

2016 Year-End Report on Ends

1.0 Global End: Girls demonstrate courage, confidence, and character, and make a difference.

-GIRLS DISCOVER-

- A. Girls understand themselves and their values and use their knowledge and skills to explore the world.**

-GIRLS CONNECT-

- B. Girls care about, inspire, and team with others locally and globally.**


-GIRLS TAKE ACTION-

- C. Girls act to make their world a better place.**

These Ends will be achieved at a cost that balances time, resources and results.

Date of Report to the Board: January 24, 2017

I hereby present my monitoring report on the Ends Policy according to the schedule set out. I certify that the information contained in this report is true, and represents compliance with a reasonable interpretation of all aspects of the policy unless specifically stated otherwise.

Signed , CEO

Date: 1/11/17

◇ Girls demonstrate courage, confidence, and character, and make a difference.

▲ This overall Ends result is the highest priority.

CEO INTERPRETATION

Interpretation of Global End:

I define overall Global End achievement as the combined achievement of Ends statements A, B and C above. These Ends are the “good” results to be achieved for girls ages 5-17 in Girl Scouts of Western Ohio who register as Girl Scout members in numbers and at costs justified by comparison to “top-ten” Girl Scout councils defined by GSUSA.

Interpretation of Ends Statements (A,B,C):

I interpret each of the Ends statements (A,B,C) by applying GSUSA’s framework (GSUSA, *Transforming Leadership*, 2008) that organizes the benefits or outcomes of the *Girl Scout Leadership Experience* by the three “Leadership Keys” (*Discover, Connect, Take Action*) and distributes 5 of the 15 outcomes¹ to each statement as shown below in **Table 1**.

Table 1

ENDS	OUTCOMES				
A) Discover: Girls understand themselves and their values and use their knowledge and skills to explore the world.	= 1. Girls Develop Strong Sense of Self +	2. Girls Develop Positive Values +	3. Girls Gain Practical Life Skills +	4. Girls Seek Challenges +	5. Girls Develop Critical Thinking
B) Connect: Girls care about, inspire, and team with others locally and globally.	= 1. Girls Develop Healthy Relationships +	2. Girls Promote Cooperation & Team Building +	3. Girls Resolve Conflicts +	4. Girls Advance Diversity +	5. Girls Feel Connected to their Communities
C) Take Action: Girls act to make their world a better place.	= 1. Girls identify Community Needs +	2. Girls Are Resourceful Problem-Solvers +	3. Advocate for Self & Others +	4. Educate & Inspire Others +	5. Girls Feel Empowered to Act

Operational Definitions (Measures):

I have adopted OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT SCORES as the primary measure of the 15 outcomes, which are comprised of specific knowledge, skills, behaviors and values gained by girls in Girl Scouting as described in GSUSA publication *Transforming Leadership* (2008). Overall, ENDS are made up of OUTCOMES which are measured by survey items that are translated into OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT SCORES. Outcome Achievement Scores are determined using GSUSA National Program Evaluation System (NPES).

This system is utilized to define the Outcome Achievement Scores based on the following rationale: 1) The system’s grade level-differentiated survey items were developed, tested and revised by GSUSA staff in partnership with local councils and positive youth development experts. 2) The NPES offers (without charge to councils) the analytics of *Qualtrics®* software which combines each girl’s replies to two to five survey items (of knowledge, skill, behavior, etc.) per outcome into one *Outcome Achievement Score*. 3) The validity of the process is referenced in the combination of GSUSA’s *Transforming Leadership* (2008) and GSUSA’s National Program Evaluation System which is available to all councils across the US. (Documentation, including that of sampling processes, is available upon direct inspection.) 4) Any updates made by GSUSA to the 15 outcomes and grade-level differentiated survey items were not introduced until Fall, 2016 and are referenced for future planning and recommendation purposes only.

Table 2 shows the types of survey concepts or items that comprise each of the 15 individual OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT SCORES.

Table 2	(A)	(B)	(C)
	Discover: Girls understand themselves and their values and use their knowledge and skills to explore the world.	Connect: Girls care about, inspire, and team with others locally and globally.	Take Action: Girls act to make their world a better place.
	1. Develop Strong Sense of Self <i>*confident * feel able to achieve goals * form positive identities*</i>	1. Develop Healthy Relationships <i>*caring * communicate effectively* protect rights * seek help as needed</i>	1. Identify Community Needs <i>*identify issues & realistic possibilities for action*</i>
	2. Develop Positive Values <i>* guided by Promise & Law* * committed to justice & service *</i>	2. Promote Cooperation & Team Building <i>*value working together * decisions benefit group* shared goals</i>	2. Are Resourceful Problem-Solvers <i>*set up & implement effective plans* get tools, resources & people to help*</i>
	3. Gain Practical Life Skills <i>*prepared for positive, healthy & independent future*</i>	3. Resolve Conflicts <i>*recognize & analyze situations* *develop skills*</i>	3. Advocate for Self & Others <i>*able to speak on own behalf * seeks to act for others behalf*</i>
	4. Seek Challenges <i>*positive about learning * *sets challenging goal * * takes appropriate risks*</i>	4. Advance Diversity <i>*promote inclusion * value diverse backgrounds, viewpoints & life experiences*</i>	4. Educate & Inspire Others <i>*effectively explains ideas to motivate others to act & serve*</i>
	5. Develop Critical Thinking <i>*examine various viewpoints & implication of gender issues*</i>	5. Feel Connected to their Communities <i>*feel part of larger community & *value social networks*</i>	5. Feel Empowered to Act <i>*feels empowered to use leadership skills* feels valued*</i>

I note that these *outcomes* measures are distinct from other NPES measures used by Girl Scouts of Western Ohio. *Attributional* and *process* measures are other NPES measures used by Girl Scouts of Western Ohio (in part) to assure use of the Girl Scouts’ three processes: girl-led, cooperative and experiential learning which, in partnership with trained adult partners, comprise Girl Scouting’s unique *theory of change*. GSUSA, (*Transforming Leadership*, 2008) states that “these three processes promote the fun and friendship that have always been so integral to Girl Scouting.” Documentation of these additional measures is available upon request or through direct inspection.

EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT

Achievement of the Global End and Ends Statements A,B,C is shown in Table 3

Table 3- Overall Achievement

Ends Statements	Combined Outcomes	Combined Outcomes Achievement Scores per End			
		2014 Actual % (n=979)	2015 Actual % (n=875)	2016 Target % (average of 2014 + 2015)	2016 Actual % (n=721)
A). Discover: Girls understand themselves and their values and use their knowledge and skills to explore the world.	1.Sense of Self 2.Values 3.Life Skills 4.Challenge-Seeking 5.Critical Thinking	60%	62%	61%	63%
B). Connect: Girls care about, inspire, and team with others locally and globally.	1.Healthy Relations 2.Cooperation/Teambuilding 3.Resolve Conflicts 4.Advance Diversity 5.Feel Connected in Community	65%	72%	69%	72%
C). Take Action: Girls act to make their world a better place.	1.Identify Community Needs 2.Resourceful Problem-solvers 3.Advocate for Self & Others 4.Educate & Inspire others 5.Feel empowered to act	57%	62%	59%	63%
Combined Ends Total Averages		61%	65%	63%	66%

Table 3 shows that for End Statements A,B,C, girls in Girl Scouts of Western Ohio actually reflect a combined average from [5] *Outcomes Achievement Scores*² (defining each End), that when averaged together surpass or meet* GSWO’s 2016 target (previous 2-year average) for that End. *No scores are lower than targets.

This evidence is consistent with my interpretation of achievement. (Please see page 9, definitions #1 and 3 for interpretation details and rationale). I therefore report overall achievement (compliance).

Evidence of overall Ends results by age-level subgroups is shown in Table 4.

Table 4- Grade Level Achievement		Averages of 5 Outcome Achievement Scores per End by Age					
Ends Statements	Combined Outcomes	Brownies		Juniors		Cadettes	
		2016 Target % (average 2014 + 2015)	2016 Actual % (n=259)	2016 Target % (average 2014 + 2015)	2016 Actual % (n=234)	2016 Target % (average 2014 + 2015)	2016 Actual % (n= 228)
A). Discover: Girls understand themselves and their values and use their knowledge and skills to explore the world.	1.Sense of Self 2.Values 3.Life Skills 4.Challenge-Seeking 5.Critical Thinking	59%	66%	73%	67%*	51%	57%
B). Connect: Girls care about, inspire, and team with others locally and globally.	1.Healthy Relations 2.Cooperation/Team-building 3.Resolve Conflicts 4.Advance Diversity 5.Feel Connected in Community	59%	61%	77%	80%	70%	74%
C). Take Action: Girls act to make their world a better place.	1. Identify Community Needs 2.Resourceful Problem-solvers 3.Advocate for Self & Others 4.Educate & Inspire others 5.Feel empowered to act	63%	65%	68%	73%	47%	51%
Total Ends Averages By Grade level		60%	64%	73%	73%*	53%	61%

Table 4 shows that for ...

Brownies –

Among End Statements A,B and C, Girl Scout Brownies in Girl Scouts of Western Ohio actually reflect a combined average from [5] *Outcomes Achievement Scores*³ (defining each End), that when averaged together surpass or meet* GSWO’s 2016 target (previous 2-year average) for Ends A,B & C. *No scores are lower than targets for Ends A,B and C. **This is improved performance over 2015.**

Juniors –

- a) Among End Statements B and C, Girl Scout Juniors in Girl Scouts of Western Ohio actually reflect a combined average from [5] *Outcomes Achievement Scores*⁴ (defining each End), that when averaged together surpass or meet* GSWO’s 2016 target (previous 2-year average) for that End. *No scores are lower than targets for Ends B and C.
- b) For End Statement A, Juniors in Girl Scouts of Western Ohio actually reflect a combined average from [5] *Outcomes Achievement Scores*⁵ (defining End B), that misses* GSWO’s 2016 target (previous 2-year average) for End A. *The score is lower than the target for End A.
- c) The average of Ends (A,B,C) scores meets* the 2016 target for GSWO Juniors.

Cadettes –

Among End Statements A, B and C, Girl Scout Cadettes in Girl Scouts of Western Ohio actually reflect a combined average from [5] *Outcomes Achievement Scores*⁶ (defining each End), that when averaged together surpass or meet* GSWO’s 2016 target (previous 2-year average) for Ends A,B and C. *No scores are lower than targets for Ends A,B and C. **This performance sustains 2015 gains.**

This evidence supports my interpretation of achievement (page 9, definitions #1 and 3). I therefore report achievement (compliance) by age or grade level. *This year continues 2015’s improvement over 2014.*

Evidence of results by short-term pathways is shown in Table 5.

Table 5- Short-term Pathway Achievement Compared to Overall Sample		Targets		Specific Outcome Achievement Scores by Short-term Pathway	
Ends Statements	Outcomes	Representative Sample (Mainly Long-term Troop Pathway)		Camp	Series
		2016 Target % (2014 + 2015 overall averages)	2016 Actual % (2 nd quarter) n=721	2016 Actual % (3 rd quarter) n= 1937	2015-16 Actual % (Fall-Summer) n=4933
A). Discover: Girls understand themselves and their values and use their knowledge and skills to explore the world.	Develop Strong Sense of Self	70%	79%	74%	77%
	Seek Challenges in the world	58%	58%	55%	52%
B). Connect: Girls care about, inspire, and team with others locally and globally.	Promote Cooperation & Team-building	65%	64%	53%	60%
C). Take Action: Girls act to make their world a better place.	Are Resourceful Problem-solvers	62%	67%	51%	55%
Combined 4 Outcomes Achievement Score Averages		64%	66%	58%	61%

Table 5 shows that among Girl Scouts during...

Camp-

- a) For ENDS statement A, 2016 summer campers in Girl Scouts of Western Ohio actually reflect a combined average for a specific subset of *Outcome Achievement Scores* (Strong Sense of Self and Seek Challenges), that when averaged together (74%, 55%) surpassed or met* GSWO's previous *overall* representative sample's two year average or targets (70%, 58%) for those 2 specific outcome(s). *Scores are within 5% of two targets for Ends A. ***This is an improvement over 2015.***
- b) In addition, among ENDS statements B and C, 2016 summer campers in Girl Scouts of Western Ohio reflect a combined average for specific subsets of *Outcome Achievement Scores* (B: Cooperation/Teambuilding and C: Resourceful Problem-solvers), that when averaged together (B: 53%, C: 51%) fall short of GSWO's previous *overall* representative sample's two year average or targets (65%, 62%) for those 2 specific outcome(s). *While actual scores are 11% to 12% lower than targets for Ends B and C, ***these results show marked improvement over 2015.***

Series-

- a) For ENDS statement C, 2016 series participants in Girl Scouts of Western Ohio actually reflect a combined average for a specific subset of *Outcome Achievement Scores* (Resourceful Problem-solvers), that when averaged together (55%) misses*[within 5%] GSWO's previous *overall* representative sample's two year average or target (62%) for the 1 specific outcome. *The actual score is more than 5% lower than the target for Ends C.
- b) For ENDS statement B, 2016 series participants in Girl Scouts of Western Ohio actually reflect a combined average for a specific subset of *Outcome Achievement Scores* (Cooperation & Team-building), that when averaged together (60%) meets*[within 5%] GSWO's previous *overall* representative sample's two year average or target (65%) for the outcome. *The actual score is 5% lower than the target for Ends B.
- c) With mixed results, for ENDS statement A, 2016 series participants in Girl Scouts of Western Ohio actually reflect a combined average for a specific subset of *Outcome Achievement Scores* (Strong Sense of Self and Seek Challenges), that when averaged together (77%, 52%) surpasses GSWO's previous *overall* representative sample's two year average or targets (70%) for Strong Sense of Self but falls short of the second outcome (challenge-seeking). *The latter score is more than 5% lower than Ends A target.

This evidence deviates from my interpretation of achievement (page 9, definitions #2 and 3). I therefore report partial achievement (compliance) of pre-specified outcomes by camp and series pathways.

Evidence of 2016 Girl Scouts of Western Ohio registered Girl Scout membership is shown in Tables 6, 7a and 7b.

Table 6 Girl Scout Membership among “Top-10” Councils⁷

Council	Girl Membership						Adult Membership	
	MY2015 Overall 9/30/15*	MY2016 Overall 9/30/16	Overall Market ⁸ Share		Overall Renewal Rate		MY2015 Overall 9/30/15	MY2016 Overall 9/30/16
			2015	2016	2015	2016		
GSUSA	1,881,232	1,805,247	7.14%	6.85	58%	59.42%	784,205	773,454
1.Nation's Capital	62,265	59,326	12.00%	11.35%	68%	67.01%	26,326	27,329
2.San Jacinto Council	61,131	58,112	8.97%	8.42%	57%	56.41%	17,181	16,381
3.Greater Chicago & Northwest Indiana	55,440	52,526	7.89%	7.52%	59%	62.21%	21,381	20,284
4.Northern California	46,903	44,187	7.34%	6.89%	63%	64.49%	31,566	29,044
5.Eastern Missouri	43,313	44,066	21.75%	22.17%	61%	60.02%	15,464	15,044
6.Girl Scouts of Western Ohio	42,486	41,440	12.46%	12.23%	59.09%	59.08%	12,858	13,010
7.Greater Atlanta	41,843	40,774	7.77%	7.56%	55%	53.07%	17,014	17,502
8.Greater Los Angeles	39,262	40,329	4.30%	4.45%	67%	72.17%	23,958	24,265
9.Eastern Pennsylvania	37,881	36,163	9.10%	8.74%	59%	57.72%	14,509	14,513
10.Eastern Massachusetts	32,782	32,621	9.25	11.29%	65%	65.17%	13,970	14,862

Table 6 shows that the number of girls registered (41,440) by Girl Scouts of Western Ohio in the 2016 membership year (October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016) positions the council within the “top-10” Girl Scout councils by GSUSA. The 2016 Girl Membership count dipped slightly (~2.46%) but market share and renewal rate remained relatively stable compared to 2015. In addition, one of the highest market shares (consistent at 12%) continues to be efficiently achieved when considering overall adult membership.

This evidence is consistent with my interpretation of achievement (page 9, definition #4 and page 10, rationale #6). I therefore report membership achievement (compliance) as compared among “top-10” Girl Scout Councils.

Table 7a Girl Scouts of Western Ohio membership among internal geographic regions.

Table 7a ⁹	Girl Members		Current Girl Market Share ¹⁰		Girl Retention Rate		Adult Members (*Includes lifetime members)		Adult: Girl Ratio	
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
Toledo	9464	8715	15.46%	14.36%	53.72%	59.07%	1957	1951	1:5	1:5
Lima	3868	3902	9.49%	9.68%	60.44%	59.69%	1147	1255	1:3	1:3
Dayton	10498	10295	11.65%	11.52%	56.84%	57.38%	3422	3537	1:3	1:3
Cincinnati	17951	17835	12.35%	12.29%	63.21%	63.27%	5836	5863	1:3	1:3
Adjacent county residents	705	693					496	404		
TOTAL GSWO	42,486	41,440	12.46%	12.23%	59.09%	59.08%	12,858	13,010	1:3	1:3

Table 7a shows that the 2016 market shares in four regions (Toledo, Lima, Dayton, Cincinnati) range from about 10% of Lima’s decentralized small-town and rural girl population to about 14% of the girl population in Toledo’s more densely populated counties. There was increased market share in 1 region and improved retention in 3 other regions.

Each region’s 2016 market share is higher than GSUSA’s country-wide 2016 market share of 6.85%.

This evidence is consistent with my interpretation of achievement (page 10, rationale #6). I therefore report membership achievement (compliance) among regional populations by geography.

Table 7b ¹¹	Underserved Girl Actual		Underserved Girl Market Share		Hispanic Girl Actual		Hispanic Girl Market Share	
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
GSWO Total	10,219	10,803	12.82%	13.29%	1898	1709	11.40%	9.3%

Table 7b shows the underserved (minority) and Hispanic members participating in all of Girl Scouts of Western Ohio.

Evidence of 2015 Girl Scouts of Western Ohio justifiable cost is shown in Table 8a and 8b.

Table 8a Girl Scouts of Western Ohio 2016 Costs Per Girl

Council	2015 GSWO Per Girl Cost	2016 GSWO Per Girl Cost
	2015 Operating Expense ÷ 2015 Girl Members	2016 Operating Expense ÷ 2016 Girl Members
Girl Scouts of Western Ohio	\$12,797,271 ¹² ÷ 42,486 = \$301	\$12,856,518¹³ ÷ 41,440 = \$310

Table 8a shows that the 2016 Girl Scouts of Western Ohio’s “cost per girl” is \$310.

Table 8b Girl Scout Council 2015 Costs Per Girl Among 2016 “Top-10” Membership Councils

Council	2015 Per Girl Costs By Council	
	Yearly Operating Expenses ¹⁴ ÷ Girl Members	
2016 Top 10 Member Councils Ranked By 2015 Cost per Girl	2015 Expenses (per Annual Report) ÷ MY 2015 Girls	2015 Cost per Girl Ranked Low to High
Nation's Capital	\$15,102,000 ÷ 62,265	\$242
San Jacinto Council	\$ 16,500,000 ÷ 61,131	\$ 270
Greater Chicago and Northwest Indiana	\$15,176,795 ÷ 55,440	\$274
Eastern Missouri	\$ 12,664,250 ÷ 43,313	\$292
Girl Scouts of Western Ohio	\$12,797,271 ¹⁵ ÷ 42,486	\$301
Greater Atlanta	\$ 15,412,032 ÷ 41,843	\$368
Northern California	\$ 17,893,444 ÷ 46,903	\$381
Eastern Massachusetts	\$13,255,043 ÷ 32,782	\$404
Greater Los Angeles	\$16,569,019 ÷ 39,262	\$422
Eastern Pennsylvania	\$17,168,107 ÷ 37,881	\$453
Average Cost per Girl 2012 All Councils (> 100)	313.08¹⁶	

Table 8b shows how Girl Scouts of Western Ohio’s per-girl cost ranks within the “top-10” councils’ 2015 cost-per-girl. GSWO’s 2016 per-girl-cost (\$310) is within 20% of at least half of the “top-10” councils’ 2015 per-girl costs.

In addition, the 2016 cost compares favorably (at less than 1% difference), with the 2012 average cost per girl (\$313) among all (over 100) Girl Scout councils in the United States.

This evidence is consistent with my interpretation of achievement (page 9, definition #4 and page 10, rationale #6). I therefore report achievement (compliance) at justifiable cost.

CONCLUSIONS and COMPREHENSIVE VIEW OF ENDS ACHIEVEMENT

Influencers of Future Action

Table 9

Table 9: % of Girl Scouts who achieve each outcome		2016 Brownie Final Overall	2016 BR Targets	2016 Junior Final Overall	2016 JR Targets	2016 Cadette Final Overall	2016 CD Targets	2016 BJC Final Overall	2016 BJC Targets	2016 Targets	2017 Targets							
		Brownies			Junior			CadetteAverages			Overall	Overall						
		2016 Final GSWO Brownie Cluster InfoScout (n= 259)	2015 Q4 2016 GSWO BR - no vol day camp SERIES BR (n=2208)	2014 & 2015 GSWO Brownie average outcome achieve score (n=442)	2016 Final GSWO Junior Random InfoScout (n= 234)	2015 Q4 2016 GSWO JR - no vol day camp SERIES JR (n=1398)	2014 & 2015 GSWO Junior average outcome achieve score (n=825)	2016 Final GSWO Cadette Random InfoScout (n= 228)	2015 Q4 2016 GSWO Cadette no vol day camp SERIES Cadette (n=1327)	2016 GSWO Cadette average outcome achieve score (n=670)	2014 & 2015 GSWO Cadette average outcome achieve score (n=721)	2015 Q4 2016 B-J-C GSWO B-J-C SERIES n=4933	2016 B-J-C GSWO CAMP - no vol day camp n=1937	2014 + 2015 GSWO BJC Overall Average Outcome Achieve Score	2015 + 2016 GSWO BJC Overall Average Outcome Achieve Score			
Ends Statements & 15 Outcomes Achieved																		
A. Girls understand themselves & their values and use their knowledge and skills to explore the world.																		
[averages]		66%		59%	67%		73%	57%		51%	63%			61%				
DISCOVER	1. Develop Strong Sense of Self	68%	77%	71%	61%	97%	92%	95%	96%	72%	62%	55%	54%	79%	77%	74%	70%	76%
	2. Develop Positive Values	58%			57%	93%			88%	92%			85%	81%			76%	81%
	3. Gain Practical Life Skills (healthy living)	71%			66%	49%			65%	12%			19%	44%			50%	
	4. Seek Challenges in the World	77%	76%	73%	71%	38%	35%	42%	52%	59%	46%	51%	52%	58%	52%	55%	58%	miss target 57%
	5. Develop Critical Thinking	54%			40%	59%			66%	50%			48%	54%			51%	weak
B. Girls care about, inspire & team with others locally & globally.																		
[averages]		61%			59%	80%			77%	74%			70%	72%			69%	
CONNECT	6. Develop Healthy Relationships	76%			76%	48%			44%	77%			73%	67%			64%	68%
	7. Promote Cooperation & Team Building	44%	66%	48%	47%	75%	63%	58%	79%	73%	52%	53%	71%	64%	60%	53%	65%	
	8. Can Resolve Conflicts	72%			69%	94%			94%	63%			58%	76%			73%	
	9. Advance Diversity in a Multi-cultural World	62%			62%	91%			82%	88%			78%	80%			74%	
	10. Feel Connected to their Communities, Locally & Globally	51%			44%	90%			87%	69%			71%	70%			67%	
C. Girls act to make the world a better place.																		
[averages]		65%			63%	73%			68%	51%			47%	63%			59%	pass target 62%
TAKE ACTION	11. Can Identify Community Needs	57%			56%	61%			60%	30%			27%	49%			47%	
	12. Are Resourceful Problem-solvers	64%	68%	68%	62%	70%	53%	42%	64%	67%	43%	43%	60%	67%	55%	51%	62%	compare to camp & series 67% 65%
	13. Advocate for themselves & others, Locally & Globally	59%			61%	73%			72%	39%			45%	57%			59%	
	14. Educate & inspire others to act	60%			62%	76%			69%	59%			48%	65%			59%	
	15. Feel Empowered to make a difference	83%			76%	86%			79%	58%			56%	76%			70%	
Yearly Average-15 Outcomes		64%			60%	73%			73%	61%			56%	66%			63%	pass target
Two-year Average (preceding 2 years)-15 Outcomes																	63%	
Yearly Averages Outcomes 1,4,7,12			72%	65%	60%	61%	59%	73%	51%	51%	59%		61%	58%		64%	miss target	66%

Table 9 shows a comprehensive view of the overall achievement of Ends as shown in Table 3. As in 2015, it shows the achievement of End Statement C (Girls act to make the world a better place) among age/grade level subsets, as shown in Table 4. By contrast, partial achievement by series or camp sub-groups is shown as summarized in Table 5.

While partial (yet improved) achievement of Ends in camp and series sub-groups does not detract from overall achievement or compliance with the overall Ends, continued efforts are needed in short-term series / camp offerings.

Having demonstrated overall achievement of Ends (Table 3), sustained performance among grade-level subsets (Table 4) AND improved camp/series performance (Table 5) at a cost that balances time, resources and results (Tables 6 and 8a-b), I plan to focus learnings from these 15 outcomes on five outcomes refined by GSUSA as best suited to address both long-term and short-term needs of girl members, as follows:

1. Strong Sense of Self, Positive Values, Challenge Seeking, Healthy Relationships, Community Problem Solving.
2. Focus adult and other resources on helping girls grow in Seeking Challenges and Community Problem-solving.

- Supplemental Notes -
CEO's Interpretation of Achievement

Interpretation of Achievement Details: (Metrics, Benchmark and Comparison)

I have defined achievement as the following:

- 1) Among an *Overall* Girl Scouts of Western Ohio (GSWO) Representative Sample and age-based sub-samples by age grade-level: For each End Statement, girls in Girl Scouts of Western Ohio will reflect a combined average from [5] *Outcomes Achievement Scores*¹⁷ (defining each End), that when averaged together surpass or meet* GSWO's previous 2-year average for that End. [Evidence for 2016 is shown in Tables 3 and 4.]
- 2) Among Camp and Series Pathway Participants: For each ENDS statement, girls in Girl Scouts of Western Ohio will reflect a combined average for a specific subset of *Outcome Achievement Scores* that are appropriate for that Pathway, that when averaged together surpass or meet* GSWO's previous *overall* representative sample's two year average for the specific outcome(s). [Evidence for 2016 is in Table 5.]
- 3) *For "Meeting" Previous Two-year Average Targets: "Meeting" means "numerically equal or not more than 5% lower", if a data inspection of 3 to 5 years shows no consistent downward progression.
- 4) For Justifiable Cost that Balances Time, Resources, and Results: Girl Scouts of Western Ohio will demonstrate performance that is within a (+/-20%) range of the average of "top-10" Girl Scout councils for a) cost per girl and b) number of girls registered as Girl Scouts (total girl members). I define "annual cost per girl" as the council's annual expenses divided by the number of girl members registered in that membership year (October-September). [Evidence for 2016 is shown in Tables 6 and 8a-b.]

Rationale for Interpretation:

The rationale and background for my interpretation of achievement is as follows:

- 1) Internal Versus External Outcomes Standards: Girl Scouts of Western Ohio has a recorded history (since 2008) of measuring Outcomes annually; but, the external standard of achievement established by GSUSA in 2010 (and used by GSWO in 2012 and 2013) was not updated 'til late 2016. As a substitute for the dated GSUSA external comparison, our council's data provides more relevant comparison given rates of change of both girls and the program's national and local resources. (Now that GSUSA has updated their outcome data-base, we will compare relevant GSWO Outcomes to the new external benchmark in 2017.)
- 2) Overall Outcomes Population: Using an overall representative sample of currently registered GSWO girl members provides the most statistically sound data base reflecting the overall performance of the council. (Note: This sample reflects on Girl Scouts who participate in a troop or group experience, not as an individual member. The majority [82%] of Girl Scouts [sampled in spring 2016] were registered with troops. By the end of the membership year [9/30/16], about 68%¹⁸ of Girl Scouts were served in troops.)
- 3) Overall Outcomes by Age / Grade Level Groups: Highlighting subsets of Brownies, Juniors and Cadette grade levels from among the overall stratified sampling of currently registered GSWO girl members (who participate mostly in troop environments) ensures that we meet the needs of important cohorts (Brownies: 31%, Juniors: 22%, Cadettes: 14% of members) who have different developmental needs. Even though Girl Scout Daisies represent 27% of membership, their reading level limits participation in this type of evaluation but we do collect troop leader reports (available upon direct inspection). Girl Scout Seniors and Ambassadors (only 5% of members) could be evaluated as needed.
- 4) Specific Outcomes By Interest Group and Pathways: Outcomes specific to *Camp* and *Series* Pathways were selected based on GSUSA's studies related to outcomes linked to the Out-of-doors and to academic benefits. Achievement is targeted to surpass or meet* *overall* achievement targets for that outcome, as a reasonable expectation given the focus of staff time and expertise deployed to members with specific interests in and/or limited availability for participation. Updated measures (and items) will be used in 2017.

**- Supplemental Notes -
CEO's Interpretation of Achievement**

- 5) Outcomes Target Trends: Given sampling error /statistical variation in girl-generated data, it is reasonable that a target is *met* "if the current combined average is not more than 5% lower than the combined previous two-year average". To check for gradual decline (downward trending), a 3 to 5-year data comparison can further classify outcomes achievement, as needed.

- 6) External Comparison of Membership and Costs: Utilizing the "top-10" Girl Scout councils for comparison of "justifiable cost" is reasonable as they represent the most comparable data base given similarity of the Girl Scout business model vs. other non-profit organizations¹⁹ and reflections of overall girl/volunteer trends affecting Girl Scouts as a whole. The 20% (+/-) reflects variability in year to year fluctuations within Council(s) data, such as inclusion or exclusion of depreciation and capital improvement costs. In addition, internal comparison of market share by GSWO region, is offered as a reasonable expectation from member and community stake-holders that membership be representative of the regional populations.

- 7) Comprehensive View: A detailed table of Outcome Achievement Scores by age level for the current and past two years is also provided to the Board as a comprehensive reference document. The additional detail provides perspective to the Board for action plans and targets for the council's future multi-year efforts to grow performance.

- End Notes -

¹ This is the final year for these 15 outcomes of the *Girl Scout Leadership Experience* which were revised by GSUSA in Fall, 2016.

² Outcomes Achievement Scores result from combining the results of 2-5 survey items per outcome for each grade-level-differentiated survey. Qualtrics©-based calculations of Outcomes Achievement Scores for each outcome are then “averaged” for each year.

³ Outcomes Achievement Scores result from combining the results of 2-5 survey items per outcome for each grade-level-differentiated survey. Qualtrics©-based calculations of Outcomes Achievement Scores for each outcome are then “averaged” for each year.

⁴ Outcomes Achievement Scores result from combining the results of 2-5 survey items per outcome for each grade-level-differentiated survey. Qualtrics©-based calculations of Outcomes Achievement Scores for each outcome are then “averaged” for each year.

⁵ Outcomes Achievement Scores result from combining the results of 2-5 survey items per outcome for each grade-level-differentiated survey. Qualtrics©-based calculations of Outcomes Achievement Scores for each outcome are then “averaged” for each year.

⁶ Outcomes Achievement Scores result from combining the results of 2-5 survey items per outcome for each grade-level-differentiated survey. Qualtrics©-based calculations of Outcomes Achievement Scores for each outcome are then “averaged” for each year.

⁷ GSUSA, *InfoScout: PR112*, January 6, 2017.

⁸ The “Market” is defined as the US Census population (e.g., girls ages 5-17), as shown in Nielsen software, who are potential GS members in the council’s jurisdiction. According to *InfoScout (Zip210)* the size of the girl population in zip codes where GSWO had registered members continued to decline in the MY2016 report to 338,828 (down 2023) from 340,851 in MY2015 and from 341,214 in MY2014. According to US Census Bureau estimates (Table 1: April, 2010-July, 2015), Ohio’s [total] population total was 11,613,423 on July 1, 2015, a 0.67% increase since the 2010 US Census. (Source: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ohio>)

⁹ Source of membership comparison by region is GSUSA’s InfoScout: MBR006, sorted by counties within each region. While the number of GSWO regions was reduced from 4 to 3 in late 2016, the (October 1, 2015-September 30, 2016) membership year was organized across 4 GSWO regions.

¹⁰ GSUSA expresses “Market Share” as a percent where the numerator is the actual number of girls registered and the denominator is the potential girl population. This is a different way of expressing the same information if calculated by dividing actual girl members by the total potential population for this demographic and age level. The later expression was previously used by GSWO and is expressed as “1 in X.” The lower the “1 in X”, the higher the percentage of the population served. For comparability with other councils, this report expresses Market Share by percent. The source is GSUSA InfoScout: MBR006, sorted by counties.

¹¹ Source: GSUSA, *InfoScout MM110* and *InfoScout Zip217*. “Underserved” replaces “minority” and includes American Indian, Asian, Pacific Islander, Multiple Races, Other Races and the Hispanic portion of any race.

¹² Girl Scouts of Western Ohio, Chief Finance Officer, per audit.

¹³ Girl Scouts of Western Ohio, Chief Finance Officer, per audit.

¹⁴ To be updated---Yearly expenses are found in each council’s annual report or on line #18 of each council’s Form 990.

¹⁵ Girl Scouts of Western Ohio, Chief Finance Officer, per audit.

¹⁶ GSUSA, *Council Statistical Information* (rev 7-2014), retrieved from [https://pearl.girlscouts.org/Resources/Council Statistical Information - Rev 7-2014.docx](https://pearl.girlscouts.org/Resources/Council%20Statistical%20Information%20-%20Rev%207-2014.docx).

¹⁷ Outcomes Achievement Scores result from combining the results of 2-5 survey items per outcome for each grade-level-differentiated survey. Qualtrics©-based calculations of Outcomes Achievement Scores for each outcome are then “averaged” for each year.

¹⁸ Source: GSUSA, *Info Scout MBR 003*.

¹⁹ Annual per-youth costs of preventive and youth development programs ranging from **\$135 to \$1000**. (*Making Out-of-School-Time Matter*, RAND Corporation, 2005)