validity is excellent	
How effective would the tool be in rapid assessment situations?	0: Unknown or not enough information to offer rating	1: Tool not likely to be effective	2: Tool has potential to be effective, with some challenges	3: Tool likely to be effective	4: Tool definitely effective	
How adaptable is the tool to different contexts (countries, populations)?	0: Unknown or not enough information to offer rating	1: Tool is not easily adaptable to different contexts	2: Tool has potential to be adapted, with some challenges	3: Tool is likely to be adaptable	4: Tool definitely adaptable	
How easy would it be to translate the tool into other languages?	0: Unknown or not enough information to offer rating	1: Tool would be difficult to translate	2: Tool has potential to be translated, with some challenges	3: Tool should be easy to translate	4: Tool has been translated	
Does the tool lend itself to scaling (e.g., can be used for small and large samples)?	0: Unknown or not enough information to offer rating	1: Tool best for only smaller samples	2: Tool has potential to be scaled from smaller to larger samples, with some challenges	3: Tool should be easy to scale	4: Tool has been used with small and large samples	

How easy would it be to administer the tool in developing country contexts (e.g., would it require an interviewer administration, self-completion, etc.)	0: Unknown or not enough information to offer rating	1: Tool would be difficult to administer	2: Tool could be administered, but likely with some challenges	3: Tool should be easy to administer	4: Tool has been administered in developing country contexts with little to no challenges	
How easy would it be to analyze and interpret the data from this tool?	0: Unknown or not enough information to offer rating	1: Tool would be difficult to analyze and interpret	2: Tool could be analyzed and interpreted, but likely with some challenges	3: Tool should be easy to analyze and interpret for most users (especially experience researchers)	4: Tool is easy to analyze and interpret by any user	
Is the data collected by this tool relevant to USAID funded youth development programs?	0: Unknown or not enough information to offer rating	1: Tool not particularly relevant	2: Tool somewhat relevant, for some programs	3: Tool expected to be relevant for most programs	4: Tool is highly relevant for most programs	
Do you think that the cost and time commitment required to implement the tool is realistic for USAID?	0: Unknown or not enough information to offer rating	1: Cost and time commitment is unrealistic	2: Cost and time commitment is somewhat realistic, with reservations	3: Cost and time commitment is anticipated to be realistic	4: Cost and time commitment is most definitely realistic	
OPEN QUESTIONS	**COMMENTS**					
Do you think the data collected by the tool can be used for performance and impact evaluations?						
How could potential limitations of the tool's design affect implementation in different environments (related to crisis/conflict status, level of poverty, strength of traditional gender norms)?						
What kind of data analysis is possible, given the data available after administering the tool?						