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Introduction
The Girl Scout program has delivered high quality experiences for girls locally, nationally, and internationally, for over 90 years. (The Girl Scouts of the United States of America, 1998-2002, Girl Scout Program). The Girl Scout program is girl-driven, reflecting the ever-changing needs and interests of participating girls. It provides girls with a wide variety of opportunities. The program encourages increased skill building and responsibility, and also promotes the development of strong leadership and decision-making skills. Girl Scouts is committed to helping today's girls become tomorrow's leaders.

All program activities are age-appropriate and based on The Four Program Goals, as well as on the Girl Scout Promise and Law (The Girl Scouts of the United States of America, 1998-2002, Girl Scout Program).

The Four Program Goals
• Developing Self-Potential
• Relating to Others
• Developing Values
• Contributing to Society

As the Girl Scout organization has evolved, they have found the need to expand into other areas rather than only program development. In 2000, one of those additions was the Girl Scout Research Institute. It is a center for research and public policy information on the healthy development of girls as they mature toward adulthood (The Girl Scouts of the United States of America, 1998-2002, Girl Scout Research Institute). The center ensures that GSUSA is asking girls the right questions, so that it continues to address their complex and ever-changing needs.

The goals of the Girl Scout Research Institute are to originate new projects and initiatives that bolster the knowledge about girls, as well as to synthesize the research that exists on the healthy development of girls (The Girl Scouts of the United States of America, 1998-2002, Girl Scout Research Institute). These efforts not only support the development of Girl Scout program
but also supply accurate information to educational, not-for-profit, and public policy organizations.

GSUSA has not reached these accomplishments alone. The United Way of America has served as the backbone of many nonprofit organizations’ ability to develop outcomes assessments. The United Way sponsors a web site entitled Outcome Measurement Resource Network (United Way of America, 2002). The Resource Network's purpose is to provide the United Way of America and other organizations outcome measurement resources. As accountability continues to become a greater issue of funders and various stakeholders, measuring outcomes has been the method of choice in addressing it.

**Purpose of Project**


This project will evaluate the Outcomes Measurement Guide for Junior Girl Scout group experiences using *The Program Evaluation Standards* developed by the Joint Committee on Standards of Educational Evaluation (Sanders, 1994). The critique of the guide will completed using the recommendations outlined in *The Program Evaluation Standards* (Sanders, 1994).
One of the recommendations was to label each standard as “addressed,” “partially addressed”, “not addressed,” and “not applicable.”

A couple issues need to be addressed before the evaluation of the guide can be conducted. First, since this guide was developed on the national level to be used at various levels within the organization, it is important that all standards be addressed within the publication because of the inexperience of the individuals who may be organizing and managing the individual assessments. Guidance should be provided throughout the entire process: from identifying the purpose for measuring the outcomes to evaluating the evaluation process. Therefore, for this evaluation the “not applicable” designation will not be used. Secondly, the Outcomes Measurement guide is a user’s guide to conducting such an evaluation. Therefore, it will be evaluated as such.

There will be a four step process in conducting this evaluation. First, a list of definitions is developed to address some of the terminology that is utilized throughout the evaluation. Second, a critique of the guide’s ability to meet each individual standard is then presented. Third, a summary of the analysis is provided. Finally, recommendations for the improvement of the guide are presented.

Definitions

While conducting the evaluation of the Junior Girl Scout Group Experience Outcomes Measurement Guide, several rather generic terms used consistently to describe specific aspects of the evaluation. The terms are identified and defined.

Back End of Evaluation

This is the portion of the evaluation which includes analysis and interpretation of the results as well as the development of the various types of reports necessary to meet each group of stakeholders’ needs.
Council
A regional group of Girl Scout troops that share the central leadership. For the purpose of this paper, this could mean any group of girls scouts (individual councils, troop(s) within council(s), or combination thereof) who wish to conduct an outcomes assessment using the Outcomes Measurement Guide.

Front End of Evaluation
This is the portion of the evaluation which includes all aspects of the evaluation from the very beginning of the process through the computation of the data. This includes the preparatory work, the administration and collection of the surveys, data entry, and the computation of the data using the software provided by GSUSA.

Guide
The Outcomes Measurement Guide that was developed to aid in the outcomes assessment will be referred to as the guide.

Point Person
The individual identified to manage the evaluation for the council. This person coordinates the entire evaluation process including the management of correspondence, reproduction of survey materials, documenting and managing the paper trail, and ensuring that the evaluation process is uninterrupted and ongoing.

Team
The team is the National Outcomes Measurement Team. This team is the group who spearheaded and managed the design and development of the Outcomes Measurement Guide.

Work Group
The committee designed to organize, lead, and manage the total evaluation process for the council.

Evaluation of the Outcomes Measurement Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Standards</th>
<th>Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Identification</td>
<td>The Outcomes Measurement Guide does identify the stakeholders. The stakeholders include girls, parents, volunteers, staff, and funders at all levels. The guide also mentions that stakeholders include both current and prospective individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator Credibility</td>
<td>Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The guide is well founded and seems to have a great deal of credibility. GSUSA has shown their commitment to evaluation through the development of a national research institution. They also commissioned SPEC Associates to assist in the development of the model presented in this guide. The relationship between SPEC and GSUSA has been built upon their previous successful collaborations. Previously, SPEC and GSUSA have worked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
together on several projects (Hwalek, M., Minnick, M.E., and Social Program Evaluators & Consultants, Inc., 1997; Hwalek, M., Minnick, M.E., and SPEC Associates, 1997; SPEC and Associates, Inc. and Girl Scouts of the United States of American, 2001; SPEC and Associates, Inc. and Girl Scouts of the United States of American, 2000; SPEC and Associates, Inc. and Girl Scouts of the United States of American, 2001; and SPEC and Associates, Inc. and Girl Scouts of the United States of American, 2000). This continued and successful collaboration has helped to build a level of trust and credibility. To develop the materials for the measurement guide and to obtain similar buy-in and credibility, GSUSA and SPEC formed a committee consisting of various stakeholders. This committee is known as the National Outcome Measurement Team. Also, after 90 years of programming for girls, the GSUSA has developed a reputation for themselves that also cares credibility and should not be overlooked.

**U3 Information Scope and Selection**

This issue was addressed. First, a program logic model was developed by the team to illustrate and connect activities and outcomes. The logic model identified nineteen outcomes of scouting. The team identified the five most important outcomes, labeled them as the key outcomes, and focused the evaluation on them.

Secondly, information is collected from girls, parents, and leaders through specifically designed surveys for each group. Questions on each survey are mapped to show which outcome is measured by each question. Therefore, all questions on the survey are pertinent and pertain to a specific outcome. The only exception to this is three “inattentive questions” that are on the girls’ survey. These questions are used to screen out the non-readers and those not paying attention while completing the survey. Surveys where two of the three questions are incorrectly marked are removed from the sample.

One minor concern related to this standard was identified. It was not evident how, if at all, current or potential funders where involved in the process. They were identified as a stakeholder but not included in the evaluation design. This issue can be argued both ways. On one hand, the funders have committed or may be willing to commit money to the program so perhaps they should have some involvement to ensure funding requirements are being met. One the other hand, funders may not be needed to be since this is an outcome focused assessment. If designed properly, the evaluation and measurement of the outcomes should satisfy the needs of the funders. The primary needs of the funders are that girls do benefit from scouting and the money they (the funders) invest does make a difference.

**U4 Values Identification**

The front end of this evaluation, some of the values have been established by the National Outcomes Measurement Team. They established the five key outcomes to be measured, which had to be established so evaluation materials could be developed. The basis and rationale behind these five keys are explained to help clarify the judgments that were made.
Once the results are ready to be analyzed and reported, no information is provided on how to analyze, interpret and report the data. This is where the identification of values would be very important. The guide is developed for councils to use to measure outcomes. The guide and all the materials including computer software system for developing data entry and analysis are meticulously laid out for each group to individually conduct an assessment. From this software, seven types of reports totaling 48 different reports can be generated. These reports are all standard, produced via the computer software, and cannot be manipulated by the individual using the program. The results of the data are generated and printed out in tables and graphs. It is left up the assessment work group, council and troop leaders to interpret the results. Unfortunately, no guidance is provided on how to handle and address those types of value judgments.

U5 Report Clarity
Not Addressed
There are two issues that need to be addressed related to report clarity. First, the computer generated reports that are provided via the computer software are clear and concise. What the guide considers “reports” are the computer derived data and, in my opinion, are really the results of the study and not necessarily in appropriate report format.

There is no mention of a report other than the computer results. The guide states that the outcomes measurement work group should help interpret what the findings mean for both internal and external audiences. The guide provides a short list of uses of the results for each audience but does not provide the work group with any insight as to how to develop such professional report(s) that meets the needs of each audience. Since the needs of each audience may differ, different versions of report may need to be prepared and presented.

U6 Report Timeliness and Dissemination
Addressed
The team developed and recommends a two year timeline for assessing the outcomes and implementing changes. Year one is used for data collection and analysis. Year two is set aside for programmatic and strategic changes based upon year one results. The team also addresses the amount of time required and the commitment necessary to complete this project. They recommend the identification of a point person with 5-10 hours per week available to manage the entire process.

Again, the end product (reports in appropriate form to meet the needs of both internal and external audiences/stakeholders) was not discussed in the guide. There is no mention of how to properly use or disseminate the results or any other reports that may be necessary.

U7 Evaluation Impact
Partially Addressed
Evaluation impact is partially addressed. In reading the guide, it is generally assumed that the council will utilize the results for programmatic changes, strategic planning, and justification of the benefits of scouting. The two year timeline that is also recommend in the guide mentions the benefits of using the findings. There is no concrete information available to ensure or even remind the work group that the evaluation could have significant impact if the findings were shared and utilized appropriately.
Feasibility Standards

F1 Practical Procedures        Addressed

The guide is designed in a very systematic way. Its layout is logical; allowing the users to go through the process step-by-step, ensuring that the work group is able to efficiently use their time and resources. The primary concerns related to this standard are the complexity of the computing software and the human resources. First, the computer software seems fairly cumbersome and will take some adjustment time. Secondly, the ability of the assessment work group to successfully meet this standard will depend on the abilities of the point person. The materials are all laid out for the group, but it will be up to the point person and the entire work group to make sure that the assessment is completed in a practical manner.

F2 Political Viability        Partially Addressed

The nature of the evaluation makes this issue slightly less of a concern. The purpose of an outcomes assessment is to measure the impact the program has on the participants. The results are primarily used for programmatic changes, strategic issues, and program justification. The reason political viability is less of a concern is because the main intent of the evaluation is for internal use in improving programming.

Since Girls Scouts is a non-profit organization that relies on external funding, politics are still an issue. The guide does address issues that could come under political scrutiny. First, all survey questions have been correlated and tied into the outcomes to be measured. Second, sample letters and materials provide for consistency and political correctness. Third, measurement tools have been field-tested to stand up to rigorous research standards. For example, survey reliabilities were calculated using pilot survey data. Next, the entire research package was field-tested matching each pre- and post-test question with the appropriate key outcome and providing the alpha level for each so that the data will hold up to statistical scrutiny. Finally, a frequently asked question guide is provided in the guide to help the work group answer the most common questions.

F3 Cost Effectiveness        Partially Addressed

There is little mention of cost. However, there are some issues related to cost that should be addressed. First, the entire guide including the instructions, surveys, other materials, and computer software were developed by the GSUSA and provided at no cost to any council or troop who requests it. Secondly, a budget outline is provided and covers the following categories: staffing, reproduction of surveys, envelopes and postage, other supplies, mileage, and copying reports. No estimates or rates are provided.

Although it will still be costly for each council to conduct the assessment, they will be faced with little risk and potentially great results (in the form of usable data). The National Outcomes Measurement Team in conjunction with GSUSA and SPEC have developed, field-tested, piloted, produced, and provided a well-tested evaluation model that can be very reliable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propriety Standards</th>
<th>Addressed/Not Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 Service Orientation</td>
<td>Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation is specifically designed around the five key outcomes of the Girl Scouts. Because of this focus, each council should be able to utilize the results for improving programming and making strategic decisions. The evaluation is designed to measure outcomes by using pre- and post-tests. These surveys have been significantly developed and tested to identify the areas of growth and areas of weakness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Formal Agreements</td>
<td>Not Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no mention of agreements in the guide. The guide does discuss the development of a local team call the Outcome Measurement Work Group (work group) and the appointment of a point person. However, the guide does fail to suggest the use of written agreements and it does not outline the roles and responsibilities of work group and point person. The guide only mentions what the work group “will be asked” to do and those items outlined are extremely generic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The guide does address a different type of formal agreement very well. It does a great job of providing all the necessary materials and examples for the work group to use related to conducting the assessment. They provide notification and information letters, consent forms, and logs to monitor the paper trail. All of these are well developed and available electronically but are not the formal agreements addressed by the standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 Rights of Human Subjects</td>
<td>Partially Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The issue is always an extremely touchy subject and one that can never be overly cautious. There are some points the guide can be commended on and other that should have been addressed even more in the guide. First, the letters and consent forms are well written and cover the human subjects issues. In the letter, it is noted that no names will be used and that initials and date of birth will be used for linking surveys only. Brief examples of the types of questions the girls will be asked was also included. Secondly, survey questions are very sterile. There is no mention of cultural, social, or economic issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The guide really did not caution the work group about working with these groups of people which include young girls. Only in the frequently asked question section, did it mention anything about how to treat the girls whose parents have not signed consent forms. In that section, it said to provide a pencil-and-paper activity and not to “ostracize” the non-participants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 Human Interactions</td>
<td>Partially Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The guide does not talk about the human interaction much. It only cautions about handling the non-participants during the survey. There is not a specific section that identifies the issues related to facilitating the survey process or how to in-service the troop leaders in giving the survey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The human interaction was addressed as it relates to the survey. The survey is well laid out with alternating white and gray shading for each question. A question mark (?) is
provided on the survey and girls are asked to circle that if they do not understand a question. The length of the survey is fairly long (60+ questions on four pages) so at the bottom of each page, in fun print and with pictures, girls are asked to do a short activity before continuing in an effort to keep them attentive. Finally, only aggregate data is reported. There are no situations where individual data are used in the report.

P5  Complete and Fair Assessment Addressed
The *front end of this evaluation* process is well established and designed. It would not be easy for the *work group* to manipulate the data or results. The entire evaluation process including the data entry and analysis software was designed in advance. Therefore, it cannot be argued the assessment was altered throughout the evaluation period to meet the needs of the work group or stakeholders.

Much of the focus and data are reported in the form of positive change and improvement from pre-test to post-test. Although this seems like a positive spin on the results, it is still possible to identify the areas of weakness or areas of little improvement. These areas would be the ones that would signal concern and the ones to focus on for future improvement. Although this is appropriate, it is something that should be watched carefully by those that use the *guide*.

Again, the primary fault of this *guide* is that it does not stress or caution the *work group* about their responsibility in conducting a complete and fair assessment. It is this group who will be responsible for analyzing, interpreting and reporting the results. This is where this standard could become a major issue.

P6  Disclosure of Findings
Disclosure of findings is not addressed in the guide.

*The Program Evaluation Standards* (Sanders, 1994) makes several recommendations. The *guide* should include information on how to present a report both in writing and orally with full disclosure and without omissions or changes. Also, all points that are addressed should be presented from both the critics’ and supporters’ perspectives.

P7  Conflict of Interest Not Addressed
Given the purpose of the outcomes assessment, there is little concern related to conflict of interest. Because the goal of the evaluation is to measure improvement in the girls involved in scouting, there is no individual financial or other gain to be made from the results of this evaluation.

However, it should be addressed in the *guide* and it is not. There could be parents, leaders, or community people involved who have ties that could be considered a conflict. For example, a scout leader could be a mom who is an upper level manager of a potential funding agency. Guidance on how to handle these types of issues should be addressed in the *guide*. 
Because of the nature of the guide, fiscal responsibility is not really addressed. The guide does provide a budget that focuses on the cash outlay that will be required and briefly mentions the need for internal appropriations, other sources of funds, and the need for volunteers.

On the other hand, much of the initial fiscal responsibility has been handled by GSUSA. They developed, tested, piloted, produced, and provided all the materials necessary to conduct the evaluation at not cost to the local council. That is a huge investment that the local groups are not burdened with. They are only responsible for the costs of actually conducting of the survey, collecting and analyzing data, and developing the final report.

The GSUSA did an excellent job of documenting the program prior to establishing the evaluation materials and guide. The groups is nationally known and respected but they did not rest on those laurels. They developed a program logic model that could visually describe girl scouting and link the identified outcomes with the activities. This program logic model also helped the group to define themselves. GSUSA also appointed an evaluation “team” including independent experts to develop, test, and pilot the guide.

For the internal use of the results, the program logic model is probably enough documentation. However, more documentation than what is provided in the guide may be necessary when reporting results to external stakeholders.

The evaluation portion of the study (year one of the two year process) was designed to be completed during the scouting year. Since pre- and post-tests were used, the study would have to begin near the start of the scouting year with the pre-test and continue until near the end of the scouting year with the post-test.

There was no mention in the guide to other contextual analysis issues like timing, political and social climate, or other concurrent activities that could affect the study. Perhaps with an outcomes form of assessment, this is less of an issue; however, it should still be mentioned in the guide.

The purposes and procedures are well defined and explained throughout the guide. A variety of materials were developed and made available to aid in administering the evaluation. One example is the tracking materials that were developed. They included contact sheets, tracking charts, and consent logs.

Based on the standards, there are a few issues that should be included in the guide. First, everyone involved in the evaluation process, should be familiar with and occasionally reminded of the purpose in order to maintain group focus. Second, the guide should encourage the work group to use field notes so that everything can be documented and
that there is a paper trail after the evaluation for validity purposes. Finally, the guide should also recommend the use of independent evaluators to assist with the processes, especially the analysis and report writing, when possible to increase the credibility of the evaluation.

A4 **Defensible Information Sources**

Great effort has been made to ensure the reliability, validity, and credibility of the information being collected. The guide that is provided to each council has been the result of an evolutionary process. It has evolved over several years as part of other projects and has been field tested, piloted and revised.

There are several information sources for the evaluation. The evaluation gathers information in the form of pre- and post-test from the girls, parents, and leaders. Sampling methods and procedures are thoroughly addressed and explained in the guide. The entire data collection process is well organized, defined, and documented.

A5 **Valid Information**

A great deal of effort is made in the guide to ensure that valid results are obtained. A very complex and systematic process was used to ensure all materials would provide valid data. Measurement tools were field-tested to stand up to rigorous research standards. For example, survey reliabilities were calculated using pilot survey data. The entire research package was field-tested matching each pre- and post-test question with the appropriate key outcome and providing the alpha level for each outcome so that the data will hold up to statistical scrutiny.

A6 **Reliable Information**

The guide aids in the ability of the councils to develop reliable information. The materials were field-tested and piloted to ensure each provides the necessary, accurate information. The girls’ survey uses inattentive questions to screen out unreliable data. All the documents needed for the evaluation are provided and are reproducible to provide consistency. Finally, the guide also suggests that the councils follow a continual two year cycle which can also increase the long term reliability.

A7 **Systematic Information**

The primary purpose of the guide is to meet this standard. Its purpose is to provide the details and appropriate materials needed for collecting and processing the data systematically. The guide fails to provide support in systematically reporting the data. The guide makes implications to the systematic processes that are needed. However, because of the purpose of the guide, the issue of systematic processes should be mentioned to that the work group and point person are aware of this issue.

A8 **Analysis of Quantitative Information**

The guide addresses this issue by making available the computer software that has been developed to prepare the results of the data obtained through the evaluation. The software prepares seven different report types and a total of 48 reports based upon the desires of the work group.
The guide does not address the organization, summarization and interpretation of the results nor does it provide any guidance on how to prepare reports using this information. There is also no caution about comparing across groups and other data comparison related issues.

A9 Analysis of Qualitative Information Not Addressed
The evaluation is not designed to collect or report any qualitative information. There are probably a couple of reasons for this. First, outcome assessment is a measurement of change between the start of the program and the end. So it would be difficult to measure this type of change using qualitative procedures, especially with youth. Secondly, this evaluation was designed for a large scale evaluations making qualitative assessment impractical.

A10 Justified Conclusions Not Addressed
The conclusions that could be developed from the results of the evaluation were not addressed in the guide. This standard raises a large concern. The guide does not address issues related the work group's ability to defend the conclusion or ensure that the judgments and recommendations made from the study are defensible.

A11 Impartial Reporting Not Addressed
Again, this is a reporting issue that should be addressed in the guide but is not. At the very least, the guide should caution the work group and point person about accounting for all perspectives in reporting the results. Those persons should also be warned about the impact of biases and methods of properly addressing those issues.

A12 Metaevaluation Not Addressed
The guide does not mention the need for the work group and point person to evaluate the process and document those aspects of the evaluation that went well and those that need to be improved for next time. This is a vital step that should be addressed in the guide.

Summary of the Analysis
The primary purpose of this guide was accomplished and it was done extremely well.

That purpose was to provide materials and information necessary to measure five key outcomes of girl scouting. This was accomplished on the front end of the evaluation with the development of all the materials needed to conduct the outcomes analysis including correspondences, survey materials, and computer software to obtain results. The materials and detail given to this portion of the evaluation are exemplary.
The problems with this guide are with the back end of the evaluation. The guide does not provide any insight on how to analyze and utilize the data obtained from the surveys and computer results. Because the guide was developed for lay people to utilize as a resource, it is vital that this area of the evaluation be addressed as well. It would be a waste of all the time and resources for a council to get this far in the process and lose its momentum because direction is not provided on how to proceed once the results are obtained.

Ironically, the guide that was developed has the same problem that many projects have. It is great at developing the program and making sure that it will work just as it was developed. However, there are no provisions as to how to successfully finish the project by writing the report and utilizing results to the group’s fullest potential. The council has the data but is not given any direction on how to utilize it. Worse yet, the guide does not provide an evaluation step so that the process can continually be improved for the council.

**Recommendations for Improvements**

Based upon the evaluation of this guide using The Evaluation Standards (Sanders, 1994), several recommendations are made for improvement. First, there are several issues that should be addressed within the guide to ensure that the people involved in the process understand the roles and purpose of the evaluation. Many of these issues do not need to be addressed at length but do need to be mentioned so that each person is aware of the issue and handles it appropriately as an evaluator. One issue is the inclusion of the responsibilities that the work group must be aware of related to human subjects, conflicts of interest, and disclosure of findings. These are vital issues that must be addressed in order to ensure the evaluation is handled appropriately and
in the most professional manner possible. Weiss (1998) also stresses the importance of the evaluators obligation to address these issues, which has not been addressed by this guide.

A second issue is the analysis of the results provide by the computer program. Weiss (1998) identifies the purpose of analysis as the conversion of “mass raw data into a coherent account.” Direction must be provided in the guide to assist the work group in interpreting and utilizing the data for programmatic and strategic purposes. Unless, individuals are experienced in evaluation, this may not be a natural or logical step. Therefore, it should not be assumed that the group can move to the next level and address this issue without some direction from the guide.

The third issue is the development of reports using the computer results. Again, unless there are experienced individuals within the work group, they may not know how to take advantage of the work they have accomplished. A section in the guide should be provided to address this issue, making sure that the work group understands the importance of this step and has some concrete examples of how to report the findings to the various audiences/stakeholders. This section of the guide should discuss reporting issues as well as dissemination and utilization of the results issues (Weiss, 1998).

The final issue that should be addressed is the need for a metaevaluation. Especially since the guide recommends that this evaluation is completed on a two year continual basis. Evaluation is an ongoing learning process where one can learn from both the things that went extremely well and those that did not. Therefore, the work group should be encouraged to continually document the entire process. Then evaluate their work so that mistakes will not be repeated and the lessons learned through the process can be duplicated in the future. There are three reasons why this is important (Weiss, 1998): 1) to combine data to obtain overall direction
of the program’s effect, 2) discover the conditions of which the outcomes are realized, and 3) examine the evaluation instruments and type of results that they produce.

**Conclusion**

This evaluation of the *GSUSA Outcomes Measurement Guide* was an excellent means to develop the skills of evaluation a program using *The Program Evaluations Standards* (Sanders, 1994). It was surprising (and disappointing) to realize that a national program, like the Girl Scouts, would provide such a resource to its local programs and not provide details on how to utilize the data collected or recommend an evaluation of the process. Although the instruments are available for local councils to measure the impact of their programs from an outcomes standpoint, the project could be fruitless if the individuals using the evaluation instruments are unaware of how to utilize and take advantage of the results.
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