

The Camp Program Quality Assessment (Camp PQA) Development and Pilot Study

December, 2009 (modified April 2010)

Tom Akiva

David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality



Correspondence regarding this report can be addressed to: Tom Akiva at toma@cypq.org or David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality, 124 Pearl Street, Suite 601, Ypsilanti, MI 48197.
Visit our website at www.cypq.org

Summary

In early 2009, the American Camping Association (ACA) contracted with the Weikart Center to develop the Camp Program Quality Assessment (Camp PQA). The Weikart Center presented a preliminary structure and data collection protocol for this tool, both based on the validated Youth Program Quality Assessment (Youth PQA), to the ACA research committee in April 2009. The Weikart Center then developed a draft tool, subjected this to expert and ACA review, and presented a revised tool for data collection in early July 2009. Trained data collectors then conducted assessments in 20 day and resident camps in the Midwest in July and August. In addition to Camp PQA data, the data collectors provided extensive written feedback about their experiences using the new tool and attended a debrief meeting to discuss this feedback. This data was used to prepare version 1.0 of the Camp PQA, described below.

Like the Youth PQA, the Camp PQA is designed to support a robust assessment process that can be used under a range of conditions and for a range of purposes. The Camp PQA was created to be used in day and residential camp settings serving children 10 years old or older. It has valid application as (1) a self-assessment by internal staff teams, (2) a monitoring and feedback tool for supervisory staff, and (3) a quality metric for external evaluation and research.

The Camp PQA consists of 3 forms. Form A is an observational assessment for program offerings (that is, activities or programs youth attend for a set time with a set purpose)—a typical camp visit would involve 3-5 Form A assessments. Form A2 is also an observational tool, designed to capture a camp's informal climate via a running narrative collected throughout an assessment visit. Form B is an interview protocol for use with the camp director. Form B is intended to capture how camp structure and administration support program quality.

The Camp PQA forms demonstrated high face validity when subjected to expert review. Form A and Form A2 possess high internal consistency and their scales exhibit relatively low bivariate correlation, suggesting discriminate validity—scales appear represent to independent factors. As this pilot study did not involve collection of youth data, predictive validity, or the association of quality items with youth outcomes or reports of quality, cannot be assessed. However, the Camp PQA is based on the Youth PQA, which has demonstrated all forms of validity.

This report contains the following sections:

- Part I: Camp PQA Pilot study
- Part II: Data analysis
- Part III: Camp PQA version 1.0
- Part IV: Camp PQA Usage
- Works Cited
- Appendices

Part I: Camp PQA Pilot Study

The Camp PQA was developed using the previously validated the Youth PQA (Smith & Hohmann, 2005) as a model. Validation information for this tool is available online at www.cypq.org. Interestingly, the Youth PQA was originally developed based on practices from the HighScope Institute for IDEAS, a resident camp that operated from 1963 to 2005. So while the tool needed adaptation to fit the camp structure, the roots of the Youth PQA were in camping.

Creation of the Camp PQA rested on a foundation of several years experience using the Youth PQA for assessment and improvement projects across the United States. A combined dataset containing over 600 assessments was used to make determinations about item reliabilities. Information gained in numerous data collector trainings was also used to make determinations about items to include and/or modify. Besides the Youth PQA, several other HighScope tools were referenced including the unpublished Younger Youth PQA, the Palm Beach County PQA, and several modified Form B tools including the Rhode Island PQA, the Iowa PQA, and the Chicago PQA.

Goals of the creation of the draft PQA were as follows:

1. Respond to ACA requests. Weikart Center staff had numerous conversations with ACA and also utilized information provided from a recent national ACA conference.
2. Fit the [resident] camp context – The protocol and the customized items are intended to fit the unique context of resident camps and day camps.
3. Update based on YPQA experience. After collecting approximately 1,000 assessments over the past 5 years, we've learned a few things. Moving from Youth PQA to Camp PQA, Weikart Center staff removed all items with the lowest levels of inter-rater reliability and removed or modified low-performing scales. The new items and scales were based on psychometric performance of previous scales.
4. Utilize recent PYD findings. Development of the Camp PQA involved review of several recent PYD findings. Namely, Camp PQA includes the SAFE features (Durlak & Weisberg, 2007), a conceptually improved domain structure (big 3 features; (Lerner et al., 2005)), and recent empirical YPQA analyses including a 7-factor structure (Smith, Peck, Denault, Blazeovski, & Akiva, in press), expansion of belongingness-related items (Akiva, 2007), recent assessment protocol experiences (Michigan DOE), and multiple YPQA tools (Younger Youth PQA, published PQA, Chicago PQA, Iowa PQA, Rhode Island PQA).

Timeline

Table 1 outlines the development of the Camp PQA; all occurred in 2009:

Table 1. Timeline of Camp PQA development and pilot data collection

Jan-Mar	The American Camping Association (ACA) contracted with the Weikart Center to develop the Camp Program Quality Assessment (Camp PQA).
Apr	Weikart Center presented a preliminary structure and data collection protocol to the ACA research committee (CARE).
May-July	Weikart Center developed a draft tool, subjected this to expert and ACA review, and presented a revised tool for data collection.
July	Data collector training – all attendees had established reliability with the Youth PQA. Half-day data collection training covered differences between Youth PQA and Camp PQA, details of data collection protocol, and assignments
July-Aug	Trained data collectors then conducted assessments in 20 day and resident camps in the Midwest. Google spreadsheet “issue tracker” used actively throughout data collection for tracking issues, resolutions for data collection, and flags for possible tool improvement. A total of 54 issues were tracked.
Sept	Data collector debrief meeting held. All data collectors attended (in person or by phone). 3 hour meeting guided by issue tracker issues.
Oct	Data entry
Nov-Dec	Data analysis conducted and report prepared

Sample

As shown in table 1, data collection occurred in July and August. Camps visited are listed in table 2. The number of Form As collected was determined by camp size. Form As ranged from 2 to 5 per camp.

Table 2. Camps visited in Camp PQA pilot

Camp	Number of Form As
4H Camp Palmer	3
Achievement Centers Highland Hills	2
Achievement Centers Strongsville/ Camp Cheerful	3
Achievement Centers Westlake	2
Camp Courageous	2
Camp Courageous- residential	3
Camp Crosley	2
Camp Crosley- YMCA	4
Camp Culver	4
Camp Ernst	3
Camp Joy	5
Discovery Day Camp- Valpraiso	2
Howe Military Camp	3

Kalamazoo Nature Center Camp	2
McMillen Program Center	3
Robin Rogers	2
Tall Turf	3
Tippacano Camp and Retreat Center	4
Van Buren Youth Camp	3

A total of 55 unique Form A assessments were conducted by 6 assessors in 20 camps. 7 camps had 2 offerings, 8 camps had 3 offerings, 3 had 4 offerings, and 1 had 5. Assessors collected between 6 and 16 Form As.

Of the 20 camps visited, 11 were resident camps, 8 were day camps, and 1 offered both day and resident camp. Six camps served youth with physical or mental disabilities. One had a Christian focus and one used a military model with uniforms and youth marching in formation. When asked to describe their camp in a few sentences, many mentioned recreation as a focus and some mentioned more specific recreational offerings such as horseback riding.

Information on the quality ratings of these camps is presented near the end of Part III.

Part II: Data Analysis

Data analysis consisted of four main steps, which are described in this section. Empirical findings were used to revise the pilot tool and produce version 1.0 of the Camp PQA. The resulting revision is a tool with extremely high internal consistency—average scale consistency considerably higher than that of the Youth PQA—and a distinct factor structure. Form A began with 54 items in the pilot tool and this was reduced to 41 in the revised 1.0, a reduction of 24%. Form A2 went from 24 to 15 items (38% reduction), and Form B from 21 to 11 (48% reduction).

This streamlining results in a tool that is both psychometrically more sound, and quicker to complete than the forms used in the pilot. This is particularly important for Form B as a shorter interview protocol makes it easier for busy camp directors to participate in.

Step 1: Data entry and cleaning

Data collectors submitted hard copies of all forms to the Weikart Center. All forms were submitted by October 1, 2009. Weikart Center staff entered data into three SPSS files. Data files were as follows:

- Form A contained 51 cases (across 20 camps) and 97 variables (camp and observed session information, scores for 54 items)
- Form A2 (previously called Form B) contained 20 cases and 71 variables (camp and observation information, scores for 30 items)
- Form B contained 20 cases and 65 variables (camp and interview information, scores for 34 items)

Data cleaning procedures included visual checks of data entry as well as recoding of system missing variables.

STEP 2: Examine as-written scales (forms A and B)

Descriptive information for items is provided in appendix A.

Each page of Form A consisted of 3 observational items and one “ambient” item which was scored without written evidence after the observation items on the page had been scored. Each page was theorized to represent a single scale. Internal consistency--Cohen’s alpha (α)—of as-written scales for forms A and A2 is presented in table 1. Interpretation of Table 3 below should be tempered by the following: Form A2 contains only 20 cases, which may make the alphas less stable. On the other hand, these scores are based on a running narrative from numerous hours of observation, which theoretically should increase precision. Form A contains 51 cases; however, in reality these cases are nested in 20 camps and nesting is ignored for this analysis.

Table 3. As-written scales for Forms A and B

Item	Form A α	Form A2 α	Notes
Activity climate			
A Staff warmth	.83	.80	
B Staff involvement	.72	.81	(.79/.85 without B3)
C Personal attention	.87	.90	
D Staff enthusiasm	.88	.85	(.91/.92 without D2 obstacles)
E Emotional safety	.76	.83	(.80/.86 without E1 no bias)
F Feelings and conflicts	.87	.84	(.95/.92 without Famb)
G Support for belonging	n/a	n/a	
Nature supplement			
A Physical setting	n/a	.79	
B Program implementation	n/a	.32	
Learning environment			
H Aim high	.90	n/a	
I Appropriate challenge	.76	n/a	(.83 without I3 staff help)
J Asking questions	.86	n/a	
K Collaborative opportunities	.93	n/a	
L Support for active learning	n/a	n/a	
Engagement			
M Planning	.93	n/a	
N Voice	.87	n/a	(.95 without M2 strategies)
O Reflection	.89	n/a	

Note that a Cohen's alpha of .6 to .7 is commonly considered acceptable and .8 or higher is considered good reliability.

No Cohen's alpha scores are presented for G and L as these items are formatted differently from the items or scales in the rest of the tool. Considered "formative items" these each consist of lists and descriptions of features that assessors checked if they occurred (e.g., "name games"), then a formula for assigning scores based on number of checks. Internal consistency techniques do not apply to these constructs.

A few items were identified in data collector feedback as difficult to score and additionally did not load particularly well in their as-written scales. The following items were removed from further analyses:

- B3: Staff "huddles" rarely or never take place
- D2: When campers encounter obstacles staff consistently use positive language
- I3: Many camper tasks are completed without help from staff or peers

Table 2 presents a correlation matrix for the as-written scales (with B3, D2, and I3 removed). Note this also includes “formative” items G and L. Numbers are provided only for significant correlations. Correlations greater than .5 are highlighted in yellow and correlations between .4 and .5 are highlighted in light orange.

Table 4. Significant correlation coefficients for as-written scales

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
A. Staff warmth		.33*	.32*	.68**	.34*				.33*						
B. Staff involvement			.80**	.66**	.36**			.27*	.28*						
C. Personal attention				.57**	.31*			.46**	.33*	.37**					
D. Staff enthusiasm					.35**				.43**						
E. Emotional safety						.37**			.36**				.37**		
F. Feelings								.38**		.30*	.27*				
G. Belonging										.30*	.27*				.60**
H. Aim high									.38**	.61**		.44**			.30*
I. Challenge										.27*				.28*	
J. Questions												.34*			.31*
K. Collaboration													.33*		
L. active														.37**	.35**
M. Plng															
N. Voice															
O. Reflection															

The correlation matrix presented in table 4 yields 6 bivariate relationships with coefficient greater than .5:

- B staff involvement & C personal attention = .8
- D staff enthusiasm & A staff warmth = .68
- D staff enthusiasm & B staff involvement = .66
- D staff enthusiasm & C personal attention = .57
- G belonging & O reflection = .60
- H aim high & J questions = .61

These findings provide empirical support for concerns expressed by expert reviewers and data collectors that several items in the Activity Climate section appear to overlap.

Step 3: Revise scales

This step primarily involved a combination of factor analyses and internal consistency tests. The goal of this step was to improve on the above formulation by creating new scales with strong internal consistency but low correlation with each other—in order to identify unique factors. All factor analyses were conducted with Principal Components Analysis and varimax rotation.

3a Items from A, B, C, and D in factor analysis

Scree plot (not pictured) clearly indicates support for 2-factor or 3-factor solution. However substantial attempts to carry out an effective 3-factor solution were unsuccessful, largely because items were spread across factors such that one factor could not be realized with existing items. Therefore a 2-factor solution was used. Factor loadings were as follows:

- Factor 1: A1, A2, A3, Aamb, D1
- Factor 2: B1, B2, Bamb, C1, C2, C3, Camb
- Cross-factor items: D3, Damb

For parsimony and usability, these new scales were reduced to the following (guided by systematic internal consistency analyses and conceptual fit of items):

- New A: Staff friendliness: A1, A2, A3, Aamb $\alpha = .83$
- New B: Staff circulation: B1, C1, C2, Camb ($\alpha = .91$)

These two new items correlate at $r = .23$
Former scales C and D were then removed.

3b Items from H and J in factor analysis

A similar process to that described above was used to address the .61 correlation between items H and J. Scree plot (not pictured) clearly indicates support for 2-factor solution. Item loadings are as follows:

- Factor 1: H1, H2, Hamb
- Factor 2: J1, J2, Jamb
- Cross-factor items: H3, J3

The factor loadings above became the new scales:

- New F aim high: H1, H2, Hamb ($\alpha = .91$)
- New H questions: J1, J2, Jamb ($\alpha = .89$)
- Items removed: H3, J3

These new items correlate at $r = .51$, still high but an improvement.

Additional changes

The following scale changes were made to reduce the overall number of items in the tool and remove items that were sometimes confusing to data collectors. Analyses indicate that these

changes do not greatly affecting psychometric performance:

- Remove E1 from Emotional safety scale (α change from .76 to .80)
- Remove I3 from Appropriate challenge (α change from .76 to .83)
- Remove M2 from Planning (α change from .93 to .95)

Step 4: Form B

Table 5 contains internal consistency statistics for Form B. This table shows Cohen’s alpha statistics for scales as they appeared in the pilot version of Form B.

Table 5. Scales for as-written Form B

Item	α	Notes
Program support		
A Beginning of session	.05	3 items
B End of session	.27	2 items
C Support for climate	---*	3 items
D Support for learning	.60	3 items
E Support for youth planning and reflection	.54	3 items
F Support for youth voice	.69	4 items
G Continuous improvement	.77	3 items; nix G1
Nature supplement		
D Camp policies & practices	.67	2 items
E Nature focus	.80	4 items
F Outdoor experiences	---*	3 items

*Scales C and F have negative average covariance.

Some of these scales have acceptable internal consistency and some do not. Regardless, because of the nature of this interview data, we recommend that the structure of form A2 is based on conceptual (or political) considerations rather than statistical ones.

During the pilot data collection it was determined that Form B needs to be shortened for usability purposes. Based on suggestions from data collectors, we recommend the following revision:

Program support

A Support for climate	(C1, C2, C3)
B Support for learning	(D1, D3)
C Support for youth engagement	(E1, E2, E3)
D Continuous improvement	(G2, G3, G4)

This would remove the following items: A1, A2, A3, B1, B2, D2, and G1.

Part III. Camp PQA version 1.0

This section presents information about the revised version 1.0 of the Camp PQA—the version suggested by data analyses and provided with this report. Table 6 contains internal consistency statistics for the refined scale described above.

Table 6. Scale information for Camp PQA 1.0

Item	A α	A2 α	B α	Items
Activity climate				
A Staff friendliness	.83	.80	n/a	A1, A2, A3, Aamb
B Staff circulation	.91	.94	n/a	B1, C1, C2, Camb
C Emotional safety	.80	.86	n/a	E2, E3, Eamb
D Feelings and conflicts	.87	.84	n/a	F1, F2, F3, Famb
E Support for belonging	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Learning environment				
F Aim high	.91	n/a	n/a	H1, H2, Hamb
G Appropriate challenge	.83	n/a	n/a	I1, I2, Iamb
H Asking questions	.89	n/a	n/a	J1, J2, Jamb
I Collaborative opportunities	.93	n/a	n/a	K1, K2, K3, Kamb
J Support for active learning	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Engagement				
K Planning	.95	n/a	n/a	M1, M3, Mamb
L Voice	.87	n/a	n/a	N1, N2, N3, Namb
M Reflection	.89	n/a	n/a	O1, O2, O3, Oamb
Program Support				
A Support for climate	n/a	n/a	---*	C1, C2, C3
B Support for learning	n/a	n/a	.35	D1, D3
C Support for youth engagement	n/a	n/a	.54	E1, E2, E3
D Continuous improvement	n/a	n/a	.77	G2, G3, G4
Nature supplement				
A Physical setting	n/a	.79	n/a	NA1, NA2
B Program implementation	n/a	.32	n/a	NB1, NB2, NB3, NB4
C Open-ended questions	n/a	n/a	n/a	
D Camp policies & practices	n/a	n/a	.67	ND1, ND2
E Nature focus	n/a	n/a	.80	NE1, NE2, NE3, NE4
F Outdoor experiences	n/a	n/a	---*	NF1, NF2, NF3

* Noted items exhibit negative average covariance.

Table 7 shows correlations for scales in revised Form A. Correlation coefficients above $r = 0.5$ are highlighted in yellow and those between $r = 0.4$ and 0.5 are shaded light orange.

Table 7. Significant correlations for scales in Camp PQA 1.0

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
A. Staff friendliness			.38**				.33*						
B. Staff circulation						.41**							
C. Emotional safety				.33*							-.38**		
D. Feelings							.36**						
E. Belonging						.36**		.36**	.27*				.60**
F. Aim high							.43**	.51**		.40**			.34*
G. Challenge												.28*	
H. Questions									.32*	.37**			.36**
I. Collaboration											.34*	.30*	
J. Active learning												.37**	
K. Planning													.32*
L. Voice													
M. Reflection													

Appendix B contains within-domain factor analyses which provides further evidence that these scales are statistically sound.

Domains in version 1.0

We do not expect domains to exhibit as high of internal consistency as scales. In this sense, domains, as second order scales, are of secondary importance. It is the scales that represent single, discriminate constructs, with items as multiple overlapping indicators for each of those constructs. The scales are really the ‘things’ that the PQA assesses. However, domains provide a useful way for users to group the scales in their head.

For domains, internal consistency was computed as follows. Item D was left out due to a high amount of missing data. Items E and I were left out as these items were in a different format than the rest and this may have affected second order factor analyses. Internal consistency is as follows:

- Activity climate (items A-C): .51
- Learning climate (items F-I): .63
- Engagement (items K-M): .29

These statistics are adequate for the first two domains. The engagement statistic is low, which is somewhat surprising as these items load together at a higher rate in out-of-school time data sets with very similar items. Nevertheless a factor analysis of scales did not yield any better solutions than the above.

Consequently we believe that there is adequate justification to use the domains as printed. As with the Youth PQA this will provide usability benefits. While a total score constructed with domains (items averaged into scales averaged into domains averaged into total score) may contain slightly more error than some other calculation (e.g., items averaged into scales averaged into total score)—as the scales are un-weighted, this is an empirical question. In other words, we have no strong evidence not to use the domains as printed and they are useful to use.

Quality of camps in the pilot

The following information was calculated using the new scale structures described above. Domain scores are computed by averaging their respective items. Total Form A score is an average of the 3 Form A domain scores. Total Camp score is an average of the three form scores. Nature supplement is computed separately and is an average of 3 scales in form A2 and 2 in Form B.

Note that the formula used below are not necessarily the final way scores should be computed—this should be decided in partnership with ACA, and can be done for conceptual reasons in the absence of pertinent empirical data. For example, ACA may decide to weight the informal climate score more and double it’s weight in total camp score calculations.

Table 8. Descriptive information for domain and total score in pilot

	N	Range	M	SD
Form A				
I. Activity climate	55	2.32 - 5.00	3.87	0.57
II. Learning climate	55	1.27 - 5.00	2.76	0.88
III. Engagement	55	1.00 - 4.72	1.82	0.69
Total Form A score	55	1.86 - 4.59	2.82	0.53
Form A2				
IV. Informal climate	20	2.44 – 5.00	4.12	0.82
Form B				
V. Program support	20	2.33 – 4.83	3.81	0.71
Nature supplement	20	2.57 – 4.60	3.63	0.55

Part IV. Using the Youth PQA

Introduction

This section details the external assessment protocol for using the Camp PQA. Program Self-Assessment practices will be developed in partnership with the ACA.

The Camp PQA is based on the High/Scope Youth Program Quality Assessment (Youth PQA), which was scientifically validated in 2004. The Camp PQA also benefits from 5 years of experience using the Youth PQA in youth program networks across the United States. The Youth PQA dataset used to make psychometric-based decisions in the development of the Camp PQA contains over 600 observations.

Like the Youth PQA, the Camp PQA is designed to support a robust assessment process that can be used under a range of conditions and for a range of purposes:

- The Camp PQA can be used in a wide variety of day and residential camp settings serving children 10 years old or older
- The Camp PQA is flexible enough to have valid application as (1) a self-assessment by internal staff teams, (2) a monitoring and feedback tool for supervisory staff, and (3) a quality metric for external evaluation and research
- The Camp PQA can be purchased and used by untrained staff (although training is recommended for first time users)
- The Camp PQA and supporting services are available at low cost.

The Camp PQA consists of 3 forms:

- FORM A: Program offerings. This observational form is designed for programs that youth attend for a set time with a set purpose. These may be referred to as programs, clubs, workshops, classes, etc. An example: arts & crafts 10:30 to noon on Tuesday. Data collectors will observe and score 3-5 program offerings (45-90 minutes each) in an assessment visit.
- FORM A2: Informal climate. This observational form is designed to capture youth experiences in non-program offering times. Examples include meal times, transition times, room group time. Data collectors will score 3-5 informal time observations (10 minutes each) in an assessment visit.
- FORM B: Camp structure and administration. This form is intended to capture how camp structure and administration support program quality. Data collectors interview the camp director (30-60 minutes) or other appropriate person.

Here's an overview of the three forms. The five domains are listed with Roman numeral labels. Each domain contains 2-7 scales. Each scale contains 2-4 items (not listed here).

FORM A Program offering (observations)	FORM A2 Informal climate (running observation)	FORM B Camp structure & administration (director interview)
I. Activity climate A Staff Friendliness B Staff circulation C Emotional safety D Feelings and conflicts E Support for belonging II. Learning environment F Aim high G Appropriate challenge H Asking questions I Collaborative opportunities J Support for active learning III. Engagement K Planning L Voice M Reflection	IV. Informal climate A Staff friendliness B Staff circulation C Emotional safety D Feelings and conflicts Nature supplement (obs) A Physical setting B Program implementation	V. Program support A Support for climate B Support for learning C Support for youth engagement D Continuous improvement Nature supplement (int) C Open-ended questions D Camp policies & practices E Nature focus F Outdoor experiences

Data Collection Protocol

The table below provides an at-a-glance view of data collection for resident and day camp visits. Note that day camp visits may involve less data collection because of logistics of the assessor visits—the residential experience (e.g. evening and night-time) is included in resident camp visits. Typical resident visits involve 3-4 program offerings and 3-4 mini-observations; typical day camp visits have 2-3 of each.

	Data	Time	Domains
Form A	Narratives 2-4 Program offerings	45-90 min each	I. Activity Climate (5 scales) II. Learning environment (5 scales) III. Youth engagement (3 scales)
Form a2	Running Narrative walkthrough 2-4 mini-observations miscellaneous observations	Ongoing	IV. Informal climate (4 scales) Nature supplement (2 scales)
Form b	Director interview	30-60 min	V. Program Support (4 scales) Nature supplement (4 scales)

The next few pages provide more in-depth info on how to complete the Camp PQA.

Step-by-Step

Your data collection assignment sheet will tell you how many program offerings and informal time mini-observations are required. Follow these steps for a full camp assessment. Note that you are free to bring a laptop for collecting narrative data if that is preferable to you. Just watch out for rain and poison ivy.

The following steps detail the data collection. Note that steps 2-4 can happen in any order.

STEP 1. SET UP VISIT

- Contact camp director
- Confirm dates & times.
- Describe the visit (program offerings, informal times, interview, walkthrough, other)
- Establish what you'll observe if possible
- Complete frontmatter in Form B if possible (can happen in interview but great to get out of the way before the visit).

STEP 2. COLLECT FORM A DATA – PROGRAM OFFERINGS

- Visit program offerings (3-4 resident camp; 2 day camp) – one might be a full camp activity (e.g. evening program).
- If possible each should last 45-90 mins.
- Complete form A for each after the observations.

Form A is for observations of discrete “program offerings”. You should plan to stay for the duration of the program offering if possible—in general, plan for 45-90 minutes.

Arrive before the program offering begins, introduce yourself to staff, and find a place to conduct unobtrusive observations. Observe the entire program offering and take extensive notes. You may wish to glance at the overview sheet in this document or pages of the Camp PQA sometimes during this observation but you should not score items.

Note, in a resident camp observation in which you are conducting 3 or 4 Form As in 1 or 2 days, it is critical that you complete the forms as soon as possible after the observations. It's important to keep the observations separate. Because of this, ideally it would be great if you have a chance to complete one form before starting another observation but you often won't have a chance to do this so just get the scoring done before the memories fade.

STEP 3. COLLECT FORM A2 DATA – RUNNING OBSERVATION

- Collect notes whenever you can. Make sure to include:
 - ⇒ Mini-observations—You should observe 2-4 mini-observations (per your data collection sheet) but more are better. Do as many mini-observations as you can. These should typically last 10-15 minutes but may be shorter. Scenes you might watch include transition times, meal times, room groups, and unscheduled “free” time. Room groups are particularly good candidates for mini-observations.
 - ⇒ Walk through—Ask the director for a tour of the camp—the director may lead this or a staff or youth may. This may be the first thing you do upon arriving.

⇒ Miscellaneous—Anything interesting or relevant that occurs in your presence anything is fair game for the running narrative. Keep your eyes and ears open for relevant observations.

The informal time instrument is intended to catch things that Form A might not. It is scored with a running narrative—an ongoing record of notes. Anything you observe outside of program offerings is fair game for this running narrative. This would include events that you observe during a program offering that are not part of that program offering (for example kids pushing each other in the transition time before the program offering begins, or loud happy cheering from a group walking by the program offering).

STEP 4. INTERVIEW DIRECTOR FOR FORM B

- Interview director -- approx 30-60 minutes
- Complete scores *after* the interview

At some point during your visit you will need to sit down with the camp director for a half hour or hour. If the camp has a “program director” or “activities director” they may be more appropriate for this interview than an executive director. Most of the questions are focused on “program”. So try to get the most appropriate person.

We’ve tried to keep the interview as short as possible—both because you have a lot of assessing to do and because camp directors tend to be pretty busy. This is the only Form where you actually use the form during the data collection.

Here are the details

- ⇒ Start with the Camp Information questions on page 2 (these can even be collected before you physically arrive).
- ⇒ Go through page by page:
- ⇒ Ask the standard questions as they are written. You may restate or modify a question—but try to keep this to a minimum. The goal for each question is to get enough information to later be able to score the item.
- ⇒ Write down the answer in the space provided but do not score in the presence of the camp director.
- ⇒ Some time after the interview is over go back through and mark scores.

STEP 5. SCORE AND MAKE NOTES FOR A REPORT

A single camp visit involves a lot of data collection. Try to make use of your time in order to complete scoring as close to observations or the interview as possible.

Works Cited

- Akiva, T. (2007). Unpacking belongingness in youth programs, independent research project. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Durlak, J. A., & Weisberg, R. P. (2007). *The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills*. Chicago, IL.: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.
- Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., Almerigi, J. B., Theokas, C., Phelps, E., Gestsdottir, S., et al. (2005). Positive youth development, participation in community youth development programs, and community contributions fo fifth-grade adolesecents: Findings for the first wave of the 4-H study of positive youth development. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 25(1), 17-71.
- Smith, C., & Hohmann, C. (2005). *Full findings from the Youth PQA validation study*. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.
- Smith, C., Peck, S. J., Denault, A., Blazeovski, J., & Akiva, T. (in press). Quality at the point of service: Profiles of practice in afterschool settings. *American Journal of Community Psychology*.

Appendix A: Item Distributions in Pilot Study

Note: Only items in Camp PQA 1.0 are presented

Table A1: Form A

	N	M	SD	Skew
IA.1. Staff mainly use a warm tone of voice and respectful language.	55	4.71	.712	-2.068
IA.2. Staff generally smile, use friendly gestures, and make eye contact.	55	4.56	.918	-1.982
IA.3. When campers approach them, staff never exhibit non-attentive behaviors.	55	4.56	.918	-1.982
IA.AMB. Staff appear to like the campers they' re working with.	53	4.34	.939	-1.467
IB.1. Staff circulate (and spread out if multiple staff) to interact with every camper...	55	4.02	1.484	-1.160
IB.2. Staff spend almost the entire activity time working side-byside with campers.	55	3.91	1.578	-1.018
IB.3. Staff "huddles" rarely or never take place.	49	4.39	1.169	-1.796
IB.AMB. All staff are engaged with campers all the time.	52	3.96	1.084	-.882
IC.1. Staff interact one-on-one at least once with every (or almost every) camper...	55	3.76	1.563	-.799
IC.2. Staff are actively involved with each camper (e.g., they provide directions...	55	4.16	1.067	-.718
IC.3. Staff support contributions or accomplishments of campers by acknowledging...	55	3.33	1.428	-.251
IC.AMB. Each camper experiences personal attention from staff.	53	3.68	1.123	-.426
ID.1. All staff are enthusiastic (animated, excited) with campers most of the time.	55	4.05	1.208	-.892
ID.2. When campers encounter obstacles (e.g., rain, challenge or problem, conflict)...	53	4.32	1.237	-1.661
ID.3. All staff consistently express enthusiasm about program offering and/or camp...	55	4.05	1.433	-1.197
ID.AMB. Staff appear to enjoy interacting with campers.	51	3.96	1.280	-.817
IE.1. There are no biased comments based on religion, ethnicity, class, gender...	55	4.89	.458	-4.034
IE.2. There are no incidents in which a camper or campers are made fun of or every...	55	4.85	.650	-4.882
IE.3. Staff shows respect for all campers and insists that campers show respect...	55	4.60	1.116	-2.711
IE.AMB. Campers appear to feel free to be themselves.	53	4.62	.837	-2.039
IF.1. Every time there is a conflict or an incident involving strong feelings...	55	6.64	1.095	-3.613
IF.2. In a conflict situation, adults ask the campers what happened.	55	6.64	1.223	-3.925
IF.3. When strong feelings are involved, staff consistently help campers...	55	6.56	1.316	-3.381
IF.AMB. Staff handle campers' feelings and conflicts supportively.	55	7.36	2.304	-1.001
IIH.1. All campers are encouraged to try out new skills or attempt higher...	55	2.96	1.784	.036
IIH.2. Staff provide intentional opportunities for development of specific skills...	55	2.71	1.739	.292
IIH.3. Staff explicitly name particular skills or goals to be addressed during...	55	2.42	1.707	.608
IIH.AMB. The staff has high expectations for campers.	51	2.73	1.401	.196
Iii.1. There is sufficient time for all of the activities (e.g., campers do not appear...	55	3.73	1.604	-.765
Iii.2. Activities are appropriately challenging (not too easy, not too hard) for all ...	55	4.05	1.145	-.724
Iii.3. Many camper tasks are completed with help from staff or peers.	55	3.87	1.479	-.914
Iii.AMB. Campers seem challenged (in a good way) by the activities.	54	3.57	1.175	-.040
III.1. Staff ask 3 or more open-ended questions (i.e., questions without...	55	2.31	1.550	.697

IIJ.2. Staff ask 3 or more challenging questions (i.e., questions that make campers...	55	1.95	1.483	1.227
IIJ.3. Staff spend more than 30 seconds each with more than half of the individual...	55	2.27	1.604	.765
IIJ.AMB. Staff uses questions effectively with campers.	54	2.13	1.245	1.087
IIK.1. The activity includes opportunities for all campers to work towards shared...	55	2.42	1.792	.619
IIK.2. The activity includes opportunities for all campers to work cooperatively together.	55	2.53	1.676	.477
IIK.3. The activity involves interdependent tasks for all campers...	55	2.05	1.580	1.076
IIK.AMB. Campers have the experience of collaborating with others.	55	2.27	1.420	.743
IIIM.1. Campers have multiple opportunities to make individual or group plans...	55	1.40	1.047	2.636
IIIM.2. In the course of planning the projects or activities, 2 or more planning...	55	1.22	.738	3.648
IIIM.3. There is a specific time or times for planning during the session routine.	55	1.44	1.198	2.569
IIIM.AMB. Campers engage in deliberate planning.	53	1.36	.857	2.270
IIIN.1. All campers have the opportunity to make at least one open-ended choice...	55	2.93	1.538	.063
IIIN.2. Staff actively encourage campers to take an activity in a new...	55	1.95	1.380	1.154
IIIN.3. Staff share control of most activities with campers, providing guidance...	55	2.93	1.762	.072
IIIN.AMB. Campers have a say in how they spend their time in the activity.	54	2.59	1.353	.223
IIIO.1. All campers are engaged in an intentional process of reflecting on what...	55	1.62	1.269	1.896
IIIO.2. All campers are given the opportunity to reflect on their activities in 2 or...	55	1.33	.747	1.870
IIIO.3. Activities involve 1 or more structured times in which staff ask campers...	55	1.47	1.152	2.367
IIIO.AMB. Campers have opportunities to look back on things they are doing...	53	1.49	.953	2.036

Table A1: Form A2

	N	M	SD	Skew
IVA.1. Staff mainly use a warm tone of voice and respectful language.	20	4.70	.733	-2.123
IVA.2. Staff generally smile, use friendly gestures, and make eye contact.	20	4.50	.889	-1.251
IVA.3. When campers approach them, staff never exhibit non-attentive behaviors.	20	4.30	.979	-.681
IVA.AMB. Staff appear to like the campers they' re working with.	20	4.40	.821	-.914
IVB.1. Staff circulate during informal times to interact with every camper	20	3.60	1.142	-.038
IVB.2. Staff members spread out during informal times to cover all areas of camp where campers may be	20	4.50	1.100	-2.239
IVB.3. Staff "Huddles" rarely or nevre take place	20	3.40	1.392	-.292
IVB.AMB. All staff are engaged with campers all the time	19	3.68	1.003	-.015
IVC.1. During informal or transition times, staff are often seen interacting one-on-one with campers.	20	3.90	1.210	-.583
IVC.2. Staff are consistently actively involved with campers during informal or transition times	20	4.00	1.214	-.785
IVC.3 Staff support at least some contributions or accomplishments of campers by acknowledging what they've said or done wiht specific non-evaluative language	20	3.30	1.174	-.004
IVC.AMB. Each youth experiences personal attention from staff	20	3.65	1.089	-.564

IVD.1. All staff are enthusiastic with campers most of the time	20	3.60	1.465	-.553
IVD.2. When campers encounter obstacles staff consistently use positive language	18	4.22	1.215	-1.362
IVD.3. All staff consistently express enthusiasm about camp activities	20	4.10	1.210	-1.003
IVD.AMB. Staff appear to enjoy interacting with campers	20	3.80	1.105	-.083
IVE.1. There are no biased comments based on religion, ethnicity, class, gender, ability, appearance, or sexual orientation that are not addressed by staff	20	4.70	.733	-2.123
IVE.2. There are no incidents in which camper or campers are made fun of or every such incident is addressed by staff	20	4.50	1.100	-2.239
IVE.3. Staff shows respect for all campers and insists campers show respect for each other	20	4.50	1.100	-2.239
IVE.AMB. Youth appear to feel free to be themselves	20	4.45	.945	-1.506
IVF.1. Every time there is a conflict or an incident involving strong feelings, staff ask about and/or acknowledge the feelings or the campers involved	6	2.00	1.673	1.537
IVF.2. In a conflict situation, adults ask the campers what happened	5	3.00	2.000	.000
IVF.3. When stron feelings are involved, staff consistently help campers respond appropriately	6	2.00	1.095	.000
IVF.AMB. Staff handle campers feelings and conflicts supportively	10	3.00	1.633	.191
NA.1. A variety of natural outdoor areas are available for the campers to explore between program offerings	20	3.90	1.210	-.583
NA.2. More than half of the camp program offerings appear to utilize natural/outdoor settings	19	3.95	1.026	.115
NB.1. More than three quarters of the campers observed outdoors were having fun	20	4.70	.733	-2.123
NB.2. More than three quarters of the staff observed outdoors with campers appeared enthusisastic	20	4.20	1.196	-1.245
NB.3. Staff were observed informally and spontaneously discussing and expoloring natural topics	20	2.30	1.174	.212
NB.4. When outdoors, campers were commonly directly and viscerally interacting with nature	20	3.20	.616	2.888
Valid N (listwise)	4			

Appendix B: Factor analyses

Factor analysis for items within Activity Climate

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
IA.1.	-.149	.002	-.038	.667
IA.2.	.302	.102	-.081	.809
IA.AMB.	-.115	.050	.282	.849
IB.1.	-.138	.913	.037	-.014
IC.1.	-.063	.921	-.011	-.042
IC.2.	.212	.741	-.066	.117
IB.AMB.	.005	.782	.075	.046
IE.2.	.310	.063	.636	-.176
IE.3.	-.025	.025	.886	.114
IE.AMB.	-.036	.003	.941	.042
IF.1.	.818	.115	.208	-.142
IF.2.	.928	.075	-.103	-.072
IF.3.	.942	.038	.049	-.012
IF.AMB.	.813	-.182	.062	.144

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 8 iterations.

Factor analysis for items within Learning Environment

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
IIH.1.	-.070	-.075	-.015	.968
IIH.2.	.261	.005	.093	.723
IIH.AMB.	.286	-.052	.061	.796
IIi.1.	.129	-.144	.940	-.244
IIi.2.	-.015	.081	.715	.245
IIi.AMB.	-.126	.238	.812	.230
IIJ.1.	.965	.003	.012	-.054
IIJ.2.	.843	.164	-.051	.118
IIJ.AMB.	.815	-.001	.083	.155
IIK.1.	.139	.836	.045	-.005
IIK.2.	.003	.914	.025	-.157
IIK.3.	-.115	.899	-.002	.045

IIK.AMB.	.133	.936	-.038	-.011
----------	------	------	-------	-------

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

Factor analysis for items within Engagement

	Component		
	1	2	3
IIIM.1.	.078	.000	-.908
IIIM.3.	-.040	.010	-.969
IIIM.AMB.	-.003	.026	-.989
IIIN.1.	.062	.880	.021
IIIN.2.	-.028	.775	-.160
IIIN.3.	-.107	.825	.045
IIIN.AMB.	.058	.968	.032
IIIO.1.	.926	.030	.107
IIIO.2.	.844	-.062	-.094
IIIO.3.	.786	-.055	-.087
IIIO.AMB.	.970	.064	.013

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.