

**WINGSPREAD DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES FOR
YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY RESEARCH AND EVALUATION**

- 1. Youth participation in community research and evaluation transforms its participants. It transforms our ways of knowing, the strategies we devise, the methods we employ, and our program of work.**
- 2. Youth participation promotes youth empowerment. It recognizes the experience and expertise of all young people, and respects their leadership capacities and potential contributions.**
- 3. Youth participation builds mutually liberatory partnerships. It values the assets of all ages, and fosters supportive and respectful youth-youth and youth-adult working relationships.**
- 4. Youth participation equalizes power relationships between youth and adults. It establishes a level playing field in which participants are clear about the purpose of the process and the power imbalances between groups. It structures environments that respect the involvement of young people, and train adults in supporting genuine youth decision-making and leadership development.**
- 5. Youth participation is an inclusive process that recognizes all forms of democratic leadership, young and old. It involves diverse populations and perspectives, especially those who are traditionally underserved and underrepresented.**
- 6. Youth participation involves young people in meaningful ways. Young people participate in all stages of the process, from defining the problem, to gathering and analyzing the information, to making decisions and taking action.**
- 7. Youth participation is a ongoing process, not a one time event. Participants continuously clarify and reflect upon its purpose, process, and content. Research and evaluation are viewed as an integral part of knowledge development, program planning, and community improvement.**

WINGSPREAD SYMPOSIUM ON YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY RESEARCH

Summary of Proceedings

Sponsored by
Center for Community Change
City Year
Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development
Institute for Community Research
Social Policy Research Associates
Youth in Focus
The Johnson Foundation

**With sponsorship and
coordination by the
School of Social Work
University of Michigan**

**And support from the
W.K. Kellogg Foundation**

**Racine, Wisconsin
June 7-9, 2002**

WINGSPREAD SYMPOSIUM ON YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY RESEARCH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PURPOSE

II. OBJECTIVES

III. SPONSORS

IV. PARTICIPANTS

V. PLANNING

VI. DESIGN

VII. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

GOALS AND INTRODUCTIONS

WHY YOUTH PARTICIPATION?

LATEST LESSONS FROM THE FIELD

YOUTH-ADULT PARTNERSHIPS: MAKING THEM WORK

TRAINING CURRICULA FOR INVOLVING YOUNG PEOPLE

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION APPROACHES AND METHODS

BUILDING A COMMON VISION

WORKING GROUPS:

- **VISIONING THE FIELD**
- **BUILDING INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES**
- **EXPANDING EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES**
- **STRENGTHENING SUPPORT FOR SUSTAINING THE FIELD**
- **GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR YOUTH PARTICIPATION**

IMPLICATIONS OF FIELD BUILDING

STRATEGIES FOR MOVING THE WORK FORWARD

APPENDICES

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

WINGSPREAD REFLECTIONS

SYMPOSIUM PROGRAM

PARTICIPANT ROSTER

CONTINUING PROGRESS

LEARNING COMMUNITY DIAGRAM

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of the symposium was to develop specific strategies for strengthening youth participation in community research and evaluation, and for advancing this as a new field of practice. These strategies were intended to enable young people and adult allies to develop knowledge in ways that contribute to civic engagement and community change.

II. OBJECTIVES

1. Develop specific strategies for strengthening youth participation in community research and evaluation;
2. Identify age-appropriate and culturally-sensitive research and evaluation practices and approaches;
3. Integrate and expand existing training curricula for involving young people in community research and evaluation;
4. Create ongoing opportunities and structures for sharing experiences, learning from one another, and building mutual support;
5. Increase communication and collaboration among allied fields for youth participation as a common cause; and
6. Explore the implications of youth participation in community research and evaluation as a new field of practice.

III. SPONSORS

The symposium was sponsored by the Center for Community Change, City Year, the Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development, Institute for Community Research, Social Policy Research Associates, Youth in Focus and the Johnson Foundation, with sponsorship and coordination by the University of Michigan School of Social Work and support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

IV. PARTICIPANTS

The symposium brought together a small number of carefully selected people who have demonstrated commitment to youth participation, including youth evaluators and other representatives of community-based organizations, civic agencies, private foundations, and universities. The participants brought a wealth of experience, enthusiasm for the topic, and the desire for dialogue at a high level of engagement. A complete list of symposium participants is included in Appendix D of these summary proceedings.

V. PLANNING

This gathering grew out of an initial meeting to discuss youth participation in community research and evaluation in Ann Arbor, Michigan, in January, 2001, after which a planning committee of Hahn Cao Yu, Barry Checkoway, Katie Richards-Schuster, Jonathan London, Hartley Hobson, Leslie Goodyear, and Andy Schneider-Munoz came together to continue the work that was started there. Committee members met, communicated regularly, and jointly developed the objectives and agenda of the second symposium. Barry Checkoway and Katie Richards-Schuster of the University of Michigan played active roles in organizing the symposium. Prospective participants were consulted through an e-mail group early in the process.

VI. DESIGN

The symposium was designed as a working group of individuals who came prepared to engage in intensive discussions rather than to make formal presentations or listen to lectures from experts. A variety of formats were used, including roundtable discussions, plenary sessions, workshops, and working groups. Participants were asked to make brief presentations and facilitate interactive discussions to increase involvement in the process.

VII. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Friday, June 7, 2002

Opening Plenary Session:

Goals and Introductions

Conveners: Barry Checkoway and Katie Richards-Schuster – University of Michigan

The conveners opened by welcoming everyone and posing two questions to be addressed: “What are specific strategies that will strengthen youth participation in community evaluation and research?” and “What are ways that we can advance this as a new field?”

The group was charged to consider “What are you going to do with what you learn here?” recognizing that the real accomplishments of this gathering will be realized when the lessons learned at the symposium are applied in the “real world.”

Why Youth Participation in Community Research and Evaluation?

What is the rationale for youth participation in community research and evaluation? Why is it important, and for whom? What does it give to young people, and the communities of which they are a part?

Moderator: Leslie Goodyear – City Year

Panel: Uriridiakoghene (Lily) Onovakpuri – Youth in Focus
Taj James – The Movement Strategy Center

Leslie Goodyear began by presenting two perspectives on why youth participation is important. First, it is important for youth development—giving young people meaningful leadership opportunities and a skill base on which to build. Second, it is important for the field of evaluation and social research as a whole. Evaluation holds the potential to be a launching point of democratic dialogue. Involving youth is one way of changing the definition of evaluation and modeling a process by which humanity may be brought back into the practice of evaluation.

Lily Ono vakpuri presented Youth Impact’s experience evaluating youth-serving community-based organizations in San Francisco. At the request of the City Department of Children, Youth and Families, Youth Impact did focus groups, questionnaires, and observation at 40 CBOs funded by DCYF. Since then, many of their suggestions and procedures have been incorporated into policy. Lily presented two main reasons to involve youth in evaluation. “Who knows what youth want more than youth themselves?” and “Youth can blend into programs, see everything, and gain the trust of other youth easier than can adults.”

Taj James began by saying that youth involvement in evaluation and research is important because young people are oppressed. Other people often make decisions for them without consulting them. Youth empowerment means young people gaining the power to transform their environment. Thus, community research becomes very important because organized knowledge is a form of power. Research and evaluation are central to any organizing effort because they provide a base from which to work. Taj identified four key arenas in which the field needs to address the definitions of young people: (1) media, (2) the academy, (3) political discourse, and (4) the nonprofit sector.

Saturday, June 8, 2002

Plenary Session:

Latest Lessons from the Field

What are some specific examples of youth participation in community research and evaluation? What are the lessons learned and future directions?

Moderator: Andy Schneider-Munoz – City Year

Panel: Randa Powell and Hanh Cao Yu – Social Policy Research Associates
S. Kneecay Green and Jonathan London – Youth in Focus

Andy Schneider-Munoz led off by sharing images of the kind of relationships he strives for in his work, saying “We are who we are—in relationship with others.” Hopefully, by working together to create these strong helping relationships with each other we can build intergenerational alliances where we can all gain from each other.

Hahn Cao Yu and Randa Powell shared their work on the two-year evaluation of the Youth Leadership Development Initiative. Randa was hired as a youth intern to work on this project and the team has learned a number of lessons about working in youth-adult partnerships:

- Treat youth as equals—you will get better results.
- Hold each other to high expectations—don't water anything down for youth.
- Provide staff support for youth—preparation before and debriefing after meetings and projects helps accelerate learning.
- Be specific about what exactly is expected on each task.
- Keep it interesting and real (site visits and other interactions with people).

Jonathan London started off with a number of innovations they are trying out at Youth in Focus:

- Constructing youth-adult partnerships in new ways.
- Processes that link youth and community development.
- Initiatives made up of several projects addressing a similar topic (e.g. schools and health).
- Working with youth in rural settings.

Knecaya Green is a Project Leader on one project within Youth in Focus' Public Health Initiative, working with young people in East Palo Alto to develop and conduct a health survey in their community. She talked about how much she has learned as a facilitator about letting those she's working with come up with their own solutions rather than imposing her ideas. This learning process has been facilitated by support from Youth in Focus' adult staff.

Concurrent Workshop Sessions

Three workshops were offered twice each, giving participants the opportunity to attend two of the three.

Workshop A: Youth-Adult Partnerships for Community Research and Evaluation: Making Them Work

Facilitators: Alicia Wilson – The Forum for Youth Investment
Linda Camino – University of Wisconsin-Madison

Alicia Wilson and Linda Camino led the group through discussion of three questions:

1. What are the necessary elements of effective youth-adult partnerships?
2. Considering the elements, what are the challenges that remain in maintaining/building youth-adult partnerships?
3. What are some strategies that we might apply to address the challenges?

Elements of an environment where everyone can work and develop together:

- Holistic, human relationships that go beyond work.
- Clear shared mission and vision for the work.
- Open lines of communication, with all relevant information shared from the start.
- Trust between the youth and adults.
- Truly shared power, with support from the adults.
- Flexible framework and outcomes, with adequate time to engage in the process.

Challenges that remain:

- Adults not feeling that they have much power themselves to share.
- Adults have difficulty being comfortable in roles other than “teacher” or “parent.”
- Pre-set ideas regarding what a “good” outcome is.
- Tension inherent between focusing on process vs. product.
- Different vocabularies and definitions.
- Lack of time and resources.

Strategies:

- Demystify the research process.
- Create an environment where mistakes are allowed and there is time and support to revise process and product.
- Adults should share context and potential consequences with young people.
- Establish baseline understandings as a group.
- Be intentional and explicit about structuring youth and adult roles.
- Treat people as “big”—they will expand and develop into the role.

Workshop B: Training Curricula for Involving Young People in Community Research and Evaluation

Facilitator: Jean (Jay) Schensul – The Institute for Community Research

Jay Schensul described the Institute for Community Research’s approach to Youth Participatory Research (Youth-PAR), an approach that enables youth, through research and relationships, to create, recreate, and transform the environments in which they live, work, and play. Youth-PAR has impacts at the individual, group, community, and policy levels. ICR tries to teach youth who are engaged to be critically engaged and youth who are not engaged to be so.

Jay identified a series of crosscutting themes and theories that undergird ICR’s curricula:

- Theories of development
 - Eco-critical thinking
 - Multiple intelligences
 - Power, gender, and voice
- Theories of Instruction

- Cooperative learning
- Social construction of methods, data collection and interpretation.
- Theories of change
 - Individual
 - Group
 - Community
 - Society

Workshop C: Research and Evaluation Approaches and Methods

Facilitator: Leslie Goodyear – City Year

Leslie Goodyear facilitated a group discussion of two key questions:

1. Are there methods and approaches which are appropriate for working with young people?
2. Can existing research methods be adapted to involve young people?

Leslie defined “method” as specific tools to conduct research and evaluation (e.g. mapping, surveys, interviews, photodocumentation) and “approach” as theoretical perspectives on research and evaluation (e.g. positivist, participatory, interpretivist).

In the discussion participants raised the question that the methods and approach we use to involve young people will depend, in part, on the reasons young people are involved in the research. Other considerations include the quality of the youth-adult relationships, the meaningfulness of the project, the assumptions of the adults and the young people involvement, and the development of young people in the process.

The discussion also focused on the importance of recognizing what methods, approaches, and knowledge development gives to young people. For example, participants may gain skills, empowerment, ideology, tools for change, critical consciousness, respect of youth identity, and informed democratic practice.

Participants also raised cautions about the need to think about the role of power in research and evaluation and the tension between the ‘rigor’ of research and youth development.

Plenary Session

Building a Common Vision of Youth Participation in Community Research and Evaluation

What is the vision? What are the particular perspectives of youth development, community organization, and participatory evaluation, and what is the common vision among them?

Moderator: Wendy Wheeler – Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development
Panel: Vera Miao – Funders’ Collaborative on Youth Organizing
Jen Tiffany, Amy Bianchi, and Patricia Enekwe – Cornell University

Wendy Wheeler began by placing the following three questions on big sheets of paper around the room and asking participants to write answers on post-it notes to be stuck on the posters:

1. What are some values and principles for the work?
2. What is your personal hope/dream for the work?
3. What are elements of the vision? Images for the future?

Hahn Cao Yu presented a draft of some guiding principles developed before the symposium and to be further developed by one of the working groups (See Appendix A).

Vera Miao pulled out four common themes of the work across the fields of youth organizing and youth participatory research, noting that both strive for multiple outcomes—at the individual as well as group and policy levels:

1. Young people are leaders today.
2. Young people have opinions and insights on community issues.
3. Methods and strategies need to be adapted to be relevant to young people.
4. There are continual questions about who has the power to make decisions.

Vera then proposed five “P’s” that need to be considered more closely in order to move the work forward:

- Purpose: What is the continuum of purposes worked for in these efforts?
- Principles: What values are critical to all of us?
- Position: What different places and standpoints are we coming from? Who are the youth involved?
- Practices: What works in the field? Why, and for whom?
- Power: How can we use the knowledge gained in these efforts to shift power?

Jen Tiffany, Amy Bianchi, and Patricia Enekwe each shared a set of principles garnered from their work on the HIV/AIDS Education Project at Cornell University.

Jen emphasized the importance of forming connections and relationships as the framework for networks of dialogue and exchange. She emphasized that young people should be at the center of social inquiry but should not bear the burden of change themselves. Thus, it is critical to pay attention to how intergenerational dynamics are structured, to ensure an appropriate division of labor, and to frame participation inclusively. Amy added the importance of valuing and using the opinions of participants, as well as providing a balance of support and freedom. Patricia emphasized that although it is important to recognize young people’s expertise, they should not be involved as

“youth,” but as full participants in the research process. Open relationships that encourage exploration and inquiry are also critical to the project.

In the discussion that followed, the group was left with questions about whether it was a good thing to begin talking about youth participation in community research and evaluation as a field of practice. Specifically, the group wondered, “Are we moving too fast toward establishing a common vision?”

Plenary Session

Implications of Field-Building for Youth Participation in Community Research and Evaluation

Panel: Taj James – The Movement Strategy Center
Barry Checkoway - University of Michigan
Andy Schneider-Munoz – City Year
Ditra Edwards – LISTEN, Inc.

To address the concerns of the group, the agenda was shuffled to add a session on the implications of using the word “field.” Each panelist presented a short piece and the discussion was opened to the entire group.

Taj James defined a field as a mechanism to concentrate resources for a certain group of people. As an example, he described his efforts to build youth organizing into a field.

Barry Checkoway said that one disadvantage of fields is that it establishes boundaries that recognize some but keep others out, which can result in power imbalances. He cited youth development as a field in which power and resources have become concentrated in the hands of a small number of people and organizations.

Andy Schneider-Munoz also used a recent case example, but advocated for field-building. He pointed to youth workers as a group that had missed their opportunity to form a field and therefore are poorly paid, disrespected, lack coordination and a set of common values.

Ditra Edwards reflected that we need to figure out a way to develop a field that respects its practitioners. How could a field with more equal power dynamics be established?

The group discussion reflected that “field” means different things to different people and that the process of drawing boundaries could have both positive and negative effects. While establishing a field could exclude people, concentrate power in the hands of a few, and establish a hierarchy, not doing so could lessen the potential impact of the work by relegating it to a series of scattered, uncoordinated projects.

Plenary Session

Strategies for Moving the Work Forward

Moderator: Karen Vander Ven – University of Pittsburgh
Panel: Della Hughes – Brandeis University
Deborah Alvarez-Rodriguez – The Omidyar Foundation

Della Hughes talked about how best to capitalize on youth participation as an opportunity to change culture. A potential question to use in framing impact is, “What would the cost be if we did not do this work?” Della also identified three realms to do work in to link research’s impact on policy: setting a research agenda, developing relationships with key players, and placing the work within a political framework.

Deborah Alvarez-Rodriguez reflected on her work at the City of San Francisco’s Department of Children, Youth, and Families, where her goal had been building a “child-friendly” infrastructure that could withstand changes in leadership. Part of this process was ensuring that three core values were at the heart of departmental efforts:

- Young people should be involved at each step.
- Expect excellence.
- Recognize that everyone brings a certain expertise to the table.

In thinking about the work, Deborah stressed that it is necessary to think about the audience it will be presented to, the desired outcomes, and what the purpose of engaging in the process is for all involved.

Working Group Sessions

Participants were divided into five small groups to develop specific strategies or products in the following areas:

Group 1: Visioning the Work

What do we want to accomplish? What is our vision for the future? What are our values, and what do we really care about? What roles should young people play as participants and leaders?

Facilitator: Wendy Wheeler

Group 2: Building Institutional Structures

What institutional structures are needed to develop and build capacity over the long haul? For example, do we need regular meetings or annual conferences? Steering committees or national networks? University programs?

Facilitators: Jonathan London and Ditra Edwards

Group 3: Expanding Educational Resources

Which educational resources and training curricula are presently available, and which ones are needed? Which topics and skills currently receive emphasis, and which ones are needed? What would a comprehensive curricular guide look like, and what types of publication would advance the work?

Facilitators: Katie Richards-Schuster and Connie Flanagan

Group 4: Strengthening Support for Sustaining the Work

What kinds of support will be needed from private institutions and from public agencies, and what are some ideas for making this happen?

Facilitators: George Walker and Nathaniel Williams

Group 5: Guiding Principles for Youth Participation

What are some guiding principles for youth participation in community research and evaluation?

Facilitators: Hanh Cao Yu and Randa Powell

Sunday, June 9, 2002

Plenary Session

Advancing the Work: Looking Back, Moving Forward

Facilitators: Barry Checkoway
Alicia Wilson

After Patricia Enekwe and Della Hughes reflected on Saturday's process, Barry Checkoway and Alicia Wilson went over the morning's agenda. The group broke back into working groups for a short session to prepare their presentations.

Working Group Sessions and Reporting Out

Group 1: Visioning the Work

Recognizing that each individual has their own vision, the group tried to distill what the group held as common values and presented a draft vision statement based on these commonalities.

We envision a situation where people who care about youth participation in community research and evaluation have ways to communicate with each other; share lessons, resources, and principles; and otherwise support the growth and expansion of this work.

Group 2: Building Institutional Structures

The group used the metaphor of a children's museum to imagine a "Learning Community of Reflective Practice" that would honor people of all ages and provide a hands-on, interactive atmosphere for people to come together and learn (See Appendix F).

Group 3: Expanding Educational Resources

The group made several specific suggestions for providing information to an inclusive and ever-expanding circle of people hopefully involved in this work:

- An electronic listserv to spread information and link people together.
- Fellowships (especially targeting nontraditional recipients—giving practitioners a chance to reflect, learn, and disseminate their knowledge).
- Mentoring and exchanges between programs.
- Youth-adult teams to document work going on in the field.
- Conferences (possibly in a "World Café" format that lets participants choose which conversations to be a part of).

Group 4: Strengthening Support for Sustaining the Work

The group stressed the importance of building momentum to be able to take the next step with this work. In approaching key audiences (funders, government, youth, nonprofits) it is important to target the message in order to meet their needs. Several specific initiatives that could strengthen support suggested were:

- Regional meetings to further build upon the work of the symposium.
- Training institutes for potential youth and adult practitioners.
- Youth Think Tank to establish best practices and build on knowledge.
- Map of conferences, publications and other opportunities for dissemination.

Group 5: Guiding Principles for Youth Participation

Randa Powell and Alicia Wilson presented a draft set of principles and solicited feedback from participants. See the attached revised list of guiding principles in Appendix B.

Concluding Comments

Lily Onovakpuri and George Walker gave concluding comments. Barry Checkoway thanked the participants and wished them safe journeys home.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: This document results from collaboration by participants at the Wingspread symposium on June 7-9, 2002. An initial draft was prepared by Hanh Cao Yu for discussion by symposium participants, and revised by participants following the symposium.

WINGSPREAD DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES FOR YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

- 1. Youth participation in community research and evaluation transforms its participants. It transforms our ways of knowing, the strategies we devise, the methods we employ, and our program of work.**
- 2. Youth participation promotes youth empowerment. It recognizes the experience and expertise of all young people, and respects their leadership capacities and potential contributions.**
- 3. Youth participation builds mutually liberatory partnerships. It values the assets of all ages, and fosters supportive and respectful youth-youth and youth-adult working relationships.**
- 4. Youth participation equalizes power relationships between youth and adults. It establishes a level playing field in which participants are clear about the purpose of the process and the power imbalances between groups. It structures environments that respect the involvement of young people, and train adults in supporting genuine youth decision-making and leadership development.**
- 5. Youth participation is an inclusive process that recognizes all forms of democratic leadership, young and old. It involves diverse populations and perspectives, especially those who are traditionally underserved and underrepresented.**
- 6. Youth participation involves young people in meaningful ways. Young people participate in all stages of the process, from defining the problem, to gathering and analyzing the information, to making decisions and taking action.**
- 7. Youth participation is a ongoing process, not a one time event. Participants continuously clarify and reflect upon its purpose, process, and content. Research and evaluation are viewed as an integral part of knowledge development, program planning, and community improvement.**

Appendix B: Reflections of Symposium participants in the weeks following the event

WINGSPREAD REFLECTIONS

It is very important to continue the good dialogue we began around the "words" we use which are the "things we carry".Research, evaluation, work, field, youth-adult collaboration, power, policy, action, advocacy, utilization of results, conference, network, node, publication, culture, identity, learning, outcomes, community, organization, participatory action research, force field analysis..... We are having a trans(you fill in the word) conversation which always requires time to listen, understand and define. I miss all of you (and the dialogue) already.

He drew a circle to shut me out
Heretic, rebel a thing to flout
But love and I had the wit to win
We drew a circle that brought him in

Keep up the good work and I look forward to other collaborations.

Thanks to everyone who attended for your respectful listening, sharing and challenging and for your openness to learn from each other. I feel as though we're creating a network of support for this work, and that we will be able to use this network to educate and advocate.

What a rare treat to be surrounded by such dynamic people, in dialogue, in an exquisite setting!

My "one more thought" about Wingspread is to share the quote from the cover of the Summer 1996 Wingspread Journal that has really stuck with me (especially in light of conversations that many of us had about adapting research vs. transforming research)

"Adding wings to caterpillars does not create butterflies -- it creates awkward and dysfunctional caterpillars. Butterflies are created through transformation."

-Stephanie Pace Marshall

I thank you all for a wonderfully thought-provoking weekend, and I look forward to our future activities together.

Coming home has been painful! I have all these student portfolios to read, end of the year student evaluations to write and a retreat to plan - all I want to do is get on email and send you all follow up message about all the REALLY COOL ideas we had for collaboration. But I will have to do one thing at a time . Never have I come away from a professional meeting with so many possibilities. Thank you Barry, Katie and the planning team, and all the Wingspread staff for a lovely, inspiring, productive weekend.

I have carried home so many vivid memories, so much "food for thought"...

"The Dance" -- especially the moment where the people in the middle danced the "giving" from our shared work to the diverse and spinning "fields of endeavor" -- this dance illuminated the importance and energy of this work ... it was spontaneous and beautiful!

The walks, allowing every-changing groups of us to share so wide a range of hopes and fears, ideas and thought, reflections on experience.

The care with which uncomfortable moments were addressed and explored, deepening understanding, and allowing us to move forward.

The "good omen coyote" walking by on the hill across the pond in the midst of Taj's presentation on the first night.

With gratitude to all for this time, and for the paths that lie ahead!

A couple of thoughts before I do deadline work today!

- * What an inspiring group of advocates for the voice and involvement of youth - most powerful I have ever met with!
- * I have so much to learn about youth participation, evaluation & research, and social change... and that is a good thing at my age and stage of career!
- * The weekend and the network will help decrease my/our team's isolation and greatly broaden our youth development horizons - and that will mean we will be more effective in our work for our community and hopefully for the greater good!

* Great job by the planning committee, Barry & Katie, and Wingspread staff!
Super space and interaction plan.

* Only one regret - I should have had a Dove bar... (I think I did and had everything else!)

Thank you to everyone - what a great group of smart, dedicated, experienced and caring people!

It happened in symposium at WINGSPREAD
We connected, we planned, had some things said,
The magic of new circles was with us
I can't forget it, it's with me all day 'cuz
Ideas were bred that'll keep moving the work way ahead!

Many thanks to all of you, and especially the planning committee, Katie, and Barry. I look forward to continued inspiration and work together.

OK, I waited too long and now I'm intimidated. All of you have written so eloquently about our experiences. I would like to second everything that everyone else has said. It was truly a wonderful weekend.

One the way home I was stuck in Chicago airport for three hours and it gave me the opportunity to really reflect on the weekend. You have all given me so much food for thought and a renewed sense of pride and excitement about the work.

I look forward to our next meeting,

Don't forget about some of us who couldn't make it! I have been somewhat jealously reading about all the great experiences you all had over the weekend! It sounds like all went wonderfully! I had to miss the dialogue because I hosted a wedding reception for my brother and his new Vietnamese wife! As one of 8 adopted Korean children, I now have a Chinese sister-in-law, a Laotian sister-in-law and the newly joined Vietnamese sister-in-law! To maximize the number of family and friends my new sister-in-law could have at the reception, we had to hold the event over the past weekend. It was an interesting day in which about 35 Vietnamese guests gathered with about 100 of our family and friends (mostly of Polish and German descent) over foods from 6 different countries! An interesting mixture of culture/ethnicity especially in terms of marriage, children and friendships.

I am hoping that a summary of the dialogue you had over the weekend will be

Wingspread Symposium on Youth Participation in Community Research

shared. I would very much like to be involved in any continued efforts on this issue.

Looking forward to other opportunities to gather and to accomplish our shared vision.

I was excited by the dynamicism in the group, and both the group activities and the individual conversations, focused on a topic that has great significance for youth development. I thought the Sunday morning presentations were phenomenal.

I too appreciate greatly Barry and Kate's leadership in planning and implementing the conference, and the idyllic surroundings in which it took place. In fact, I was honored to be included.

Most of all, I'm excited about the future and the opportunity for the work done to continue, and to hopefully be a part of it.

I also wanted to add my thanks to everyone for what was a personally transforming weekend. I look forward to the work ahead and to continuing to develop the relationships of new circles formed.

Most especially I wanted to thank each of you--because our experience at Wingspread could only be what we made it.

Finally as for a few memories...thanks to Lily for a great and inspiring story...to those who participated in the circle dance..and to all the thoughtful presentations from the working groups for giving me ideas to think about--especially the idea of a "children's museum" as a space for a learning community of reflective practice.

Dear Barry and Katy. I wanted to thank you personally for all of the considerate things you did to make the weekend a smooth and comfortable one for all of us. I thought that the weekend was very successful in terms of building relationships. For me, it helped to sort out where our work fits in the domain of youth involvement in PAR and/or evaluation, so that I help our group to situate it. It was also gratifying to see that there were opportunities, small and large, for everyone to participate. I think people found enough variation so that they could gravitate toward places where they felt both comfortable and uncomfortable. I especially enjoyed my conversations with both of you as I came to know you, your lives and your work better, and could connect these with my own.

Wingspread Symposium on Youth Participation in Community Research

I do feel strongly that there is much left to discuss including conceptual distinctions, disciplinary distinctions, the gap between research and practice which I feel we must close, and the question of ownership of intellectual capital at all levels. These are serious questions that bear on the ethics of what we are doing.

I continue to be intrigued by the strong opinions one way or another about research versus evaluation or the other way around. But in the end, for me, we have a responsibility to provide high quality educational experiences for youth that arouse their passion for inquiry and make it possible for them to speak and act with authority and with adults to improve our communities. I suspect that this is the goal of most of us, regardless of what language we use to express it.

I wanted to thank you again for offering me the tremendous luxury of 90 full minutes with two highly energetic and conversant groups of people. I think we got somewhere, and it's always fun to be challenged. I do actually love to "teach" in informal settings, and it was very satisfying to be able to do it. I also like small group work where I can sit back, listen and play a strategic small role in moving things ahead.

The capacity of the youngest people at Wingspread to express themselves in a confident, articulate and sophisticated manner is very impressive.

I have never been in a place that provides tubes, bottles, and packages of Bulgari spa stuff!!! Even Bellagio was not so well provisioned in this area. Discussing the bubblebath took up 15 precious minutes of one of the curriculum sessions, but it was definitely worth it to luxuriate in the pleasure!!!

Thank you for forging ahead to bring people together to frame this approach and for doing it in such a pleasant and supportive way. Katy, the issue of the significance of location for the curriculum meeting that I was discussing with you at the end of the meeting was raised and has been addressed, so not to worry.

Finally, opportunities must be made to support the writing of those who don't, don't have time to or can't like Deidre. Her ideas are too good to lose, and too good for someone else to write up.

Thanks again. If you would like or could use additional support for planning something beyond curriculum meeting, I would be happy to provide some input.

Dear Friends. Kim just reminded me that we wanted to inform you informally (!!) that a group met (informally) at Wingspread to talk about strategies for defining and organizing existing and and supporting and making accessible new curricula in the field of youth research and evaluation. This initial group included Barry, Jonathon, Jay, Louise, Yve, Kim, Katie and Linda. Did I miss anyone? We thought for a variety of reasons that the best thing would be to meet between August 9 and 12 in New York, at NYU (mainly because Yve and Jonathon will be in the east at that time). Also others are in the general vicinity of the "east". In any case, I will write up a summary of where we were in our initial thinking after this breakfast conversation. This is mainly to let you know that there is likely to be a meeting to plan future work in this area, likely to be at the above time, and that everyone/anyone interested is welcome.

The topic is important, but I think we can safely assure you that the setting will not be anywhere near as lovely as Wingspread!!

Our discussions from the weekend have been spinning in my head all day. And then this afternoon I heard a bell ringing, and for a second I thought there might be some snacks waiting in the next room.

I was struck by the honesty and intensity of the dialog, and really valued the multiple perspectives in the room. It was a wonderful example of democracy in action -- with people actually listening, and responding, and creating new perspectives in the process.

I'm looking forward to meeting you all again and again in our learning 'community of reflective practice' -- at the cafe, in the various wings, and on the terrace for an occasional dove bar.

Thanks to all of you for drawing a circle that brought me in.

Friends,

A circle is spinning
In my mind
and
in my heart

Looping through
thought, action, and passion

Dear Friends and Colleagues,

We waited with anticipation for last weekend after the hundreds of hours of collective planning, and it turned out as we had hoped.....full of excitement, energy, and commitment to keep the conversation going.

Defining moments for me at the symposium:

- * Ditra's courage to raise the critical dialogue about whether we're prepared to be building a new field.
- * The exhilarating bike ride with Nat, Vera, and Randa to the light house.....I felt like a kid again!
- * Debbie's sharing her mother's wisdom. Debbie, I've taken the assimilation, accommodation, and infiltration routes at various points in my life, and did what it took to survive psychologically intact as a refugee fleeing to this country. Thank you for taking the personal risk and making a strong heart connection with us. I particularly appreciated your insights into the relationship among policy, politics, organizing, and research. It put our work into perspective.
- * Jonathan et al's creative interpretive dance. I never knew you had such talent or moxy Jonathan!

Appendix C: Symposium Program

**WINGSPREAD SYMPOSIUM ON
YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY RESEARCH AND
EVALUATION**

Sponsored by

**Center for Community Change
City Year
Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development
Institute for Community Research
Social Policy Research Associates
Youth in Focus
and
The Johnson Foundation
with sponsorship and coordination by
The University of Michigan School of Social Work
and support from
W.K. Kellogg Foundation**

June 7-9, 2002

Statement of Purpose

To develop specific strategies for strengthening youth participation in community research and evaluation, and for advancing this as a new field of practice. These strategies will include approaches which enable young people and adult allies to develop knowledge in ways which contribute to civic engagement and community change.

**WINGSPREAD SYMPOSIUM ON
YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY RESEARCH AND EVALUATION**

PROGRAM

Friday, June 7, 2002

4:00 *Hospitality*

Welcome to Wingspread

Boyd H. Gibbons III
President
The Johnson Foundation

4:30 *Opening Plenary Session*

Symposium Goals and Introductions

Why Youth Participation in Community Research and Evaluation?

What is the rationale for youth participation in community research and evaluation? Why is it important, and for whom? What does it give to young people, and the communities of which they are part?

Facilitator:

Panel:

Taj James
Movement Strategy Center

Leslie Goodyear
City Year

6:00 *Hospitality*

6:30 *Dinner*

7:30 *Adjournment*

Evening hospitality will be available in the Living Room of the Guest House.

Saturday, June 8, 2002

Breakfast will be available from 6:30 to 8:15 a.m. in the Living Room of the Guest House.

8:30 *Plenary Session*

Latest Lessons from the Field

What are some specific examples of youth participation in community research and evaluation? What are the lessons learned, and future directions?

Moderator:

Panel:

*Jonathan London and Lily Onovakpura
Youth in Focus*

*Hanh Cao Yu and Randa Powell
Social Policy Research Associates*

9:30 *Break*

10:00 *Concurrent Workshop Sessions I*

*Workshop A:
Youth-Adult Partnerships for Community Research and Evaluation:
Making them Work*

Co-Facilitators:

*Alicia Wilson
Forum for Youth Investment*

*Linda Camino
University of Wisconsin*

*Workshop B:
Training Curricula for Involving Young People in Community Research
and Evaluation*

Facilitator:

*Jay Schensul
Institute for Community Research*

*Workshop C:
Research and Evaluation Approaches and Methods*

Facilitator:

*Leslie Goodyear
City Year*

10:45 *Concurrent Workshop Session 2*

*Workshop A:
Youth-Adult Partnerships for Community Research and Evaluation:
Making them Work*

Workshop B:

Training Curricula for Involving Young People in Community Research and Evaluation

Workshop C: Research and Evaluation Approaches and Methods

11:45 *Hospitality*

12:00 *Luncheon*

1:00 *Plenary Session*

Building a Common Vision of Youth Participation in Community Research and Evaluation

What is the vision? What are the particular perspectives of youth development, community organization, and participatory evaluation, and what is the common vision among them? Some participants will present a rough draft of common principles for subsequent discussion by a working group.

Moderator:

*Wendy Wheeler
Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development*

Panel:

2:00 *Working Group Sessions*

Group 1:

Visioning the Field

What do we, as a field, want to accomplish? What is our vision of the future? What are our values, and what do we really care about? What roles should young people play as participants and leaders? This group will prepare a draft vision statement.

Group 2:

Building Institutional Structure

What institutional structures are needed to develop the field and build its capacity over the long haul. For example, do we need regular meetings or annual conferences? Steering committees or national networks? University programs?

Group Leader:

*Jonathan London
Youth in Focus*

Group 3:

Expanding Educational Resources

Which educational resources and training curricula are presently available, and which ones are needed? Which topics and skills currently receive emphasis, and which ones are needed? What would a comprehensive curricular guide look like, and what types of publication would advance the field?

Group Leaders:

*Katie Richards-Schuster
University of Michigan*

Group 4:

Strengthening Support for Sustaining the Field

What are some strategies for strengthening support for sustaining the field? What kinds of support will be needed from private institutions and public agencies, and what are some ideas for making this happen?

Group Leader:

*George Walker
Center for Community Change*

Group 5:

Guiding Principles for Youth Participation

What are some guiding principles for youth participation in community evaluation and research? This group will prepare a draft document with guiding principles.

Group Leaders:

*Hanh Cao Yu and Randa Powell
Social Policy Research Associates*

3:00 *Leisure*

4:00 *Roundtable Discussion*

Strategies for Establishing a New Field

What are some specific strategies for establishing youth participation in community research and evaluation as a new field?

Moderator:

*Karen Vander Van
University of Pittsburgh*

Panel:

*Taj James
Movement Strategy Center*

5:30 *Personal Journeys*

Selected participants will describe their personal journeys, what they are trying to accomplish, and their hopes for the future.

Co-Facilitators:

*Andy Munoz
City Year*

Participants:

7:00 *Hospitality*

7:30 *Dinner*

8:30 *Adjournment*

Evening hospitality will be available in the Living Room of the Guest House.

Sunday, June 9, 2002

Breakfast will be available from 6:30 to 8:15 a.m. in the Living Room of the Guest House.

8:30 *Plenary Session*

9:00 *Working Group Sessions*

Group 1:

Visioning the Field

Group 2:

Building Institutional Structure

Group 3:

Expanding Educational Resources

Group 4:

Strengthening Support for Sustaining the Field

Group 5:

Guiding Principles for Youth Participation

9:30 *Break*

10:00 *Concluding Plenary Session*

Co-Facilitators:

*Barry Checkoway
University of Michigan*

*Alicia Wilson
Forum for Youth Investment*

Wingspread Symposium on Youth Participation in Community Research

Appendices

Working Group Reports

Strengthening Strategies

Next Steps

Concluding Comments

12:00 Luncheon

1:00 Symposium Adjourns

1:30 Transportation departs from the Guest House.

Appendix D: Roster of participants

WINGSPREAD SYMPOSIUM
YOUTH PARTICIPATION
IN COMMUNITY EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

June 7-9, 2002

Deborah Alvarez-Rodriguez
Vice President
The Omidyar Foundation
15466 Los Gatos Boulevard
Suite 109-218
Los Gatos, CA 95032
PH: (408) 399-3800
FAX: (408) 884-2740
deborah@omidyar.org

Amy Bianchi
Research Assistant
Cornell University
212 Giles Street
Apartment 7
Ithaca, NY 14850
PH: (607) 256-7643
FAX:
alb25@cornell.edu

Kelli McCormack Brown
University of South Florida
College of Public Health
13201 Bruce B. Downs Boulevard
Tampa, FL 33612
PH: (813) 974-6605
FAX: (813) 974-5172
kmbrown@hsc.usf.edu

Linda Camino
Senior Scientist
School of Human Ecology
University of Wisconsin-Madison
2811 Regent Street
Madison, WI 53705
PH: (608) 231-1319
FAX: (608) 231-1333
lcamino@facstaff.wisc.edu

Louise Chawla
Associate Professor
Whitney Young College
Kentucky State University
416 Logan Street
Wingspread Symposium on Youth Participation in Community Research

Frankfort, KY 40601
PH: (502) 227-0052
FAX: (502) 597-6041
chawla393@aol.com

Barry Checkoway
University of Michigan
School of Social Work
1080 South University
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
PH: (734) 764-5960
FAX: (734) 763-3372
barrych@umich.edu

Dave Dobbie
University of Michigan
School of Social Work
1080 South University
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
PH: (734) 615-5613
FAX: (734) 763-3372
ddobbie@umich.edu

David Driskell
Visiting Scholar
Cornell University
201 Thurston Avenue
Ithaca, NY 14850
PH: (607) 227-0327 (cell)
FAX: (607) 257-4244 (phone/fax)
driskell@bdplanning.com

Ditra Edwards
Director, training and Youth Development
LISTEN, Inc.
1436 U Street NW
Suite 201
Washington, DC 20009
PH: (202) 483-4494
FAX: (202) 483-1390
Edwards@lisn.org

Patricia Enekwe
Research Assistant
Cornell University
123 Linn Street #1
Ithaca, NY 14850
PH: (607) 256-8758
adoabi@hotmail.com

Connie Flanagan
Professor
Pennsylvania State University
0336 AG Administration Building
University Park, PA 16802

Wingspread Symposium on Youth Participation in Community Research

PH: (814) 863-7425
cflanagan@psu.edu

Leslie Goodyear
Director of Evaluation
City Year
285 Columbus
Boston, MA 02116
PH: (617) 927-2506
FAX: (617) 927-2510
lgoodyear@cityyear.org

Della Hughes
Visiting Fellow
Institute for Sustainable Development
Heller Graduate School for Social Policy
Brandeis University
60 Turner Street Mail Stop 077
Waltham, MA 02453
PH: (781) 736-3607
FAX: (978) 443-8426
dhughes@brandeis.edu

Merita Irby
Deputy Director
The Forum for Youth Investment
7014 Westmoreland
Tacoma Park, MD 20912
PH: (301) 270-6250

Taj James
Movement Strategy Center
1714 Franklin Street #100-405
Oakland, CA 94612
PH: (510) 839-9615
FAX: (510) 839-9610
tajjames@earthlink.net

Secorro Knecaya Green
Youth in Focus
216 F Street #6
Davis, CA 95616
PH: (530) 758-3688
FAX: (530) 758-3550
knecaya@youthinfocus.net

Jonathan London
Co-Director
Youth in Focus
216 F Street #6
Davis, CA 95616
PH: (530) 758-3688
FAX: (530) 758-3550
jonathan@youthinfocus.net

Wingspread Symposium on Youth Participation in Community Research

Appendices

Vera Miao
Project Director
Funders' Collaborative on Youth Organizing
260 Fifth Avenue Suite 701
New York, NY 10001
PH: (212) 213-2113 ext 24
Fax: (212) 213-2233
vera@jfjustice.org

Phil Nyden
Director and Professor of Sociology
Center for Urban Research and Learning
Loyola University Chicago
820 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611
PH: (312) 915-7761
FAX: (312) 915-7770
pnyden@luc.edu

Krysta Oechsle
Mawby Intern
Council of Michigan Foundations
2006 Lake Drive
East Grand Rapids, MI 49506
Ph: (616) 862-0515
Fax: (616) 842-1760
princesskatrinka@yahoo.com

Uriridiakoghene (Lily) Onovakpuri
Youth in Focus
16 Ledyard
San Francisco, CA 94124
PH: (415) 467-3411
lilpopers@yahoo.com

Randa Powell
Youth Activist
Leadership Excellence/SPR
2662 77th Avenue
Oakland, CA 94605
PH: (510) 633-1847
FAX: (510) 267-9772
messiya1@hotmail.com

Roger Rennekamp
Extension Specialist for Program and Staff Development
University of Kentucky
Cooperative Extension Service
203 Scovell Hall
Lexington, KY 40546
PH: (859) 257-7193
FAX: (859) 323-9797
rrenneka@uky.edu

Wingspread Symposium on Youth Participation in Community Research

Katie Richards-Schuster
University of Michigan
School of Social Work
1080 South University
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
PH: (734) 615-5613
FAX: (734) 763-3372
kers@umich.edu

Matt Rosen
Director of Youth Philanthropy
Youth Leadership Institute
246 First Street
Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94105
PH: (415) 836-9160
FAX: (415) 836-0071
mrosen@yli.org

Kim Sabo
Senior Evaluation Consultant
Kim Sabo Consulting
422 West 49th Street #3A
New York, NY 10019
PH: (917) 817-1841
KimSabo@aol.com

Jean (Jay) Schensul
Executive Director
Institute for Community Research
2 Hartford Square West
Suite 100
Hartford, CT 06106
PH: (860) 278-2044 ext 227
FAX: (860) 278-2141
JSchensu@aol.com

Andy Schneider-Munoz
Vice President, Research and Program Development
City Year
285 Columbus Avenue
Boston, MA 02116
PH: (617) 927-2337
AMunoz@cityyear.org

Yve Susskind
Coordinator
Vashon Island Youth Council
10515 SW 110th Street
Vashon, WA 98070
PH: (206) 567-5036
FAX: (206) 567-5418
yve@seanet.com

Wingspread Symposium on Youth Participation in Community Research

Appendices

Jennifer Tiffany
Director, HIV/AIDS Education Project
Cornell University
FLDC
MVR Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
PH: (607) 255-1942
FAX: (607) 255-8562
jst5@cornell.edu

Karen Vander Ven
Professor
School of Education
University of Pittsburgh
5F26 Posvar Hall
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
PH: (412) 624-6945
FAX: (412) 624-7231
kvander@pitt.edu

George Walker
Director, Evaluation
Center for Community Change
1000 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20007
PH: (202) 339-9324
FAX: (202) 342-1815
gwalker@communitychange.org

Judy Watson-Olson
Marquette Alger Youth Foundation
307 South Front Street
Marquette, MI 49855
PH: (906) 228-8919
FAX: (906) 228-7712
jwatsonolson@mayf.org

Wendy Wheeler
President
Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development
7100 Connecticut Avenue
Chevy Chase, MD 20815
PH: (301) 961-2867
FAX: (301) 961-2831
wwheeler@theinnovationcenter.org

Nathaniel Williams
Program Officer
New York Foundation
350 5th Avenue
Room 2901
New York, NY 10118
(212) 594-8009
(212) 594-5918 (fax)
nwilliams@nyf.org

Wingspread Symposium on Youth Participation in Community Research

Roxanne Williams
Director, Lifting New Voices
Center for Community Change
1000 Wisconsin Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20007
PH: (202) 339-9304
FAX: (202) 342-1132
rwilliams@communitychange.org

Alicia Wilson
Project Coordinator
The Forum for Youth Investment
118 East Forest Street #1
Ypsilanti, MI 48198
PH: (734) 485-1454
FAX: (734) 485-0704
alicia@iyfus.org

Hanh Cao Yu
Senior Social Scientist
Social Policy Research Associates
1330 Broadway
Suite 1426
Oakland, CA 94612
PH: (510) 763-1499
FAX: (510) 763-1599
Hanh_Cao_Yu@spra.com

Cheryl Zando
Director
The John W. Gardner Center for Youth and Communities
CERAS Building, Room 425
520 Galvez Mall
Stanford, CA 94305-3084
PH: (650) 736-2064
FAX: (650) 936-2296
czando@stanford.edu

Appendix E: Continuing Progress from Wingspread

A number of important steps have taken place following the symposium. Several participants have written papers on youth participation in community research and evaluation for publication, an issue of Community Youth Development will be devoted to the topic, participants have presented their work in a variety of venues, and many have continued to work for the involvement of young people in important work.

One follow-up meeting of a group has already occurred. On August 13, 2002, a group convened at the City University of New York Graduate Center to discuss curricula and training in youth participation in community research and evaluation.

Attending: Yve Susskind and students Camille Coldeen and Eli Steffen (Vashon Island Youth Council), David Dobbie (Michigan), Marlene Berg and Jay Schensul (Institute for Community Research), Andy Schneider-Munoz (City Year), Kim Sabo.

By telephone: Cheryl Zando (Gardner Center), Jonathon London (Youth in Focus), Barry Checkoway (Michigan), Hartley Hobson and Kris Woolery (Innovation Center), Matt Calvert (Wisconsin).

Critical Issues

The group began with discussion of the meanings of curricula, research and evaluation, among other terms. Without establishing hard and fast definitions of each term, a number of critical issues emerged for consideration in the framing and development of curricula:

1. How do race, ethnicity, language, cultural factors, age, gender and sexual preference and other social issues that differentiate intersect with the twin issues of privilege and power? What tools are available (including theory) to address the above issues and to strengthen our abilities to “cross boundaries?”
2. What does em‘power’ment at the individual, group, and social levels look like and how can it be accomplished?
3. How can we strengthen intergenerational communication and work to ensure power-with rather than power-over relationships?
4. How can issues of program and organizational development be integrated with action research? Where do research and evaluation fit in the spectrum of youth programming?
5. How can we make the tools of social science available to everyone in such a way that the process (learning) reflects the outcome (dialogue and collaborative social change)?

Strategies for supporting Youth Research and Evaluation

A number of strategies essential to programs looking to involve youth. The group imagined that programs would potentially need support in the following areas:

- Planning and facilitating meetings

- Crossing boundaries and addressing issues of power, gender, class, race, etc.
- Understanding how ideology forms the basis for practice
- Advocacy and Activism
- Working with people who have different learning styles
- Research, evaluation and problem-solving methods and skills
- Self reflection at the individual, group, and program levels
- Sustaining lasting youth programs and partnerships
- Stories and examples from the field

One way the group conceptualized these topics were as categories on a website which would have a variety of tools, resources, and discussions under each.

Next Steps

Ideas were generated and progress made on a number of strategies to help programs involve youth in participation. Small groups committed to:

- working towards a writers' workshop where people will come together to document the work being done and existing knowledge;
- pulling together and analyzing existing curricula related to involving youth in research and evaluation;
- and working toward a long-term plan for the creation of an interactive website through which information could be shared.

Appendix F: This graphic was conceptualized by the symposium working group charged with talking about the institutional structures necessary to support this work.

Learning Community of Reflective Practice: A Youth-Adult “Museum” of Youth Participation in Community Research and Evaluation

