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The Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation, and Maintenance (RE-AIM) evaluation framework, as first introduced by Glasgow, Vogt, and Boles (1999), offers a straightforward method for evaluating Extension related programs. In this study, the RE-AIM framework is used to evaluate the Kentucky Association of 4-H Extension Agents (KAE4-HA) annual conference by examining pre-existing organizational data and records that include the results from KAE4-HA post-conference surveys that had never been reviewed as part of a comprehensive program evaluation.

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter I provides an overview of the study. Chapter II reviews the history of Extension in Kentucky, program evaluation within the organizational context, and application of the RE-AIM framework. Chapter III discusses the relationship between storytelling and program evaluation, perspective and role of the researcher, the selected research design, data collection and procedures, and data analysis. Chapter IV provides a description of the program being evaluated and presents the results from the study related to each of the RE-AIM dimensions. Chapter V provides a summary of the study, discussion of the findings, recommendations for future practice and research, and a conclusion of the study.

In summary, this study concludes that a preponderance of evidence suggests the KAE4-HA annual conference has had a substantial role in the advancement of the 4-H profession in Kentucky. This study also concludes the RE-AIM evaluation framework is
an effective tool for evaluating programs and communicating the results with program stakeholders.
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Organizational Context

The Smith Lever Act (1914) established a partnership between land-grant universities and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to provide educational outreach. The law established a cooperative extension system, commonly referred to as Cooperative Extension Service (CES) or Extension (Hoelscher, 2015). The U.S. Department of Agriculture and land-grant universities such as the University of Kentucky (UK) and Kentucky State University (KSU), use Extension as part of a system for disseminating information and knowledge gained from publicly funded research with the ultimate goal of improving the quality of life. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (2017), Extension has a presence in all of the nation’s 3,000 plus counties and employs over 8,000 County Extension agents and educators at land-grant universities across the US.

In Kentucky, Extension receives federal and state appropriations plus additional funding from County Extension Districts that levy local taxes. All 120 Kentucky counties have Extension offices staffed with Extension agents who conduct educational programs designed to meet local needs and to address national and state initiatives. UK, in partnership with KSU, employs over 300 Extension agents who work in counties across Kentucky. Agents are responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating specific county-based programs related to agriculture and natural resources, family and consumer science, community and economic development, fine arts, horticulture, and 4-H youth development. Additionally, Extension agents in Kentucky share responsibility for county office management, supervision of office staff, and the supervision of certified program volunteers (CES Overview, 2017).
A major component of the professional development system for Extension agents, Extension specialists, and Extension associates in Kentucky includes professional development conferences sponsored by Joint Council of Extension Professionals (JCEP) affiliated organizations. Seven separate national professional development organizations form JCEP:

- The Association of Natural Resource Extension Professionals
- Epsilon Sigma Phi
- The National Association of County Agricultural Agents
- The National Association of Community Development Extension Professionals
- The National Association of Extension Program & Staff Development Professionals
- The Extension Association of Family and Consumer Sciences
- The National Association of Extension 4-H Agents (JCEP, 2017)

A major function of each of the national JCEP affiliated organizations and many state affiliated organizations, such as the Kentucky Association of 4-H Extension Agents (KAE4-HA), which is a state chapter of the National Association of Extension 4-H Agents (NAE4-HA), is to offer annual professional development conferences. Depending on the location, duration, and other factors, the cost for one employee to attend a JCEP affiliated conference including lodging, meals, and registration fees can range from $200 to $2,500. Current Extension policy allows for agents in Kentucky to use Professional Improvement funds that are allocated as part of each County Extension District’s budget to cover associated conference expenses. During the 2017 fiscal year, Extension agents in
Kentucky who wanted to attend any of the JCEP affiliated professional development conferences were required to pay organizational membership dues using personal funds (CES Policies and Procedures Manual, 2017).

**Research Problem**

Given the vast amount of research published on the evaluation of Extension programs, there is a relatively small amount of available research on the evaluation of Extension professional development conferences (Chase & Kuehn, 2010). Furthermore, the relatively small amount of research has resulted in the lack of an established method or framework for evaluating Extension professional development conferences. While it is common practice for JCEP affiliated conference planning committees to use a post-conference questionnaire to collect feedback, the impact of JCEP affiliated annual conferences is undocumented in Extension literature.

**Purpose of the Study**

The findings of this study will help stakeholders, including conference sponsors, Extension leadership, conference participants, and the public, make informed decisions regarding future conference planning efforts. Furthermore, an analysis of the utility of the selected program evaluation framework will help to improve and inform future Extension program evaluation efforts.

**Research Questions**

The RE-AIM model (Glasgow et al., 1999) is the selected framework for this program evaluation. RE-AIM, as defined by Gaglio, Shoup, and Glasgow (2013); the RE-AIM Model Dimension Checklist (National Cancer Institute, 2012); and the RE-AIM
criteria developed by Workman and Scheer (2012), were used to formulate research questions related to each of the model’s five dimensions and specific to this study.

1. *Reach* is the number, proportion, and representativeness of intervention participants

   • Research Question 1a. *What is the primary target population for KAE4-HA membership and conferences?*
   
   • Research Question 1b. *What proportion of the target population attends annual KAE4-HA conferences?*
   
   • Research Question 1c. *Are those who are participating in annual KAE4-HA conferences representative of the target population?*

2. *Effectiveness* is the impact of the intervention relative to important outcomes.

   • Research Question 2a. *What are the intended outcomes of the annual KAE4-HA conference?*
   
   • Research Question 2b. *What are the reported outcomes of the annual KAE4-HA conference?*
   
   • Research Question 2c. *What costs are associated with attending a KAE4-HA conference?*

3. *Adoption* represents the number, proportion, and representativeness of entities or intervention agents willing to initiate the intervention.

   • Research Question 3a. *How many other states offer similar conferences?*
   
   • Research Question 3b. *Why do participants attend KAE4-HA conferences?*
   
   • Research Question 3c. *Do KAE4-HA conference participants adopt new professional practices as a result of participation?*
4. Implementation speaks to the fidelity to various elements of the intervention's protocol.

- Research Question 4a. *What have conference participants liked about past KAE4-HA conferences?*
- Research Question 4b. *What improvements have past KAE4-HA conference participants suggested?*
- Research Question 4c. *Have suggestions for improvement from past KAE4-HA conference participants been addressed in subsequent conferences?*

5. Maintenance, at the individual level, is the long-term impact of the intervention in terms of program outcomes and, at the organizational level, is the extent to which the intervention becomes institutionalized.

- Research Question 5a. *What Extension policy and resources support KAE4-HA conferences?*
- Research Question 5b. *What is the long-term outcome of KAE4-HA conferences on the Kentucky Extension system?*
- Research Question 5c. *What threats exist related to the success of future conferences?*

**Significance of the Study**

As a cloud of economic uncertainty looms and the call for public transparency and accountability continues to grow, program evaluation will play an increasing role in the development of public policy. Program evaluations help stakeholders make informed decisions regarding future investment of public funds. Programs that do not have data and
evidence of impact have a greater risk of elimination and undermine the ability of the stakeholders to make sound public policy.

Economic uncertainty in Kentucky continues to put publicly funded programs and agencies at risk for future budget cuts or elimination. Societal changes, including the evolution of technology and urbanization also have caused some to question the relevance of Extension (Bull, Cote, Warner, & McKinnie, 2004). Furthermore, Extension in Kentucky is currently undergoing significant organizational change in response to an internal audit (UK-CAFE, 2018). Additionally, the state of Kentucky is facing a pension liability obligation of an estimated $64 billion, and the Governor of Kentucky has called the situation a “crisis” (Bevin, 2018). State appropriations for Extension in Kentucky are included as part of higher education funding in the state’s biannual budget, and the overall state appropriations for UK have steadily decreased each year from a high in 2008 of $335 million to $267 million in the 2017-2018 budget (UK, 2017). As a result, County Extension Districts have faced continued increases in assessed fees for services from UK, leaving less local funding—the current primary source of funds for the professional development of Extension agents.

Extension agents, specialists, and associates in Kentucky are required to evaluate all programs they conduct and share the results with a variety of stakeholders for input. Stakeholder groups include County Extension Councils; local and state Program Advisory Councils; special interest groups such as Kentucky Farm Bureau, Kentucky Cattleman’s Association, and the Kentucky Homemakers Association; the general public; and elected officials. The extent to which Extension programs are evaluated varies greatly. Often the rigorousness of Extension program evaluations is a direct function of
available time, resources, and the competency of the employee to develop evaluation tools and program evaluation plans. A common Extension practice includes surveying program participants about their experience at the conclusion of a program. While some of the data collected via survey are used in reporting or planning, a large portion does not get analyzed. This study design is intended to determine the utility of the RE-AIM framework as a method for reviewing preexisting organizational records and data collected over multiple years and from a variety of different sources.

**Limitations of the Study**

On February 15, 2017, the KAE4-HA Board of Directors voted to authorize this proposed program evaluation by providing access to their organizational database that includes the results from voluntary, anonymous post-conference surveys from 2015 to 2017, none of which had been analyzed as part of a comprehensive program evaluation. The response rate and resulting sample size from KAE4-HA post-conference surveys from 2015 to 2017 limit the internal validity of the findings from the surveys. Furthermore, the size and unique composition of KAE4-HA and the Extension system in Kentucky limits the external validity of the findings from the study. This research is intended to identify trends in data and to serve as a benchmark to compare and contrast with other state JCEP affiliated conferences, including the Kentucky Association of County Agriculture Agents annual conference, Kentucky Association of Family Consumer Science Agents annual conference, and other Extension related programs that use the RE-AIM framework for evaluation and planning purposes.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

 Origins of Extension and the 4-H Profession in Kentucky

The Morrill Act of 1862, signed into law by Abraham Lincoln, resulted in the creation of the Land-Grant University System in the United States. The legislation gave federally owned land, 30,000 acres per congressional seat, to each state to sell. The proceeds from the sale of the land were intended to endow institutions and colleges that focused on agriculture and mechanical engineering. In 1865, Kentucky College and Kentucky A&M (Agriculture and Mechanical Engineering), known today as UK, were selected by the Kentucky Legislature to become the first land-grant institution in Kentucky. In 1890, with the passage of what is known as the second Morrill Act, 17 historically black colleges and institutions were given land-grant status. The Kentucky Normal and Industrial Institute, known today as KSU, became Kentucky's second land-grant institution in 1890 (Kiesel & Thelin, 2003).

The Hatch Act of 1887 further supported land-grant institutions by providing funding for the expansion of Agriculture Experiment Stations in each state. Created prior to the Hatch Act in 1885, the UK Agriculture Experiment Station existed because of a need for scientific research to increase agriculture production and was one of the intended recipients of Hatch Act funding (Kiesel & Thelin, 2003). The Agriculture Experiment Station at UK is part of the College of Agriculture, Food, and the Environment (CAFE) and currently conducts research focused on a variety of topics addressing problems related to agribusiness, consumers, international trade, food processing, nutrition, community development, soil and water resources, and the environment (UK, 2018).
In the early 1900s in rural communities across the United States, a popular trend in education emerged involving the formation of clubs for youth that focused on learning important life skills such as growing crops, raising livestock, and food preservation. A key component of the clubs involved adults working with youth to pass on important information and life skills that helped youth develop in a positive manner and contribute to society. The clubs for youth were similar in nature to prevalent agricultural clubs and societies of the time for adults that had been around since the end of the American Revolution (NIFA, 2018).

One person who started such a club was a high school principal in Ohio named A. B. Graham, who formed clubs for boys and girls. The young club members elected officers, completed projects, held meetings, and learned about recordkeeping. Growing corn was one of the main activities for club members who were supported by researchers and agents from The Ohio State University. Youth used new research-based methods of growing corn that had been developed at Agriculture Experiment Stations. When parents saw the results, they were more willing to adopt new agriculture practices. Researchers at Agriculture Experiment Stations and agents employed by land-grant institutions realized early on that adult farmers were slow to accept and adopt new research-based agriculture practices, while young people were more open to change and innovation. As the corn grew, so did the popularity of the club concept as an educational delivery method, and clubs started in every state. These clubs later became known as 4-H (Head, Heart, Hands, and Health) Clubs (The Ohio State University, 2013).

While Graham is credited with starting the first 4-H Club, their development was a collective effort of multiple individuals over the course of a decade (Enfield, 2001;
Reck, 1951). In 1909 the first corn club, later known as a 4-H Club, was organized in Kentucky by UK professor George Roberts (UK, 2018). The members were all male. In 1912 the first agent was hired by UK to supervise corn clubs in addition to working with adult farmers to increase the adoption of research-based agriculture practices. In 1913 the first female agent was hired by UK as a home demonstration agent who also worked with adults and young girls to form canning clubs. By 1939, all 120 Kentucky counties had 4-H Clubs (UK, 2018).

As a strategy to extend the knowledge gained from research conducted at Agriculture Experiment Stations at land-grant universities and to increase the number of agents, the Smith Lever Act of 1914 was passed that created the CES. The legislation provided funding and created a formal partnership between local, state, and federal government agencies to help educate all citizens on the application of evidence-based practices to improve daily life. The additional funding helped land-grant institutions greatly expand outreach and hire more agents. In 1996 all 120 Kentucky counties had at least one home economics agent, and at least one agriculture agent, and 110 counties had agents who exclusively worked with 4-H Clubs (Hart, Stephens, & Heaton, 1996).

A program, as defined by Rennekamp, Nall, Prince, and Jacobs (2007), is “a sequence of intentional actions and events organized in a manner that results in valued outcomes for a clearly defined audience” (p. 1). Throughout the 20th century changes in programs offered by Extension were reflective of the societal challenges of the time. Extension during World War I (1914-1918) offered programs focused on increasing wheat production that resulted in an increase from 47 million acres annually in 1913 to 74 million acres in 1919. Programs also were offered to encourage the conserving of
perishable products by canning, drying, and preserving. Extension also helped organize
the Women's Land Army and the Boys' Working Reserve to help with harvest during
World War I. During World War II (1939-1945), Extension worked with farmers and
their families, including 4-H Club members, to increase food production by 38% from
1939 to 1944. After World War II, Extension continued to play a role in the increased
adoption of new technologies designed to help farmers increase production. In 1950, one
farmer produced enough food and fiber for 15.5 people; and by 1997, one farmer
supported the food needs of almost 140 people (NIFA, 2018)

Over the last century, U.S. demographics have changed, and less than 2% of
people live on a farm (NIFA, 2018). However, the use of clubs and organizations as a
vehicle to deliver education is still prevalent. Extension has adapted to changing societal
needs, and agents work in both rural and urban settings. Agriculture and natural resource
agents and horticulture agents in Kentucky work with commodity groups such as local
beef, poultry, soybean, and farmer’s market associations. Family and consumer science
agents, formally known as home demonstration agents and later home economic agents,
work with health coalitions and homemaker clubs. 4-H Youth Development agents work
with youth to form clubs around special interests such as engineering, music, livestock,
horses, and shooting sports. Extension agents in Kentucky work with community
development organizations, including community foundations, chambers of commerce,
and other civic groups, in addition to County Extension Councils and County Program
Advisory Councils to address community priorities to improve the quality of life. Beyond
clubs, Extension agents in Kentucky use a variety of other methods to educate the public,
including workshops, seminar series, camp and conferences, school enrichment

Public Accountability and Evaluation

For over a century, the accountability of public funds in the US has been a major topic of both political and academic discussion. As noted by Woodrow Wilson (1886), political scientist and former president of the US, in an essay about the study of public administration: “The object of administrative study is to discover, first, what government can properly and successfully do, and, secondly, how it can do these proper things with the utmost possible efficiency and at the least possible cost either of money or of energy” (para. 1). Demands for an efficient and effective government grew out of a necessity to fight the Great Depression and World War I; by the 1930s, the application of scientific management principles in the delivery of public services was well established (Rabin, Hildreth, & Miller, 1998). As a result of a continued public interest in government accountability, social inquiry spanning decades, and a need for an effective and efficient bureaucracy, program evaluation has emerged as both a field of study and a common practice that is used to examine the quality and effectiveness of publicly and privately funded programs and initiatives in the US.

As evident in Alkin and Christie’s (2004) Evaluation Theory Tree (see Figure 2.1), the field of evaluation draws from different schools of thought and perspectives that are rooted in a quest for accountability, control, or social inquiry, or a combination of all three. The main branch of their tree includes theorists who Alkin and Christie classified as viewing evaluation from the perspective that evaluation is research, and, thus, focused on the development of methods. Another branch of the tree includes theorists who Alkin
and Christie classified as focused on the utilization of evaluation to make decisions. The third main branch of the tree includes theorists who Alkin and Christie classified as viewing evaluation as a tool for placing value and judgment.

In 2008, Alkin and Christie published a modified version of the tree. The authors noted that the 2004 conceptualization needed updating because many of the theorists’ views of evaluation had matured metaphorical similar to that of a real tree. Additionally Alkin and Christie (2008), noted that, while both versions included distinct branches similar to a real tree, all branches are connected and often intertwine.

Extension Program Evaluation in Kentucky

A primary function of Extension is to offer educational programs; thus, it is not surprising that program evaluation has remained a persistent topic in Extension literature, relative to both the evaluation of Extension programs and the professional competency of the Extension agents to conduct program evaluations (Arnold & Cater, 2016). As indicated in the Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies Study (Stone & Rennekamp, 2004), program evaluation is considered a core competency for the Extension professional. As described by Patton (1983), Extension and program evaluation have common processes and principles, share common terms, and are grounded in the need to provide people with relevant information.

One example of an integration of Extension work and program evaluation involves incorporating Bennett’s hierarchy of evidence (1975; see Figure 2.2) into Extension organizational policy. For over 40 years, Bennett’s hierarchy has remained as one of the predominant evaluation frameworks used within Extension (Arnold & Cater, 2016; Radhakrishna & Bowen, 2010). Bennett’s hierarchy includes categorized levels of evidence starting with Inputs defined as resources used, followed by Activities that are produced by inputs. People involvement produces Reactions, that results in changes in Knowledge, Aspirations, Skills, and Attitudes (KASA) and changes in Social Economic and Environmental Conditions (SEEC) (Bennett, 1975). Bennett’s hierarchy has been predominately used to evaluate Extension programs, but it also has been used to evaluate a broad variety of other educational programs such as National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration educational programs (National Research Council, 2010) and institutions of higher learning in Malaysia (Endut, Majid, Ibrahim, & Ashari, 2013).
The use of Logic Models is another example of the integration of program evaluation tools and Extension organizational policy, reporting systems, and culture. A Logic model is a visual representation that depicts relationships and connections. Logic models are considered an excellent educational tool for describing a program to stakeholders and are widely used within Extension (Braverman & Engle, 2009). Expanding on Bennett’s hierarchy of evidence published in 1975, researchers at the University of Wisconsin Extension (Taylor-Powell, Steele, & Dougla, 1996) published a standardized “Logic Model” evaluation framework that included Inputs (available resources); Outputs (activities or interventions); and Outcomes (short-, medium-, and long-term results). As depicted in Figure 2.3, their version of Logic Models incorporated a program theory, situational analysis, an acknowledgment of environmental factors, and an acknowledgment that evaluation needed to happen throughout the program development process. Logic Modeling has since saturated Extension program development, and the terminology is ingrained into Extension culture and reporting systems (Radhakrishna & Bowen, 2010; Workman & Scheer, 2012).
In Kentucky, organizational evaluation capacity-building efforts are focused on helping Extension agents learn about the program development process, as described by Rennekamp (2007) in a series of UK publications. Extension agents in Kentucky are required to use Bennett’s framework (1975) and the Taylor-Powell et al. (1996) Logic Model framework to develop four-year Plans of Work (POW) or program plans. State Extension specialists also use both tools when developing programs designed to address statewide initiatives (CES Policies and Procedures Manual, 2017). The Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 requires states to submit POW
and to document program impact in order to receive federal funds (Lamm, Israel, & Diehl, 2013).

One similarity of both Bennett’s framework (1975) and that of Taylor-Powell et al. (1996) is that they were developed to help researchers and educators plan for and measure long-term outcomes or “impact,” as defined by Diem (2003) and Rennekamp (2007). In Kentucky, Extension agents are required to submit a minimum of five “Success Stories” that include evidence of program impact for the purpose of informing public stakeholders.

The perceived importance of documenting impact in Extension is further evident by Workman and Scheer (2012), who conducted a quantitative content analysis study to search for evidence of impact in published articles in the Journal of Extension (JOE) from 1965 to 2009. Workman and Scheer (2012) established three objectives for the study: to determine the number of program evaluations published in JOE; to determine the extent to which each evaluation study reached level of evidence of impact, as described by both Bennett (1975) and Logic Models (Taylor-Powell et al., 1996); and to identify any trends during the years 1965 to 2009 (Workman & Scheer, 2012). Workman and Scheer looked for documentation and evidence of impact, and articles only pertaining to program evaluations were selected for review. Commentaries on evaluation methods that did not include evaluation data were excluded. To further restrict the studies selected for review, Workman and Scheer developed a procedure to only select articles described as needs-assessment, process and monitoring studies, or outcome studies and reviewed articles only in JOE.
To collect and analyze the data, Workman and Scheer (2012) completed observation forms and rubrics that included publication year, number, lead author’s name, and category of *JOE* article. The researchers screened abstracts for inclusion in the study, used coding, and completed a questionnaire that required each of the reviewers to determine the level of evidence, as described by both evaluation frameworks (Workman & Scheer, 2012). They found 302 articles that met the established criteria as an evaluation study.

The most frequently reported level of evidence measured by Bennett’s (1975) process was KASA Change (29.8%) and Logic Model short-term outcomes (29.8%). Additionally, Workman and Scheer (2012) reported that 88.5% of the reviewed articles from 1965 to 2009 documented evidence above the level of participation in the Logic Model framework (corresponding to Bennett’s levels 4-7), and 62.6% measured outcomes in the Logic Model framework (Bennett’s levels 5-7). Diem's (2003) discussion of the importance of impact evaluation put forward the terms “substantial” and “true” when describing impact. Workman and Scheer used Diem’s term and reported that 32.8% measured evidence of "substantial" impact (Bennett’s levels 6-7), and 5.6% documented "true" impact (Bennett’s level 7).

Workman and Scheer (2012) suggested the findings from their study indicate a need to evaluate Extension programs at a higher level based on the result that only 5.2% reported “true” impact. This logic is consistent with Bennett’s (1975) hierarchal framework and Logic Modeling (Taylor-Powell et al., 1996) that highlight the importance of outcome over process and that greater impact equates greater accountability.
The perceived importance of impact evaluation has persisted in Extension for decades, evident by Bennett (1975); Taylor-Powell et al. (1996); Diem (2003); Davis (2012); and Workman and Scheer (2012). Thus, evaluating long-term outcomes remains as the primary focus of many organizational evaluation capacity-building efforts. However, some more recent Extension scholars have called for a greater focus on implementation, program integrity, and quality (Arnold & Cater, 2016; Borden, Perkins, & Hawkey, 2014; Lamm, Israel, & Diehl, 2013). The call for a shift in focus results from the belief that greater focus on process will lead to improvements that will ultimately lead to better outcomes.

**RE-AIM Framework**

Similar to the parallels between Extension and program evaluation, the field of health promotion also shares common terminology and processes with program evaluation and Extension. Furthermore, a substantial amount of public funding across federal, state, and local government agencies is dedicated to improving health outcomes and promoting health resulting in a need for efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability similar to Extension. One evaluation framework that has recently permeated health promotion literature is the *Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation, and Maintenance* (RE-AIM) model (Glasgow et al., 1999). The RE-AIM framework, or model, was first used in the health promotion and intervention fields as a way to consistently report the results of both publicly and privately funded research. It has been cited in over 100 published studies and used in a variety of settings (Gaglio et al., 2013).

In 2013, Gaglio et al. conducted a study to examine the application of the RE-AIM framework. The study included a review of six databases—MEDLINE, PubMed,
PSYCHinfo, EBSCOhost, Web of Science, and Scopus—for RE-AIM related publications. Since the focus of this study is on the application of the RE-AIM framework, commentaries, theoretical papers, published abstracts, dissertations, chapter editorials, and non-empirical articles are not included. Of the 71 articles identified as meeting the study’s criteria for inclusion, the most frequent topics are related to physical activity and obesity (26, or 36.6%) and disease management (21, or 29.5%), followed by seven (9.85%) on tobacco or substance abuse, five (7%) on health promotion, one (1.4%) on mental health and dementia, one (1.4%) on cancer prevention, and 10 (14%) on other or multiple topics.

The research studies included in this review were conducted in a variety of settings. Eighteen (25.3%) were in the context of a community or policy setting, six (8.4%) in a primary care setting, four (5.6%) in healthcare or hospitals, two (2.8%) in a school setting, and 31 (43.6%) were categorized as other or non-specified. A majority of the articles (44, or 61.9%) included in the study reported on all five dimensions of the RE-AIM framework, four (5.6%) reported solely on one (1.4%) dimension, five (7%) reported on two dimensions, seven (9.8%) on three dimensions, and 11 (15.4%) on four dimensions (Gaglio et al., 2013).

Gaglio et al. (2013) established 34 criteria to determine the extent to which each dimension was addressed. None of the articles reviewed in their study reported on all of the 34 criteria across the five dimensions. According to the authors, reach was the most frequently reported dimension (91.5%), followed by implementation (90.1%), effectiveness (77.5%), adoption at the setting level (75.3%), adoption at the staff level
(74.6%), maintenance at the setting level (71.8%), and maintenance at the individual level (64.8%).

In the study (Gaglio et al., 2013), the authors concluded that, while the majority of interventions reviewed reported data related to the simple definitions of RE-AIM, measurement across studies varied greatly. They expected this outcome, given the broad application of the RE-AIM framework across different settings and the varying integration of the RE-AIM framework into organizational policy and reporting systems. The authors also noted that the lack of consistency across RE-AIM program evaluation was not a critical observation, as much as it was an observation of the broad application of the RE-AIM framework and its utility in program planning, assessing progress, and reporting results (Gaglio et al., 2013).

**RE-AIM and Extension Program Evaluation**

The first documented use of the RE-AIM framework in *JOE* was published in 2017. With funding from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, youth from select rural areas in Mississippi and Tennessee participated in a program to increase vegetable intake, physical activity, and frequency of youth who were eating breakfast daily (Downey et al., 2017). The Jump into Foods and Fitness (JIFF) curriculum (Baird, Branta, Mark, & Seremba, 2003) had been previously used and implemented in a program in other states. Prior to implementation of the program across Mississippi and Tennessee, program staff were educated on the curriculum and evaluation protocols that were based on the RE-AIM framework. According to the authors of the study, the RE-AIM framework was selected out of a necessity for a standardized approach to evaluate the different settings across the two states that varied greatly (Downey et al., 2017).
In the study, Downey et al. (2017) measured Reach by calculating the percentage of youth who participated. Participation was recorded on sign-in sheets, and a valid denominator of the total target population was derived from school records. Effectiveness was assessed at two levels: the effectiveness of the training for 4-H professionals and volunteers, and the effectiveness of JIFF on youth participants. Adoption was assessed by comparing the number of settings. Implementation was assessed by documenting adherence to the JIFF protocol, and Maintenance was assessed at the individual level through a follow-up survey administered to youths three months after the post-test (Downey et al., 2017).

The authors of the study concluded that the RE-AIM framework was a good tool to help inform modifications while enhancing the success and sustainability of the target program (Downey et al., 2017). Since the RE-AIM framework was applied during the program implementation process, researchers were able to train staff on evaluation protocols thus ensuring quality data collection across sites, which allowed for comparison. They described the RE-AIM framework as a straightforward approach that helped program planners determine and document whether they had reached their target audiences and achieved the intended outcomes (Downey et al., 2017).

The need and public desire for a transparent, effective, and efficient bureaucracy has not wavered and is a core value associated with the American form of democracy. Since the beginning of Extension, the need for program accountability has evolved, yet remains consistent. As demographic and social changes occur, continuous improvement of methods used to reach and serve new audiences is warranted. For innovation related to the delivery of Extension programs to occur, Extension program evaluation efforts need
to reflect advancements in the broader field of program evaluation. The intent of this research is to help bridge the gap between the emerging field of program evaluation and Extension that will lead to better evaluations, better outcomes, and greater organizational effectiveness and performance.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Storytelling and Program Evaluation

The ability to pass information and knowledge from one person to another has helped the human race survive and thrive for thousands of years. It is this unique ability that sets humans apart from other species. One extremely effective strategy that humans have used for thousands of years for transferring knowledge, and noted by numerous scholars, is the art of storytelling. A story, whether orally transmitted or in written form, or as expressed as findings from a research study, has the ability to change attitudes, increase understanding, and influence future behavior. The power of storytelling is evident by its uses in formal education and research, in addition to its everyday use to describe and derive meaning from life’s daily events. Stories are powerful and can transcend cultural boundaries and foster universal understanding by penetrating the core of human commonality (Miller & Jack, 2007).

Researchers face significant challenges when attempting to extract a story from data. Bias and reification are inherent in human nature and not entirely avoidable in research. In addition, the process of imposing a storied form of events that are non-storied is bound to include a “storyteller’s stretch.” However, with no narrative to bind the story, one is left with only a chronological order of events (Miller & Jack, 2007). To resolve the dilemma with bias and reification, program evaluators must adhere to the rigors of methodological training, acknowledge potential bias, and submit for peer review.

Role and Perspective of the Researcher

As discussed by Danquah and Miller (2007), emic and etic in terms of qualitative research refer to different, opposing, or coexisting perspectives. In broad terms, emic
refers to analysis from the perspective of a person considered as an insider, local, or native. The term etic refers to analysis from the perspective of a person viewed as an outsider, foreigner, or a transplant. Emic and etic analyses are not mutually exclusive or necessarily opposing perspectives. They can result in different, similar, or the same observations and conclusions. The importance of emic and etic analyses relative to program evaluation is in the acknowledgment that philosophical or cultural perspectives of a researcher can potentially influence analysis.

The relationship of the researcher with the target of the research is an important consideration. The researcher in this study is aware that his scholarly background, worldview, philosophical view on the role of government, employment as an Extension agent, and role as a former member of KAE4-HA Board of Directors could impact interpretation of the data affecting the validity of the findings. As a result of his awareness of this possible bias, the researcher took all possible steps to mitigate the concerns, including strict adherence to established program evaluation protocols and seeking Institutional Review Board approval.

**Research Design**

The program evaluation methodology used for this applied study was based on the RE-AIM model (Glasgow et al., 1999). The non-experimental, mixed-methods study design was selected due to the availability of existing organizational data, organizational support from KAE4-HA, and Extension leadership for a program evaluation using the RE-AIM framework. Furthermore, this research design was selected based on recommendations found in current literature from Extension evaluators (Downey et al., 2017) who have advocated for the application of the RE-AIM framework when planning,
implementing, and evaluating Extension programs.

**Research Questions**

The RE-AIM Model Dimension Checklist developed by the National Cancer Institute (2012), and the RE-AIM criteria developed by Workman and Scheer (2012), were used to develop research questions related to each of the RE-AIM model’s five dimensions, as defined by Downey et al. (2017).

1. **Reach**: The number, proportion, and representativeness of intervention participants.
   - RQ1a. What is the primary target population for KAE4-HA membership and conferences?
   - RQ1b. What proportion of the target population attends annual KAE4-HA conferences?
   - RQ1c. Are those who are participating in annual KAE4-HA conferences representative of the target population?

2. **Effectiveness**: The impact of the intervention relative to important outcomes.
   - RQ2a. What are the intended outcomes of the annual KAE4-HA conference?
   - RQ2b. What are the reported outcomes of the annual KAE4-HA conference?
   - RQ2c. What are the costs associated with attending a KAE4-HA Conference?

3. **Adoption**: The number, proportion, and representativeness of entities or intervention agents willing to initiate the intervention.
   - RQ3a. How many other states offer similar conferences?
   - RQ3b. Why do participants attend KAE4-HA conferences?
• RQ3c. Do KAE4-HA conference participants adopt new professional practices as a result of participation?

4. Implementation: The fidelity to various elements of the intervention's protocol.

• RQ4a. What have conference participants liked about past KAE4-HA conferences?
• RQ4b. What improvements have past KAE4-HA conference participants suggested?
• RQ4c. Have suggestions for improvement from past KAE4-HA conference participants been addressed in subsequent conferences?

5. Maintenance: At the individual level is the long-term impact of the intervention in terms of program outcomes and at the organizational level is the extent to which the intervention becomes institutionalized.

• RQ5a. What Extension policy and resources support KAE4-HA conferences?
• RQ5b. What is the long-term outcome of KAE4-HA conferences on the Kentucky Extension system?
• RQ5c. What threats exist related to the success of future conferences?

**Data Collection and Procedures**

KAE4-HA is an independent 501(c)(3) organization (see Appendix A), as classified by the Internal Revenue Service. Since a majority of the members of KAE4-HA are UK employees, the UK Office for Research Integrity was contacted and determined that, since KAE4-HA is an independent organization, a review by their Institutional Review Board was not warranted, However, a review by Western Kentucky University’s Institutional Review Board was recommended since the principal
investigator was conducting research as a student at that university (see Appendix B). On September 17, 2017, the Western Kentucky University Institutional Review Board approved this research based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a project design wherein the risks had been minimized. This study received exemption from full IRB review based on the applicable federal regulation (see Appendix C).

This study included an analysis and review of preexisting KAE4-HA, NAE4-HA, and UK organizational data. KAE4-HA organizational records used included copies of KAE4-HA meeting minutes, conference registration packets, email correspondence related to request for workshop proposals, and the results of post KAE4-HA conference surveys from 2015 to 2017. Key UK officials and KAE4-HA members also were contacted by phone and email to obtain pertinent demographic and attendance data. In preparation for analysis, Microsoft Word was used to create a matrix table that included all research questions categorized by the RE-AIM dimension and the potential source of data needed to answer each of the research questions (see Appendix D).

**Data Analysis**

KAE4-HA conference survey data from 2015 to 2017 were exported from Qualtrics to Microsoft Excel and SPSS for analysis. Questionnaires used to collect feedback from participants included Likert type, ranking, and open-response questions. Since each of the questionnaires that were used to collect participant feedback was different (see Appendices E-G), Microsoft Excel was selected to compile a list of all survey questions. The survey questions were then categorized based on their relationship to one or more of the RE-AIM dimensions and corresponding research questions. As an example, simple survey questions about attendance were categorized in the Reach
dimension, while more complex open-response questions about participants’ primary
motivation for attending the conference were categorized as both Adoption and Reach.
This step was completed to organize the data and to look for connections and gaps in
collected data and research questions. A combination of content analysis, thematic
coding, and descriptive and inferential statistics was used to analyze the data when
appropriate.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Program Description - KAE4-HA Annual Conference

The Kentucky Association of Extension 4-H Agents (KAE4-HA) was officially formed at a conference in March of 1968. Since 1968, the format of KAE4-HA meetings and conferences has varied from organizational business meetings held in conjunction with or following Extension sponsored in-services to multiple-day, stand-alone meetings and workshops organized by KAE4-HA members (Welch & Phelps, 2008). A review of organizational records that included past conference schedules dating back to 2007 indicated the format of an annual three-day, two-night conference remained relatively consistent from 2007 through 2017. Key KAE4-HA conference activities included:

- Pre-conference Workshops and Tours – Educational seminars held prior to the official conference opening event that typically take place in the evening
- Pre-conference Extension Sponsored In-services – UK Extension sponsored educational workshops that count toward hours needed for professional advancement within the university
- KAE4-HA Board of Directors Meetings – Public meetings held to conduct organizational business
- KAE4-HA Officer Elections and Candidate Speeches – Takes place over the course of the conference that concludes with new officer installation
- Networking and Social Events-Activities that take place in the evenings designed to facilitate networking among 4-H professionals
- Educational Workshops – Seminars offered during the day focused on both 4-H program content and personal professional development
• Keynote Speakers – Guest presenters recruited to motivate, educate, and inspire
• Updates from Extension Administration – Specific time set aside designed to facilitate communication with Extension administration
• KAE4-HA Committee Meetings – Time set aside for organizational standing committees to meet
• KAE4-HA Task-force Meetings – Time set aside for organizational task force meetings that mirror national program task force established by NAE4-HA
• Member Recognition Ceremony – Event held during the conference to announce KAE4-HA awards and NAE4-HA award finalist

Findings Related to Reach

Reach: The number, proportion, and representativeness of intervention participants.

RQ1a. What is the primary target population for KAE4-HA membership and conferences?

According to UK College of Agriculture Food and the Environment (UK-CAFE) reports, 369 Extension agents were employed by UK during 2017. One hundred thirty-two (36%) had full-time 4-H appointments, six (1.6%) held a joint appointment with Agriculture and Natural Resources, and five (1.3%) held a joint appointment with Family Consumer Science, for a total of 144 Extension agents with 4-H program responsibilities. In addition to Extension agents, 15 Extension specialists and associates, 10 in the 4-H Department and five spread across other departments within UK-CAFE, held positions with 4-H program responsibilities during 2017. UK-CAFE also employed four 4-H Camp Managers with 4-H program responsibilities, for a total primary target population of 163
for the KAE4-HA annual conference in 2017. The number of Extension agents, specialists, and associates in Kentucky with 4-H program responsibilities prior to 2017 is unknown. SAP software used by UK for business operations and recordkeeping does not collect or maintain information about program responsibilities (Keene, 2017). According to NAE4-HA records, KAE4-HA had 142 regular members plus 16 lifetime members in 2017.

RQ1b. What proportion of the primary target population attends annual KAE4-HA conferences?

The earliest record of attendance (36 people) for a KAE4-HA conference dates back to 1968 (Welch & Phelps, 2008). Since then, attendance records for past conferences are limited and intermittent. Additionally, attendance records for specific workshops, activities, and events held during past KAE4-HA conferences have not been maintained in any KAE4-HA or UK organizational records.

Based on available UK records, the average recorded attendance for KAE4-HA conferences from 2009 to 2017 was 89.3, ranging from a high of 98 in 2017 to a low attendance of 48 in 2011 (Holbrock, 2017). A comparison of KAE4-HA and UK records suggests that approximately 92 (63.8%) Extension agents and 6 (31.5%) Extension specialists and associates with 4-H program responsibility attended the 2017 KAE4-HA conference. The 98 registered participants represented approximately 60.1% of the primary target population. In 2017, official guests including lifetime KAE4-HA members, Extension District Directors, and other university officials were not required to register and not included in recorded totals. It is unknown if they were included in previously recorded totals.
Based on post-conference survey results from 2015 to 2017 and as indicated in Table 4.1, a majority of conference participants attended committee meetings and educational workshops. According to the results of the survey, the most attended conference activities were the educational workshops, and the least attended were taskforce meetings.

Table 4.1

**KAE4-HA Conference Activity Participation 2015-2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Conference Attendance</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size/ Response Rate</td>
<td>46 (57.5%)</td>
<td>28 (31.1%)</td>
<td>60 (61.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Committee Meetings/% of Sample</td>
<td>39 (84.78%)</td>
<td>24 (88.89%)</td>
<td>45 (75.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Task-Force Meetings/% of Sample</td>
<td>31 (67.39%)</td>
<td>15 (57.69%)</td>
<td>21 (35.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Pre-Conference In-Service</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>16 (26.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Pre-Conference Workshops</td>
<td>22 (48.89%)</td>
<td>10 (40%)</td>
<td>15 (25.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Conference Workshops</td>
<td>45 (97.83%)</td>
<td>28 (100%)</td>
<td>56 (93.33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: KAE4-HA Post-Conference Survey Results 2015-2017 and UK CEU records.*

*Extension sponsored in-services were not scheduled in collaboration with the 2015 and 2016 conferences.*

**RQ1c. Are those who are participating in annual KAE4-HA conferences representative of the primary target population?**

Prior to this study, KAE4-HA and NAE4-HA did not collect demographic information such as age, gender, race, or ethnicity as part of conference registration or
during enrollment. In 2017, approximately 65 (39.8%) people from the target population and 44 (31.9%) regular KAE4-HA members did not attend the 2017 KAE4-HA annual conference.

**Findings Related to Effectiveness**

Effectiveness: The impact of the intervention relative to important outcomes

*RQ2a. What are the intended outcomes of the annual KAE4-HA conference?*

According to the KAE4-HA Bylaws (2015), the mission of KAE4-HA is:

- To advance the professional status of the Extension 4-H professional
- To promote cooperation among all Extension personnel
- To encourage professional improvement of all Extension personnel
- To promote Extension 4-H work as a professional career
- To provide an opportunity for the exchange of ideas, methods, and techniques
- To strengthen communications with Extension Administrators
- To promote the educational programs of UK and KSU.

According to NAE4-HA records, in the spring of 2014 members of the NAE4-HA Research and Evaluation Committee developed a list of intended conference outcomes and goals based on the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competences study (Stone & Rennekamp, 2004) and NAE4-HA’s established mission and vision. The outcomes were identified to establish a standardized method for evaluating the success of each annual professional development conference. Following the 2014 NAE4-HA conference, participants were asked to complete an online questionnaire that included a list of the intended established outcomes. Using a Likert type scale, participants were
asked to rate how successful or unsuccessful they believed the conference was at meeting each goal. The established NAE4-HA conference goals included:

- Deepening your understanding of issues confronting the field of youth development
- Making connections between your local work and the direction of the National 4-H Program
- Energizing you to move the work for 4-H youth development ahead
- Connecting you to a network of people that will support your work
- Equipping you with resources that can be used in your work
- Exposing you to new 4-H programs
- Providing high quality keynote speakers
- Integrating scholarship, research & practice. (NAE4-HA, 2014)

*RQ2b. What are the reported outcomes of the annual KAE4-HA conference?*

The nine NAE4-HA goals (modified for state-level context) were included in post-conference surveys administered by KAE4-HA following the 2015 to 2017 conferences. Participants were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 how successful the conference was at meeting each of the goals, with 1 = Very Unsuccessful, 2 = Somewhat Unsuccessful, 3 = Neither Successful nor Unsuccessful, 4 = Somewhat Successful, and 5 = Very Successful. As indicated in Table 4.2, in 2015 the average response for seven of the outcomes was categorized as Somewhat Successful. Two of the outcomes, *Deepening your understanding of issues confronting the field of youth development* and *Integrating scholarship, research & practice* were categorized as Neither Successful nor Unsuccessful.
Table 4.2

*Success Toward Meeting Conference Goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Goal</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>(57.5%)</td>
<td>(31.1%)</td>
<td>(61.2%)</td>
<td>(49.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deepening your understanding of issues confronting the field of youth development</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making connections between your local work and the direction of the State 4-H Program</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energizing you to move the work for 4-H youth development ahead</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting you to a network of people that will support your work</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipping you with resources that can be used in your work</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing you to new 4-H programs</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a variety of session types</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing high quality key note speakers</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating scholarship, research &amp; practice</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Results from KAE4-HA Post-Conference Survey of Participants, 2015-2017.

In 2016 and 2017, the average responses for eight of the outcomes were categorized as Somewhat Successful, with the exception of *Connecting you to a network*
of people that will support your work, with the average response was categorized as Very Successful in 2016 and 2017. Over the three-year period, the average score increased each year on all nine outcomes, with the exception of Equipping you with resources that can be used in your work, that decreased from an average response of 4.36 to 4.35.

Following the 2017 KAE4-HA conference, participants were asked to rate the quality of the individual educational workshops offered during the conference on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = Terrible, 2 = Poor, 3 = Average, 4 = Good, and 5 = Excellent. Additionally, participants were retrospectively asked to rate their level of knowledge of the topic presented in the workshop or tour before attending and their level of knowledge after. As indicated in Table 4.3, 11 of the 18 workshops were rated as Excellent, and seven were rated as Good. According to the 2017 KAE4-HA survey results, 60 participants evaluated workshops and tours, and 62.9% of the time the participants reported that they increased their knowledge of the topic.
Table 4.3

Quality of 2017 KAE4-HA Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Workshop Quality</th>
<th>Quality Rating</th>
<th>Survey Responses</th>
<th>Participants Who Increased Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share Your World &amp; Explore Your World</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Hatchery Tour</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Bots &amp; What-Not</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Natural Resources &amp; Environmental Science Academy</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Reality Store</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Physical &amp; Digital Spaces</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11 (78.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Boot Camp</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Poultry Cooking Contests in 4-H Food Science</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9 (69.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize Your Stars</td>
<td>17th</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9 (69.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caving Dale Hollow</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 (66.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plein-Air Paint-Out</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capturing Spring Wildflowers</td>
<td>16th</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9 (56.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Session with KY 4-H Foundation</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive Agriculture Safety Day</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATV Safety Skill-a-thon</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking Dale Hollow</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns &amp; Candidates: The Mock Election Process</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5 (41.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-the-Creek Winery Tour</td>
<td>15th</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.52</strong></td>
<td><strong>170</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>107 (62.9%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Results from KAE4-HA Conference Survey of Participants, 2017
RQ2c. What are the costs associated with attending a KAE4-HA Conference?

According to the UK Human Resources Department, Extension agents are exempt from overtime pay, and their salary is based on 260 working days. The base salary for Extension agents in Kentucky in 2017 was $35,500, or $39,500 with a master’s degree. The average yearly salary was $51,764. Internally, 38% of salary is used to estimate the approximate cost of the benefits package. The total average estimated cost to employ an Extension agent in 2017 at UK was approximately $71,434 ($51,764 in salary + $19,670 in benefits), an estimated cost of $275 per day. The average estimated cost of three days of service to attend the KAE4-HA conference in 2017 was approximately $824.

UK Extension agents who attended KAE4-HA conferences from 2015 to 2017, and who worked in counties that appropriated professional improvement funds, could get reimbursed for a portion or all conference registration fees, transportation costs, and additional meals that were not included in the conference registration fee. According to past KAE4-HA Board of Director meeting minutes, the KAE4-HA Board of Directors annually votes to establish the cost of conference registration for KAE4-HA members and non-members based on recommendations from the conference planning committee. The average registration cost for KAE4-HA members to attend a KAE4-HA conference from 2015 to 2017 was approximately $137 per person, ranging from a high of $150 in 2016 to a low of $125 in 2015. The KAE4-HA membership fee in 2017 was $60 for new members, $110 for returning members, and $240 for new lifetime members (retired professionals). For returning members, $80 of their dues went to NAE4-HA for membership dues.
The cost for lodging during past conferences has varied by individual depending on room occupancy and location. The UK reimbursement rates are based on federal per diem rates established by the General Services Administration (2017). During the 2017 KAE4-HA conference, the per diem rate for lodging at the conference location was $91 per day.

The UK reimbursement rate for mileage is based on the IRS amount for allowable deductions. In 2017 the rate was $.54 per mile. According to 2017 KAE4-HA post-conference survey results, the average person commuted one way an estimated 136 miles, ranging from a high of 250 miles to a low of 25. The estimated average around trip transportation cost to attend the 2017 KAE4-HA was $146.88 (272 miles x $.54).

The reimbursement rate for meal cost by UK is a set amount for breakfast, lunch, and dinner based on location. The standard rate includes a majority of locations in Kentucky outside of urban centers. For the 2017 KAE4-HA location, the reimbursement rate for breakfast was $11, $12 for lunch, and $23 for dinner. UK policy does not require a receipt for claimed meals; reimbursement occurs only when an overnight stay occurs, and is based on what time the employee departs and returns to their original work location. Based on 2017 KAE4-HA post-conference survey and attendance records, a majority of the 2017 conference participants were away from their regular work stations three days, requiring two overnight stays. The 2017 KAE4-HA conference registration fee included dinner on the first day; breakfast, lunch, and dinner on the second day; and breakfast and lunch on the third day. Agents departing before 6:30 AM from their regular work location were able to get reimbursed for breakfast and lunch, and those leaving prior to 11:00 AM were able to be reimbursed for lunch prior to the official start of the
conference that evening. The total estimated average cost for one person to attend the 2017 KAE4-HA conference, including registration fee, transportation, meals, and employment cost was $1,410.

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost (Per Person) to Attend 2017 KAE4-HA Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Employment Cost (3 Days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Conference Registration (6 Meals Included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Membership Dues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Lodging Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Additional Meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Average Transportation Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Based comparison of UK records and results from KAE4-HA Post-Conference Survey of Participants, 2017.

**Findings Related to Adoption**

Adoption: The number, proportion, and representativeness of entities or intervention agents willing to initiate the intervention.

*RQ3a. How many other states offer similar conferences?*

According to organizational records, the NAE4-HA had 4,335 members in 2017. The number of members in each state, territory, and providence varied, ranging from 338 members in Texas, 158 in Kentucky, 17 members in Hawaii, and one member in the U.S. Virgin Islands. As a result, the extent to which other states have similar conferences is largely a function of the number of members in each state. The NAE4-HA organization is
broken into regions. Kentucky, along with 11 other states, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are in the Southern Region. NAE4-HA does not keep records of affiliated state association meetings or conferences. Using Google search, records were found, including registration websites and conference schedules, that documented that all of the NAE4-HA affiliated organizations in the Southern Region, excluding Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, held a similar multi-day professional development conference in 2017.

RQ3b. *Why do participants attend KAE4-HA conferences?*

Following the 2015 and 2017 KAE4-HA conferences, participants were asked via online questionnaire about their primary motivation for attending. In 2015, 38 (47.5%) KAE4-HA conference participants responded to the open-ended question; in 2017, 41 (41.8%) conference participants responded. Content analysis and thematic coding were used to analyze the responses. The number one reason for attending in both 2015 and 2017 was networking. In 2015, 31 (84.2%) responses were related to networking; in 2017, 31 (75.6%) responses were related to networking. The second most common reason for attending in both years was to learn about new professional practices, ideas, or techniques. In 2015, 12 (31.5%) responses were related to improving a professional practice; in 2017, 12 (29.25%) responses were related to improving a professional practice. The third most common reason for attending in both 2015 and 2017 was to learn about implementing new programs. In 2015, 11 (28.9%) responses were related to implementing new programs; in 2017, 6 (14.6%) responses were related to implementing new programs.
RQ3c. Do participants adopt new professional practices as a result of participation?

The 2017, KAE4-HA conference participants were asked via post-conference survey what, if any, impact past KAE4-HA conference participation had on their professional capacity to perform their job. Thirty-three of the 98 (33.6%) people who attended the 2017 KAE4-HA responded to the question. As indicated in Table 4.5, a majority (19, or 57%) of the coded responses were related to implementing new programs, ideas, or practices; nine (27%) of the participants felt KAE4-HA had motivated them; seven (21%) responses indicated that conference participation had helped them improve professionally; and four (12%) responses indicated that the participants felt they had strengthened their support system.

Table 4.5

Impact of KAE4-HA Conference Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coded Response</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implemented New Programs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Ideas and Practices</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Professional 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened Support System</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Data from 2017 KAE4-HA Post-Conference Survey responses
Findings Related to Implementation

Implementation: The fidelity to various elements of the intervention's protocol.

RQ4a. What have conference participants liked about past KAE4-HA conferences?

Following the 2015, 2016, and 2017 KAE4-HA conferences, participants were asked similar open-ended questions requesting feedback to help improve future conference implementation. The 2015 and 2017 questions requested comments and recommendations, while the 2016 question included a request for only recommendations.

Of the 46 people who participated in the 2015 post-conference survey, 20 (43.4%) provided implementation feedback. Of those responses, seven (35%) were general comments related to positive satisfaction and appreciation of effort. Two people liked the food, one person liked the facilities, and another person enjoyed the networking activity.

Of the 60 people who participated in the 2017 post-conference survey, 21 (35%) provided implementation feedback. Of the 21 responses, 11 (52.3%) provided general comments related to positive satisfaction and appreciation of effort. Five (23.8%) people enjoyed the conference retreat-like setting, one (9%) liked the quality of the workshops, and one (9%) liked the poster sessions.

RQ4b. What improvements have past KAE4-HA conference participants suggested?

As previously mentioned, both comments and recommendations for improvement were requested from the 2015, 2016, and 2017 KAE4-HA conference participants via open-ended response. Of the 46 people who participated in the 2015 post-conference survey, four (8.6%) made recommendations about the format of the conference, two (4.3%) recommended more free time due to overscheduling, one (2.1%) said there was too much free time for those who were commuting, and one (2.1%) recommended that
paid speakers address the group and not present a workshop or seminar. Additionally, three (6.5%) participants recommended that future planning committees recruit Extension leadership representatives to speak at the conference with possible time set aside for questions. One (2.1%) person recommended that future workshops include information about new programs, and one (2.1%) person recommended that more planning go into preconference options. Three (6.5%) responses were general negative remarks that did not present any constructive value or useful information.

Of the 28 people who participated in the 2016 post-conference survey, 10 (35.7%) provided implementation recommendations. Seven (25%) included recommendations for specific workshop topics related to agriculture, science, robotics, academic standards, ways to engage older youth, how to start a rabbit club, how to start a poultry club, and new 4-H art curriculum. Additionally, one (.03%) person recommended lowering the registration cost, one (.03%) recommended moving the conference date earlier in the spring, and one (.03%) recommended exploring methods for getting in-service credit for conference workshops.

Of the 60 people who participated in the 2017 post-conference survey, 21 (35%) provided comments and implementation feedback. Of those who made recommendations, eight (13.1%) made multiple suggestions for improvement. Three recommended shortening the awards program, two recommended that the association set a policy on bringing family members, one recommended a more central location, one recommended keeping the cost affordable, one recommended increasing the speed of the buffet lines, and one recommended improving communication for off-site trips.
RQ4c. Have suggestions for improvement from past KAE4-HA conference participants been addressed in subsequent conferences?

As documented by the 2015 KAE4-HA conference schedule, no Extension administrators brought greetings or spoke at the conference, as had traditionally occurred at previous conferences. Extension administrators were recruited and spoke at the 2016 and 2017 conferences. In 2017, as indicated by conference planning records, location of the conference was selected based on perceived lower cost, and two in-services were coordinated prior to the conference in response to a suggestion for improvement from one 2016 KAE4-HA participant.

Prior to the 2015, 2016, and 2017 KAE4-HA conferences, planning committees were given a copy of the raw results from the previous year’s post-conference survey. As documented by the 2017 KAE4-HA planning committee meeting minutes, the committee identified networking as the primary reason for attending and planned accordingly. During the course of the study, the 2018 KAE4-HA planning committee requested a copy of the raw results from 2017 to use for planning.

Findings Related to Maintenance

Maintenance: At the individual level is the long-term impact of the intervention in terms of program outcomes and at the organizational level is the extent to which the intervention becomes institutionalized.

RQ5a. What Extension policy and resources support KAE4-HA conferences?

Section 5.4 of the UK CES Polices and Procedure Manual (2017) focuses on the allocation and use of professional improvement funds. Local Extension Districts, when developing annual budgets, are allowed to include a line-item for professional
improvement. The amount of local funds varies, but counties are allowed to appropriate up to $3,000 annually per Extension agent. Policy restricts the use of these funds for attending JCEP affiliated conferences such as KAE4-HA. Section 5.4 states that all other financial obligations must be met before funds can be appropriated for professional improvement. Section 5.4 also states that amounts must be applied equally based on job classification. However, availability of funding varies from county to county.

Extension agents are considered employees of the UK CAFE. In 2015, the college completed a strategic plan that included macro and micro goals. Macro Goal 3 included plans to recruit, develop, and retain exceptional faculty and staff who are leaders in expanding knowledge to improve the quality of life and sustainability of the human and physical environment. Micro Goal 3B states that all full-time faculty and staff will attend at least one professional development, continuing education, or business-procedure training on an annual basis (UK CAFE Strategic Plan, 2015).

According to KAE4-HA historical documents and conversations between the principal investigator and retired Extension agents, staff had to officially request off to attend some of the first KAE4-HA meetings. In 2017, the UK Extension administration changed policy to allow for the use of County Professional Improvement funds to pay for 2018 membership dues to KAE4-HA and other JCEP affiliated Kentucky-based organizations.

**RQ5b. What is the long-term outcome of KAE4-HA conferences on the Kentucky Extension system?**

According to the 2017 KAE4-HA post-conference survey, participants who responded attended an average of 11.5 years, ranging from 1 to 30 years. According to
2017 KAE4-HA conference participants who responded to an open-response question about long-term outcome of participation, the most common response (57%) was related to implementing a new program, idea, or practice; 27% of the participants felt more motivated; 21% indicated that conference participation had helped them improve professionally; and 12% indicated that they had strengthened their support system.

*RQ5c. What threats exist related to the success of future conferences?*

In November 2016, the UK Provost charged UK CAFE with conducting a comprehensive review of the UK CES. The review followed a recurring cut of $2.6 million from the Extension budget that coincided with the completion of an audit of Extension operations by the University’s internal audit division. In 2017, a committee was formed to conduct a comprehensive analysis of all aspects of the UK CES. The review examined:

- Organization – How Extension is structured, including how it is staffed both administratively and at the county level;
- Financial Accountability – How Extension handles fiscal management of both state and county funds;
- Programming – How Extension establishes programmatic priorities and delivers its programming;
- Marketing/External Relations – How Extension defines its return on investment and communicates its successes to its stakeholders; and
- Communication – How we effectively disseminate information throughout the organization, e.g., programming, compliance, diversity, business practices, etc.

(UK-CAFE CES Review Action Plan, 2018)
The action plan developed as part of the committee’s work included recommendations for changes in organizational staffing patterns and responsibilities that could require KAE4-HA to examine their role within the Extension professional development system in Kentucky. Furthermore, the recurring cuts at the university, state, or federal level could impact county Extension Districts’ budgets, the primary source of funding for KAE4-HA.

While the sample size from past conference surveys limited the generalizability of the findings, a majority of people who responded to past KAE4-HA conference surveys have been satisfied with the quality of the workshops that they attended, enjoyed the networking a conference setting can provide, and enjoyed the opportunity to learn from colleagues. Yet, a significant portion of those in Kentucky with 4-H program responsibility do not attend.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The Study in Brief

The purpose of this study was to inform the reader about the impact of the KAE4-HA annual conference, while also providing analysis that will help inform future KAE4-HA planning efforts and guide future Extension program evaluations. As an economic cloud of uncertainty continues to hover over public funded programs in Kentucky, it is essential that members of the public are informed and engaged in the policy development process to ensure the greatest impact of available resources. While it is important for members of KAE4-HA to understand how association resources are used, all Extension employees are public employees; thus, it is equally important to document public value and greater good to society.

Discussion of Findings

Analysis of available data from the last decade suggests that a majority (approximately 63.8% in 2017) of Extension agents with 4-H responsibility attend KAE4-HA conferences annually. While the primary target population for KAE4-HA membership and conferences, as the name of the organization implies, has traditionally been Extension agents with 4-H program responsibilities, Extension specialists and Extension associates were KAE4-HA members and attended KAE4-HA and NAE4-HA conferences in 2017. Looking forward, organizational changes could alter job responsibilities within Extension, creating new roles and responsibilities necessitating a comprehensive review of the Extension professional development system in Kentucky that could change the target population of KAE4-HA annual conferences.
A review and analysis of available records to determine whether or not those participating in KAE4-HA conferences were representative of the target population was inconclusive. Analysis was limited due to the lack of demographic information about past KAE4-HA membership and past conference participation. A comparison of available KAE4-HA and UK records suggests that approximately 36.1% (52 of 144) of Extension agents and 68.1% (13 of 19) of Extension specialists and associates with 4-H program responsibility did not attend the 2017 KAE4-HA annual conference. Additionally, 46 (31.9 %) regular KAE4-HA members did not attend the 2017 KAE4-HA annual conference.

Analysis of post-conference survey results from 2015 to 2017 suggests that the conference participants who completed the online questionnaires were generally satisfied with the quality of the KAE4-HA conference and believe the conferences have been at least somewhat successful at meeting all nine established professional development conference goals. Further review of post-conference survey results from 2017 suggests that the conference participants who completed the online questionnaire believe all of the educational workshops and tours were at least good, and a majority (11, or 57.8%) of the educational workshops and tours were rated as excellent quality. The 2017 KAE4-HA participants who completed the online questionnaire increased their knowledge of the topics presented 62.9% of the time.

The total estimated average cost for one person to attend the 2017 KAE4-HA conference, including registration fee, transportation, meals, and employment cost, was $1,410. In addition to organizational cost, past KAE4-HA conference participants have contributed time spent away from home and family that could have been used on other
non-work commitments or other work-related commitments. Time away from home also can result in additional personal cost, such as childcare and pet care. Furthermore, past KAE4-HA participants have been required to invest personal funds in order to attend by paying membership dues and in earlier years all associated expenses (Welch & Phelps, 2008).

The occurrence of similar conferences in all 12 affiliated state NAE4-HA associations in the Southern Region suggests broad adoption of the use of professional development associations and conferences as a predominant method for educating employees within Extension. The most commonly reported reason past participants have attended KAE4-HA conferences has been for networking and the sharing of ideas with colleagues. According to the 2017 KAE4-HA conference participants who responded to the post-conference survey, a majority (57%) reported that they had implemented a new program, idea, or practice; 27% of the participants felt more motivated; 21% of the responses indicated that conference participation had helped them improve professionally; and 12% indicated that they had strengthened their support system.

A total of 29 suggestions for improvement were received from the KAE4-HA conference surveys from 2015 to 2017. KAE4-HA records reflect that past post-conference survey results were used in planning efforts from 2015 to 2017, and documents indicate that efforts were made to make improvements annually, including a focus on networking and the inclusion of pre-conference in-service. Over the three-year period (2015 to 2017), the perceived success of meeting conference goals increased each year on eight of nine measures.
Throughout the history of KAE4-HA, the organization has experienced varying amounts of Extension administration support (Welch & Phelps, 2008). A review of 2015-2017 KAE4-HA records indicated that UK has sponsored the KAE4-HA conference for the past three years, equal to the cost of the awards banquet meal. In 2017, all seven Extension District Directors attended the KAE4-HA awards banquet that was part of the KAE4-HA annual conference. In 2017, Extension administration at UK changed policy to allow for the use of County Professional Improvement funds to pay for 2018 membership dues to KAE4-HA and other JCEP affiliated Kentucky-based organizations.

Recommendations for Future Practice

Thoughtful data collection based on the RE-AIM evaluation framework, coupled with established protocol for maintaining data, is recommended for future KAE4-HA program planning and evaluation efforts to better understand the impact and role of KAE4-HA within the Extension professional development system. Improved recordkeeping, about members who are participating and those not participating, such as percentage of 4-H responsibility, position classification, and other demographic information consistent with state and federal reporting, is warranted. Additional research also is needed to better understand why those with 4-H program responsibility do not attend KAE4-HA conferences.

It is recommended that KAE4-HA conference planning committees look for ways to differentiate workshop offerings based on experience level as a method to increase the amount of knowledge gained from workshop participation. Furthermore, improved recordkeeping related to conference implementation, such as conference scheduling; meals; and participation in award ceremonies; conference workshops and tours;
committee meetings; and other conference activities will help inform future conference planning efforts and will ensure that future conference participants’ expectations are met.

In 2013, KAE4-HA incorporated as a 501(3)(C)(3) not-for-profit public charitable organization, as documented by a letter of inclusion from the IRS (see Appendix A). As part of the incorporation process, the KAE4-HA Board of Directors established a mission that is included in the KAE4-HA Bylaws (2015). The stated mission includes seven statements. As described by Drucker et al. (2008), a mission statement should be short, concise, and simply communicate the purpose of the organization. It is recommended that the KAE4-HA Board of Directors, with input from stakeholders, reexamine the stated mission of the organization and look for ways to operationalize the mission by establishing goals and measurable outcome to allow for continuous improvement. It is also recommended that KAE4-HA develop a Logic Model to use in conjunction with the RE-AIM framework to help plan and evaluate future professional development conferences.

According to the KAE4-HA By-laws, part of the organization’s mission is to encourage professional improvement of all Extension personnel. Collaborating with other JCEP affiliated organizations in Kentucky and surrounding states may pose as an opportunity to expand the scope and reach of KAE4-HA annual conferences. Non-exempt staff, including Program Assistants, may also benefit from future KAE4-HA conferences. Current KAE4-HA policy does not allow support staff, including 4-H Program Assistants, to join as members.
Recommendations for Further Research

Given the vast amount of public and private resources used for JCEP affiliated conferences, further research is warranted for public accountability, organizational system effectiveness and performance, efficiency, and to determine the ongoing impact on the Extension professional development system. While outside of the scope of this study, it is recommended that future research examine professional association participation in relation to established organizational measures of success of such retention and performance and as measured by established constructs such as job embeddedness (Jiang, Liu, McKay, Lee, & Mitchell, 2012; Young, 2012); organizational commitment (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993), job satisfaction (Locke, 1976; Vlosky & Aguilar, 2009); and intent to stay (Hoisch, 2001; Price & Mueller, 1981) to connect Extension research with the broader body of organizational development research.

The RE-AIM framework is an easy-to-understand approach for conducting an evaluation and can provide a lens for stakeholders to view how resources are used within an organizational context. This benchmark study is intended to spur more research into the application of the RE-AIM framework within Extension. The theoretical foundation of the RE-AIM program evaluation framework assumes that the dimensions of reach, effectiveness, adoption, implementation, and maintenance are universal terms related to all programs, thus allowing for broad comparison across organizational efforts. Further research is recommended to establish universal definitions applicable to Extension and common measures to evaluate Extension programs.

Organizational evaluation capacity is a continuing topic among Extension leaders across the country. Often Extension staff are hired because of their specific content
knowledge related to animal science, horticulture, community development, family consumer science, or youth development, as well as varying expertise related to evaluation research methods. As a result of the perceived importance of outcome or impact evaluation, a majority of recent Extension program evaluation capacity-building efforts have been focused on teaching Extension agents how to develop and conduct evaluations focused on outcomes (Arnold & Cater, 2016). While outcome or impact often is most important to stakeholders, focusing on outcome evaluation first may not be the best strategy for educating Extension agents about program evaluation. It is recommended that future evaluation capacity-building efforts should focus equally on process, implementation, and fidelity. One strength of the RE-AIM model is that it is a comprehensive evaluation framework that includes process, impact, and other measures associated with accountability and research that could potentially help Extension employees conduct better and more rigorous evaluations. Further research also is recommended to explore how the RE-AIM can work in conjunction with other program evaluation tools, such as Logic Models.

Conclusions

Public funding for higher education in Kentucky has been on a downward trend for the last decade (UK, 2017). Kentucky faces an unfunded liability related to pensions for teachers and other public sector employees that has resulted in multiple downgrades of Kentucky’s credit rating (Research: Rating Action, 2017). Obligated increased spending on pensions and debt may result in decreased funding available for other programs, such as higher education and Extension.
Policy drives behavior, and sound public policy is based on input from those with direct impact and from people who are indirectly impacted. This study was intended to serve as a snapshot of the role of the KAE4-HA annual conference within the organizational context of Extension to help inform internal stakeholders and external stakeholders, including elected officials, private citizens, and those who serve in an advisory capacity over local extension programs.

The 2018 KAE4-HA conference will mark 50 years of consecutive annual conferences focused on the development of the 4-H profession in Kentucky. A preponderance of evidence has suggested that the KAE4-HA annual conference has played a substantial role in the advancement of the 4-H profession in Kentucky. Determining the value of that role, as was outside the focus of this study, and is reserved for future policymakers.
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APPENDIX A: IRS Letter of Inclusion for KAE4-HA

Dear Applicant:

We're pleased to tell you we determined you're exempt from federal income tax under Internal Revenue Code (IRC) Section 501(c)(3). Donors can deduct contributions they make to you under IRC Section 170. You're also qualified to receive tax-deductible bequests, devises, transfers of property, or gifts under Section 2055, 2518, or 2522, this letter could help resolve questions on your exempt status. Please keep it for your records.

Organisations exempt under IRC Section 501(c)(3) are further classified as either public charities or private foundations. We determined you're a public charity under the IRC Section listed at the top of this letter.

If we indicated at the top of this letter that you're required to file form 990/990-EZ/990-N, our records show you're required to file an annual information return (Form 990 or Form 990-EZ or Electronic Notice (Form 990-N, the e-Notice)). If you don't file a required return or notice for three consecutive years, your exempt status will be automatically revoked.

If we indicated at the top of this letter that an accounting applies, the enclosed addendum is an integral part of this letter.

For important information about your responsibilities as a tax-exempt organization, go to www.irs.gov/charities. Enter "4221-HA" in the search bar to view Publication 4304-70, Compliance Guide for 501(c)(3) Public Charities, which describes your recordkeeping, reporting, and disclosure requirements.

Letter 4221-HA
APPENDIX B: UK Office for Research Integrity Determination

From: Kolas, Amy
To: Wilson, Michael
Subject: UK IRB oversight of your project
Date: Tuesday, August 22, 2017 2:00:04 PM

Hi Elijah,

It was a pleasure speaking with you about your research project this afternoon. From your description, I have determined that the University of Kentucky would not be considered engaged in your research activities, since you are completing this project in your role as a student at Western Kentucky University. Furthermore, the WKU IRB will provide oversight of your research activities. Therefore, no UK IRB review is needed.

My recommendation is that you obtain written permission from the head of the Association from which you hope to access the data for its use in your research.

Please let me know if you need anything else from our office. Thank you!

Amy S. Kolas, MS, CIP
ORI Reliance Manager
Office of Research Integrity
407 Kinkead Hall
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506-0057
ph: (859) 257-9425
fax: (859) 257-8995
akolas@uky.edu

Please Note: ORI is transitioning to an EIRB process for Exempt Protocols.

***As of June 21, 2017, ALL Exempt Initial Submissions are required to be submitted through the E-IRB portal. Modifications for Exempt protocols will still be submitted electronically in PDF format to IRBSubmission@uky.edu. You are NOT required to submit a paper copy when submitting through E-IRB portal. Please contact Joe Brown at Joe.Brown@uky.edu, or Michelle Hill at Michelle.Hill@uky.edu for any additional information.***

Please click the following link for E-IRB access information:
http://www.research.uky.edu/ori/human/HumanResearchForms.htm#XX
APPENDIX C: WKU Institutional Review Board Determination

DATE: September 18, 2017
TO: Elijah Wilson, MPA
FROM: Western Kentucky University (WKU) IRB
PROJECT TITLE: [1073402-1] Program Evaluation and Accountability: Applying the RE-AIM Model to the Kentucky Association of Extension 4-H Agents Annual Conference
REFERENCE #: IRB 18-068
SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project
ACTION: APPROVED
APPROVAL DATE: September 18, 2017
REVIEW TYPE: Exempt from Full Board Review

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this project. The Western Kentucky University (WKU) IRB has APPROVED your submission regarding data set analysis. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a project design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

This submission has received Exempt from Full Board Review based on the applicable federal regulation.

Please note that any revision to previously approved materials must be approved by this office prior to initiation. Please use the appropriate revision forms for this procedure.

All UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS involving risks to subjects or others and SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported promptly to this office. Please use the appropriate reporting forms for this procedure. All FDA and sponsor reporting requirements should also be followed.

All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must be reported promptly to this office.

This project has been determined to be a Minimal Risk project.

Please note that all research records must be retained for a minimum of three years after the completion of the project.

If you have any questions, please contact Paul Mooney at (270) 745-2129 or irb@wk.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Western Kentucky University (WKU) IRB's records.
## APPENDIX D: RE-AIM Research Questions and Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>RE-AIM Applied to KAE4 HA Professional Development Conference</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reach     | ● RQ1a. What is the primary target population for KAE4 HA membership and conferences?  
|           | ● RQ1b. What proportion of the target population attend annual KAE4 HA conferences?  
|           | ● RQ1c. Are those who are participating in annual KAE4 HA conferences representative of the target population? | Sources: UK Employment Data/2015, 2016, and 2017 KAE4 HA Survey Questions/Previous Conference Registration Data/KAE4 HA Accounts | |
| Efficacy  | ● RQ2a. What are the intended outcomes of the annual KAE4 HA conference?  
|           | ● RQ2b. What are the reported outcomes of the annual KAE4 HA conference?  
| Adoption  | ● RQ3a. How many other states offer similar conferences?  
|           | ● RQ3b. Why do participants attend KAE4 HA conferences?  
|           | ● RQ3c. Do KAE4 HA conference participants adopt new professional practices as a result of participation?  
|           | ● RQ3d. What have conference participants liked about past KAE4 HA conferences?  
|           | ● RQ3e. What improvements have past KAE4 HA conference participants suggested?  
|           | ● RQ3f. Have suggestions for improvement from past KAE4 HA conference participants been addressed in subsequent conferences? | Sources: KAE4 HA Records/KAE4 HA Records/2015 and 2017 KAE4 HA Survey Questions | |
| Maintenance | ● RQ4a. What evaluation policy and resource support KAE4 HA conferences?  
|           | ● RQ4b. What is the long-term outcome of KAE4 HA conferences on the Kentucky Education system?  
|           | | Sources: 2015, 2016, and 2017 KAE4 HA Survey Questions/KAE4 HA Strategic Plan/KAE4 HA Accounts/KAE4 HA Extension Service Records | |
APPENDIX E: KAE4-HA 2015 Conference Survey

Default Question Block

☐ Full-time registration
☐ Part-time registration
☐ Other

☐ Yes
☐ No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task force meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Conference tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ 1-5 times
☐ 6-10 times
☐ 11-15 times

Please select how successful or unsuccessful that you believe the 2015 KAE4-HA Conference was at meeting the goals listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Somewhat Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Neither Successful or Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Somewhat Successful</th>
<th>Very Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deepening your understanding of issues confronting the field of youth development.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making connections between your local work and the direction of the State 4-H Program.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energizing you to move the work for 4-H youth development ahead.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting you to a network of people that will support your work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipping you with resources that can be used in your work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing you to new 4-H programs.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a variety of session types.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing high quality key note speakers.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating scholarship, research &amp; practice.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What was your primary motivation for attending the 2015 KAE4-HA Conference?

Please provide any comments on your experience at the KAE4-HA conference that would be helpful for next year's planning team.
KAE4HA 2016 Annual Conference hosted by District 4

Thank you for attending the 2016 KAE4-HA Conference. Please complete this short questionnaire about your experience. The information collected will be shared with the 2017 KAE4-HA Conference Planning Committee and the KAE4-HA Board of Directors.

Please select the choice below that best describes your conference registration.

- Full-time registration
- Part-time registration
- Other

I attend the Annual KEA4-HA Annual Meeting...
2. I attend the meetings to:

- [ ] To see old friends/co-workers
- [ ] To network with other professionals
- [ ] Enhance my professional development
- [ ] To receive award
- [ ] Other:

Did you attend any:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task force meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Conference tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rank the following in regards of the 2016 KAE4HA Conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Could have been better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The overall experience of the KAE4HA Annual Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilities for the meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Auction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced meeting information and registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening event on Belle of Cincinnati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule and time frame of the conference

Do you have any recommendations for the 2017 KAE4HA Conference Planning Committee to consider?

Please rank the Pre-Conference Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Could have been better</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dinmore Woods</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TechXcite in Action</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelatin Printmaking</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rank the Workshop Sessions on Tuesday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Could have been better</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting 4-H'ers Career Ready</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disguised - KY &amp; Natural Resources Lessons</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Ways to include Cultural Diversity in your programming</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY Themed 4-H Arts Projects</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Escape Game</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography Basics: Rules meant to be broken</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM for the Non-STEM Minded</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverbud Art: Make and Take</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snap Circuits</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game-based Ag Education Activities</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>Could have been better</td>
<td>Did not attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Ingredients to a better program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Clubs Crash Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have recommendations for topics for workshops/activities for KAE4HA offer to support members professional growth?


Do you have any suggestions on how to get current 4-H agents who are not current KAE4HA members to get involved in our association? What reason/barriers do you think exist?


Please select how successful or unsuccessful that you believe the 2016 KAE4-4HA Conference was at meeting the goals listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deepening your understanding of issues confronting the field of youth development.</th>
<th>Very Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Somewhat Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Neither Successful or Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Somewhat Successful</th>
<th>Very Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making connections between your local work and the direction of the State 4-H Program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energizing you to move the work for 4-H youth development ahead.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting you to a network of people that will support your work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipping you with resources that can be used in your work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Somewhat Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Neither Successful or Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Somewhat Successful</th>
<th>Very Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposing you to new 4-H programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a variety of session types.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing high quality key note speakers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating scholarship, research &amp; practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am...

- Agent
- Administration
- Specialist
- Retiree

I have worked for Kentucky Cooperative Extension for

- 0-4 years
- 5-10 years
- 11-20 years
- 21-25 years
- More than 25 years

Including this year, how many times have you attended KAE4-HA Conferences?

- 1-5 times
- 6-10 times
- 11-15 times
- 16-20 times
- 21-25 times
- 26 times or more

**Default Question Block**
APPENDIX G: 2017 KAE4-HA Survey

Default Question Block

If you attended the 2017 KAE4-HA professional development conference, please click on the small blue box below and complete the following questions about your experience.

Please select the choice below that best describes your conference registration.

- Full-time registration
- Part-time registration
- Other

Did you attend any:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee meetings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task force meetings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Conference In-Service</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Conference Workshops</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Workshops</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please select ALL of the conference workshops you attended.

- [ ] Including Poultry Cooking Contests in 4-H Food Science
- [ ] Share Your World & Explore Your World
- [ ] Pro-Bots & What-Nots
- [ ] Capturing Spring Wildflowers
- [ ] Collaborative Session with KY 4-H Foundation
- [ ] Progressive Agriculture Safety Day
Campaigns & Candidates: The Mock Election Process
Managing Physical & Digital Spaces
4-H Natural Resources & Environmental Science Academy
Livestock Reality Store
Recognize Your Stars
ATV Safety Skill-a-thon
4-H Boot Camp
Hiking Dale Hollow
Caving Dale Hollow
Plein-Air Paint-Out
Fish Hatchery Tour
Up-the-Creek Winery Tour

Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop "Including Poultry Cooking Contests in 4-H Food Science".

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Including Poultry Cooking Contests in 4-H Food Science" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics present in "Including Poultry Cooking Contests in 4-H Food Science" AFTER you attended the workshop.

Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop "Share Your World & Explore Your World".

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Share Your World & Explore Your World" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics present in "Share Your World & Explore Your World" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable
Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop “Pro-Bots & What-Nots”.

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in “Pro-Bots & What-Nots” BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in “Pro-Bots & What-Nots” AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop “Capturing Spring Wildflowers”.

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent
Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Capturing Spring Wildflowers" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Capturing Spring Wildflowers" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop “Collaborative Session with KY 4-H Foundation”.

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Collaborative Session with KY 4-H Foundation" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Collaborative Session with KY 4-H Foundation" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop “Progressive Agriculture Safety Day”.

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Progressive Agriculture Safety Day" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Progressive Agriculture Safety Day" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop “Campaigns & Candidates: The Mock Election Process”.

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Campaigns & Candidates: The Mock Election Process" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Campaigns & Candidates: The Mock Election Process" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable
Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop "Managing Physical & Digital Spaces".

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Managing Physical & Digital Spaces" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Managing Physical & Digital Spaces" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop "4-H Natural Resources & Environmental Science Academy".

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent
Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "4-H Natural Resources & Environmental Science Academy" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "4-H Natural Resources & Environmental Science Academy" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop "Livestock Reality Store".

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Livestock Reality Store" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Livestock Reality Store" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop "Recognize Your Stars".

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Recognize Your Stars" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Recognize Your Stars" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
Moderately knowledgeable
Very knowledgeable
Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop "ATV Safety Skill-a-thon".
Terrible
Poor
Average
Good
Excellent

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "ATV Safety Skill-a-thon" BEFORE you attended the workshop.
Not knowledgeable at all
Slightly knowledgeable
Moderately knowledgeable
Very knowledgeable
Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "ATV Safety Skill-a-thon" AFTER you attended the workshop.
Not knowledgeable at all
Slightly knowledgeable
Moderately knowledgeable
Very knowledgeable
Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop "4-H Boot Camp".
Terrible
Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "4-H Boot Camp" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "4-H Boot Camp" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop "Hiking Dale Hollow".

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Hiking Dale Hollow" BEFORE you attended the workshop.
Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Hiking Dale Hollow" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop "Caving Dale Hollow".

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Caving Dale Hollow" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable
Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Caving Dale Hollow" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop "Plein-Air Paint-Out".

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Plein-Air Paint-Out" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Plein-Air Paint-Out" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable
Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop "Fish Hatchery Tour."

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Fish Hatchery Tour" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Fish Hatchery Tour" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects the overall quality of the workshop "Up-the-Creek Winery Tour."

- Terrible
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent
Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Up-the-Creek Winery Tour" BEFORE you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Please select the answer that best reflects your knowledge level of the topics presented in "Up-the-Creek Winery Tour" AFTER you attended the workshop.

- Not knowledgeable at all
- Slightly knowledgeable
- Moderately knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

Including this year, how many years have you attended KAE4-HA conferences?

Please select how successful or unsuccessful do you believe the 2017 KAE4-HA conference was at meeting the goals listed below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4/5/2018</th>
<th>Qualtrics Survey Software</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deepening your understanding of issues confronting the field of youth development.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making connections between your local work and the direction of the State 4-H Program.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energizing you to move the work for 4-H youth development ahead.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting you to a network of people that will support your work.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipping you with resources that can be used in your work.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing you to new 4-H programs.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a variety of session types.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing high quality keynote speakers.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating scholarship, research &amp; practice.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What was your primary motivation for attending the 2017 KAE4-HA conference?

What, if any, impact has your past KAE4-HA conference participation had on your professional capacity to perform your job?
Please provide any comments or recommendations related to your experience at the 2017 KAE4-HA conference that would improve future conferences.

How many miles did you travel (one way) to attend the 2017 KAE4-HA conference?

Did you shop at any businesses in Burkesville, Kentucky?
- No
- Not sure
- Yes

Prior to attending the 2017 KAE4-HA conference, had you ever visited Cumberland County?
- No
- Not sure
- Yes