

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. A total of 417 completed calls were included in the final data analysis. This produced a 36% successful completion rate and a margin of error of plus/minus 4.8%.
2. There were roughly equal amounts of respondents from agencies serving urban, rural and suburban areas, and 23% that served a mix of all areas.
3. Sixty-four percent (64%) of the total sample were familiar with IYI, and 54% had a “very favorable” opinion of the organization, and another 45% had a “favorable” opinion – for a combined 99% favorability rating. Faith-based organizations had a lower familiarity with IYI (52%) compared to non-faith-based organizations (70%).
4. Youth-serving organizations largely employ full time employees (88%) and this is consistent among agencies with varying budget sizes except for those agencies with budgets under \$250,000 – where the full-time rate dipped to 80%.
5. Direct Service Youth Workers were more likely to work fewer hours, part-time, and in seasonal positions than Administrators; and small budget organizations were also more likely to use part-time and seasonal workers in their labor mix.
6. Direct Service Youth Workers spent 64% of their time in “face to face” contact with youth, and Administrators spent 79% of their time in “administrative” tasks, but each group spent time doing “double duty” – Administrators had face-to-face contact and Direct Service Youth Workers had administrative responsibilities.
7. Compared to smaller agencies, youth agencies with larger budgets tended to spend more hours per week on the job (47.2 hour average vs. 40.8 hour average), employed staff with longer years of service (20 year average vs. 12.9 year average), and were able to retain employees for longer periods of time (10.0 year average vs. 8.0 year average). While smaller budget agencies were more likely to spend more face-to-face time with youth (42% average versus 30.2% average). Larger budget agencies also tended to spend more time in administrative tasks (74% versus 63%).
8. The average overall salary for all respondents was \$39,450. Several categories of respondents averaged higher salary levels: large population counties (\$48,226), large budget agencies (\$55,736), older respondents (\$45,700), and male respondents (\$53,578 for Administrators).
9. In general, male Direct Service Youth Workers earn more money in youth organization than female Direct Service Youth Workers – a \$14,294 difference among Administrators and \$2,563 among Direct Service Direct Service Youth Workers. However, when accounting for years of service, the difference among Administrators is considerably reduced for employees with less than 20 years of service. Among Direct Service Youth Workers, females with 11-20 and 31+ years of service actually earn more than their male counterparts.
10. Overall, 50% of all youth organization employees are offered employee benefits in which they participate. However, employees of large budget organizations have a 70% benefit/participation rate,

and this declines steadily by each level of agency budget size – with small budget agencies (less than \$250,000) having a 33% benefit/participation rate.

11. Medical and dental coverage is likewise affected by agency budget size with larger budget agencies more likely to offer those benefits.
12. Sixty-five percent (65%) of Direct Service Direct Service Youth Workers had a college degree compared to 76% of Administrators. Faith-based organizations tended to have fewer college degreed employees (62%) than non-faith-based organizations (81%).
13. Forty-nine percent (49%) of all respondents indicated that their organization provided professional development assistance at no cost to the employee. This benefit was higher among large county and large budget organizations.
14. The most prominent reason for respondent participation in professional development was for “personal growth”.
15. Respondents preferred traditional workshop/conference formats and schedules: classroom settings and work day schedules, although there was some support for an online format.
16. The average professional development budget was \$8,000 for the entire organization, yet with wide variance by agency budget size (\$22,263 for agencies with \$1 million budget versus \$1,638 for agencies under \$250,000).
17. Respondents reported three primary reasons for engaging in youth work: 1) commitment and enjoyment working with youth; 2) ability to “make a difference” in the lives of youth; and 3) satisfaction doing important work in building youth skills.
18. Factors that might make the respondents leave the field of youth work were: 1) retirement; 2) better paying job opportunities; and 3) desire for new opportunities or challenges in other fields.
19. Over half (54%) of respondents indicated their agency's employed internal staff to manage their Information Technology resources.
20. There were significant percentages of respondents who used high-tech communication technologies (37% used RSS, 39% Blogs, and 41% Social Networking sites). Facebook and My Space were the most common social networking sites.
21. Administrator information suggests that agencies from smaller population counties utilize a greater number of program sites to deliver services.
22. While large budget agencies employ larger numbers of direct and administrative staff, the percentage of administrative to direct staff is approximately similar to smaller budget agencies.
23. A high school degree is the minimum education requirement for 46% of Youth Worker positions, while a bachelor's degree is required by 47% of Administrator positions.

24. Respondents felt most competent in content areas Professionalism and Program Content, and least competent in Child/Youth Development. Yet Direct Service Youth Workers were more likely to rate themselves higher in Child/Youth Development, while Administrators were more likely to rate themselves higher in Professionalism.
25. Approximately 48% of all attended professional development services occurred in Indianapolis.
26. The most frequently mentioned unmet professional development needs were: human resource training, administration and planning, grant writing, and computers and technology.