
Youth Friendly Needs Assessment

Sibylle Artz

Diana Nicholson

Elaine Halsall

Susan Larke

School of Child and Youth Care

University of Victoria

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the development of a needs assessment guide that is user-friendly, facilitates the development of the youth-counsellor relationship, and is sensitive to gender, sexual orientation, and cultural diversity. Through a three-phase collaborative process with counsellors and youth, the major issues in needs assessment were uncovered and a youth sensitive needs assessment guide that supports a strong positive working alliance between counsellor and youth was developed. The project highlights the importance of involving youth in assessing their own needs. Suggestions for supporting workers in needs assessment activities are provided. The needs assessment guide and background information on the development project are available on-line at <http://web.uvic.ca/cyc/naty>.

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article décrit l'élaboration d'un guide d'évaluation des besoins d'utilisation facile, qui contribue à établir des relations efficaces entre les jeunes et les conseillers et conseillères, et qui tient compte des différences entre les sexes, de l'orientation sexuelle et de la diversité culturelle. Par le biais d'un processus de collaboration à trois phases entre les conseillers et conseillères et les jeunes, les questions principales relatives à l'évaluation des besoins ont été identifiées. Celles-ci ont servi à la conception d'un guide d'évaluation des besoins axé sur les jeunes et favorisant la création de relations fructueuses et positives entre les conseillers et conseillères et les jeunes. Ce projet souligne l'importance d'impliquer les jeunes dans l'évaluation de leurs propres besoins. Des suggestions sont offertes pour appuyer les praticien(ne)s dans l'accomplissement des activités d'évaluation des besoins. Le guide d'évaluation des besoins ainsi que des renseignements généraux sur le projet d'élaboration du guide sont disponibles en ligne à l'adresse suivante : <http://web.uvic.ca/cyc/naty>.

Counsellors who work with children and youth must assess and respond to the needs of those they work with on an almost constant basis. This process is difficult for a number of reasons, including the lack of a consistent and universal definition of what constitutes a *need* (Colton, Drury, & Williams, 1995). *Need*,

Authors' Note: The project described in this paper and the preparation of this manuscript were supported by a grant from the National Crime Prevention Center Partnership Program, Department of Justice Canada, to the first author.

as defined by Altschuld and Witkin (2000), is “a measurable discrepancy between the current and desired status for an entity” (p. 253). McKillip (1987) defines *need* as “the value judgment that some group has a problem that can be solved” (p. 10). Both these definitions imply that a problem or a measurable discrepancy can be recognized and defined. But Posavac and Carey (1985) note that need definition is dependant upon who is doing the defining, and Colton, Drury, and Williams (1995) concur that the term, *need*, has changing and competing definitions and suggest that numerous difficulties exist in operationalizing concepts of need. Others note that *need*, like *risk* and *resiliency*, is not a static construct and is best viewed as dynamic and evolving (Bradshaw, 1972; Johnson, Meiller, Miller, & Summers, 1987; Wright, Williams, & Wilkinson, 1998).

Although the difficulty in defining *need* presents its own challenges, a further complication is introduced by a lack of distinction in the literature on needs assessment between the use of the term, *need* and the use of the term, *risk*. As a number of researchers have pointed out, even in the literature that purports to have a needs focus there is instead, an emphasis on risk and resiliency to risk (Henderson, Aydlert, & Bailey, 1994; Hodges, 1999; Kroll, Woodham, Rothwell, Bailey, Tobias, Harrington, & Marshall, 1999; Ottenbacher, Taylor, Msall, & Braun, 1996; Towberman, 1992). Needs assessment that is collapsed into risk assessment tends to be deficit-focused, that is, concerned with problematic conditions and behaviours rather than with strengths and potential (Ernst, 2000; Henderson, Aydlert, & Bailey, 1994; Hodges, 1999; Kroll et al., 1999; Ottenbacher et al., 1996; Towberman, 1992). Deficit-based approaches mask the ability of individuals to thrive even in adversity, and do not create a basis for the kind of strengths-based assessment that was suggested by Wolin, Wolin, and Wiczorek (1999) as preferable to “narrow models that emphasize people’s vulnerability, the power of disease processes and professional expertise” (p. 3).

Finally, risk assessment should not be confused with or substituted for needs assessment. More than thirty years ago, Garmazy (1971) suggested that risk assessment be approached with caution, and made clear that the presence of a risk factor or an adversarial circumstance in the life of an individual is not predictive of what will happen in the future. This observation has been confirmed by Werner and Smith (1992) and others for example, Masten (1999), who found that more than half of the children studied who were categorized as high risk, grew up to be happy, successful people. Thus, a focus on risk factors alone will not help researchers or counsellors to predict or determine outcome (Mangham, McGrath, Reid, & Stewart, 1995), nor will it help to determine need.

The difficulties with needs assessment identified in the literature first came to our attention in the context of our work with youth custody officers on the design of a staff-driven program for ongoing staff development (Artz, Blais, & Nicholson, 2000a&b). Custody officers and their colleagues from local youth serving agencies and the British Columbia Ministry for Children and Family Development (BCMCFD), expressed concern about their ability to adequately plan for their clients because the assessment materials they had at their disposal did not sufficiently support them in their efforts to assess youth needs and

strengths and focused instead on youth's risks and deficits. These counsellors' and youth workers' concerns and their willingness to become involved in finding ways to remedy their situation with regard to needs assessment gave the impetus for the creation of a collaborative project involving them, the youth with whom they worked, and with us in the development of a *Guide for needs assessment for youth*, (Artz, Nicholson, Halsall, & Larke, 2001)¹ that is described here.

METHOD

The development of the *Guide for needs assessment for youth* was conducted in (Artz et al., 2001) three phases and followed a participatory action research approach grounded in the principles that: research questions or problems about any particular phenomenon originate in the location that gives rise to the question or problem; those involved in the articulation of a particular question or problem have the capacity to create knowledge and theory that speaks to the question or problem and are also in the best position for giving meaning to and shedding light upon the question or problem they have identified (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Maguire, 2001; Reason & Bradbury, 2001; Stringer, 1999).

With these principles in mind, we brought together willing counsellors employed by the BCMCFD and by youth serving agencies in three different Vancouver Island communities and the youth served by these various agencies to focus on the task of creating the guide. We organized the undertaking into three phases and worked through an iterative process with our research participants to create the guide.

Phase I: Participant Development

In Phase I, 21 counsellors (14 females, 7 males) who worked in youth outreach, special care fostering, probation, sexual abuse counselling, youth and family counselling, youth forensics, youth custody, youth corrections, child protection and child welfare came forward to collaborate with us on gathering information about the theoretical and practical approaches to needs assessment used by counsellors working in the participating agencies. In addition, those involved worked at creating the foci and questions for the interviews with counsellors and youth who would be involved in Phase II and recruiting the youth and counsellors involved in Phases II and III.

Phase II: Guide Development

In Phase II, 7 youth and 8 youth counsellors from the youth serving agencies listed above were interviewed according to semistructured interview guides created in Phase 1. For youth, the questions focused on their perceptions about, and experiences with, being assessed and counselled and on their beliefs about optimal assessment and counselling services. For counsellors, the questions focused on their experiences with assessing and counselling youth and on their beliefs about optimal assessment and counselling services. The interviews with the youth and their counsellors generated close to 500 pages of interview data. Each interview

transcript was analyzed by at least two researchers, and all team members met weekly to share, compare and contrast perceptions about information contained in individual transcripts (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Transcript data was studied carefully to identify the experiences of youth and counsellors with respect to assessing, understanding and responding to *need*. Participants' responses were used to develop typologies of perceptions and experiences.

While the interviews were being conducted, the research team also embarked on an extensive literature review that generated 1500 documents that were examined to locate research on needs assessment materials developed for youth. From these documents, 108 publications focusing on, or in some way informing the development of, youth needs assessment materials were selected as the basis for the literature review that assisted in the development of the guide.

The information generated by the interviews and the literature review was then combined, analyzed, organized into categories and spheres of interest relevant to needs assessment, and used as the basis for a *Draft guide for needs assessment for youth*. The draft guide was then shared with the original Phase I focus group members and youth and counsellors who had earlier been interviewed in this phase to elicit their comments and suggestions. Changes to the draft guide were then made based on the comments and suggestions provided by the youth and their counsellors. The development of the guide then moved into Phase III.

Phase III: Guide Pilot and Evaluation

In Phase III, the guide was again given to the 21 participants from Phase I, the 7 youth and 8 counsellors who had participated in Phase II, as well as to three academics from 3 Canadian universities who were themselves conducting research on needs assessment. Additionally, 8 new counsellors (4 male, 4 female) and their clients (8 males, 3 females) from the participating agencies were recruited to pilot the guide and to provide feedback that would be incorporated into the final draft for the guide.

FINDINGS

Phase I: Participant Development Phase, Key themes

The purpose(s) of needs assessment. Phase I focus group participants alerted us to conflicting demands in their experiences with needs assessment. For the majority, the purpose of needs assessment varied according to agency and government department mandate. Thus, while all participants agreed that youth needs should ultimately drive the provision of services, they often found themselves required to make their mandates primary and to shape both their assessment and their interventions according to those mandates. Needs assessment, therefore, really turned into an assessment for "fit" between program and youth rather than an assessment that sought to determine what services the youth required. Only some focus group participants reported being able to work from a youth-centred perspective and engage in a process that supported careful examination of the conditions of a

young person's life to assist them in connecting youth to resources that could best meet their needs.

All the focus group participants agreed that they struggle with the ethics of reconciling their workplace mandate with truly serving youths' needs and with the knowledge that even if they were able to place youth need ahead of sometimes very narrow mandates, there were still insufficient resources to respond to those needs. Despite acknowledging the limiting conditions under which they work, Phase I focus group participants strongly endorsed that "best practice" in needs assessment must make youth needs, not agency mandate, primary.

Understanding youth. Phase I focus group participants also emphasized the importance of recognizing that conditions far beyond young people's personal controls often propel youth into challenging situations. They noted the existence of a direct relationship between youthful misbehaviour and unmet needs and stressed the importance to needs assessment of a solid understanding of the dynamics in a youth's world. The participants believed that a solid understanding of the challenges and barriers faced by their clients prevented judgmental approaches and promoted the creation of positive relationships and working alliances with youth. They emphasized the importance of approaches that valued youths' strengths and capabilities. Additionally, the participants alerted us to an importance of exercising sensitivity to peer culture because in their experience, peer rejection very often followed positive change in a youth's behaviour, especially if the youth was beginning to disengage from delinquent acts that have typically bonded the peer group. They, therefore, suggested that needs assessment should include a thorough understanding of the context and social connections in which youth find themselves and the effects of these on young people's behaviour.

Relationship-building. Phase I participants stressed that effective needs assessment depends upon the helper's ability to build a trusting relationship with youth and noted that both relationship building and accurate assessment were time sensitive. They emphasized the importance of spending time in the context that constitutes the daily life of the youth and stated that, "there is no typical situation." They wanted us to understand that no two clients, even siblings, experience their living conditions in quite the same way and that it was, therefore, impossible to create "cookie cutter" templates for understanding individual life worlds and for creating a basis for the kinds of trusting relationships that form a therapeutic alliance.

Our participants told us that they rely on a number of cues to gauge the level of trust that has been established with any given youth. They stated that of the cues they rely upon, "80% are nonverbal" and noted youth counsellors must learn to pay attention to the indicators of trust exhibited by youth, because they must wait until trust is established before probing more deeply with personal questions in their quest to better understand a youth's needs. As one participant declared, "You have to earn the right to ask the questions."

Gender and cultural sensitivity. Focus group participants generally did *not* describe the ways in which they strive to be sensitive to gender and culture in their

work with youth. However, they did engage in a discussion about gender that revealed a number of biases and beliefs. They reported that girls are often seen more as “victims” while boys are seen more often as “perpetrators,” and that in general, the overall risk level for girls is frequently assessed as higher than that for boys, even when a close look at specific risks indicates that most boys and girls share similar levels of risk. They noted that difficult topics such as the exploration of boys’ involvement in the sex trade are typically avoided especially by male counsellors, and that boys, unlike girls, are rarely “tagged” by counsellors as victims of sexual exploitation.

Participants also reported that “girls implode, internalize and show self-destructive behaviours, whereas boys explode and show external violence,” but these sentiments were in direct contradiction to information that they also shared showing that boys are at far greater risk for suicide. Another example of contradictory beliefs was evidenced in participants’ assertions that “girls more readily present their needs to workers and can be more persistent than boys,” read against the assertion that “working with girls is more complex; it takes longer to get to discover and understand what [girls’] behaviour is about.” Finally, girls and boys were compared based on their emotionality, reflecting a belief that emotional complexity is related to gender. Focus group participants indicated that “with boys, things are very much as they appear,” while for girls, things were far more emotionally layered, complex and difficult, often making girls “harder and more demanding to work with.” Most participants indicated that they preferred working with boys. However, it was also suggested that it was harder to work with boys because they “are closed off and angry.”

Overall, workers seemed to think that relationships were more important to females. This perception prompted one worker to say, “Working with girls as a female worker elicits more responsibility as the mentorship role is seen as more prominent.” No comparable mentoring responsibility was discussed for male workers working with boys, female workers working with girls, or male workers working with girls. These absences were noted by the research team.

The discussion on gender remained largely speculative and bound by opinion. A theoretical basis for purposeful, gender-sensitive practice was not articulated, although the need for such a framework was acknowledged. The discussion yielded no information on how participants approached culture other than a unanimous endorsement that culture was important.

Ideal needs assessment design. Focus group participants suggested that an ideal needs assessment should begin with determining all the people involved with a youth, including their peers, in order to establish a communication network. They stated that youth should be involved in every step of the process, including goal setting, that youth should be offered choices, and that their successes should be celebrated by their counsellors. They wanted the information-gathering process to be flexible and to provide a variety of means for information gathering that could be tailored to the youth’s preferred communication style. They suggested that assessment materials should be constructed to prevent labeling and

limiting young people, and that check-list assessments should be avoided as these do not leave room to tailor an assessment to individuals.

They wanted to acknowledge the role of subjectivity in assessment and ensure that something of the worker is documented in the assessment. It was their belief that assessment should facilitate interaction and the development of the youth-counsellor relationship, and make possible the telling of youth's stories while also including some way of assessing the therapeutic relationship. They wanted to steer clear of reducing the complexity that is inherent in youth's lives to simplistic categories and suggested that complex issues need to be documented in their complexity, and rejected the notion of a "one-size-fits-all" approach. As one focus group participant noted: "If the [assessment] tool is [deemed] universal, it is like giving everyone a hammer and then everything becomes a nail." They wanted assessment materials to avoid reducing young people to categories and to have an open enough architecture that leaves room for counsellors and clients to engage in building a full picture of the client's life and needs.

Questions for Phase II. Based on the suggestions made by the Phase I focus group participants, the semistructured interview guide for youth participating in Phase II focused on asking them to define need, and on discussing what they liked and disliked about the ways in which they had been assessed and worked with in the past, what they most wanted their workers to do, how they would like to be treated, and how they responded to being helped in various ways. For counsellors, the questions also focused on asking them to define need, and on asking them to discuss how they created relationships with their clients and formulated an understanding of their clients needs, made sense of gender and culture, and what they believed an ideal needs assessment guide should include.

Phase II: Guide Development

Youth responses. When asked to define need, youth responded with concrete examples of what they believed they needed. The two boys who participated in this phase had some trouble articulating their needs, and both said that they had never been asked before to talk about what they needed. Once prompted, they were able to answer and did provide examples. Male and female youth spoke to the need for relationship, connectedness and care (e.g., someone to sit beside them and comfort them when they are feeling bad, workers who genuinely care, being listened to and feeling heard, having someone with whom they could connect, who would help them to see how they might be hurting themselves, who would advocate for them and respect their right to not answer questions that they found to be too personal). They also told us quite plainly, that unless they felt they could trust their helpers, they would not open up nor would they tell the truth about their thoughts, feelings, and situations. They spoke about basic needs like money, food, shelter, an education, responsibility, self-definition, time to work things out, stability, less adult control, and more help with avoiding harmful behaviours. They also spoke about peer pressure, the need for friendship and their fears of being judged negatively by peers if they were seen as cooperating with adults.

Counsellors' responses. Counsellors had some difficulty defining need, that is, treating the term as a concept. Rather than offering definitions, like youth, they offered concrete examples of the kinds of needs that they saw in the young people they served. Examples that spoke to youth needs fit into four categories: (a) positive relationships with adults (e.g., youth need nonjudgmental, healthy adult models, supportive involvement with adults, increased access to workers, and help beyond their practical needs); (b) experiences of capability and strength (e.g., opportunities, resources and skills to take control of their own lives, some freedom to find their own way, and opportunities to learn positive coping mechanisms); (c) experiences of mattering and being cared for (e.g., increased access to helpers, along with much less counsellor turn over, a sense of safety and comfort, acceptance of their feelings along with an understanding that their acting out behaviours reflected unmet needs, help with working through conflict); (d) experiences with connectedness (e.g., respect along with support and encouragement, involvement with a larger community to which youth could belong, and feeling supported in facing their problems — that is not “going it alone”).

Youth and counsellors acknowledged and discussed the importance of a number of issues also identified by Phase I participants: genuine relationships based in trust and a nonjudgmental approach, having the time to fully get to know one another, working from strengths and leaving room for mistakes, assuming a capacity for youth to contribute to the process, focusing on the present and the future, making space for youth to articulate their own needs, considering gender, sexual orientation and culture, making room for individual difference, working collaboratively with young people's peers, families and with other counsellors, exercising respect, and reflecting on one's own biases and standpoints. When asked to speak to assessment, the central theme that emerged for both youth and counsellors was the notion that a true and useful assessment, one that could lead to a change plan with buy-in from the young person, could only grow out of a trusting relationship that made it possible for the counsellor to really understand the young person's situation.

Literature review. Our literature review echoed our discussions with counsellors and youth and supported our findings that needs assessment is a dynamic undertaking that requires an affirmative orientation built upon a collaboration between counsellor and client. The literature strongly supports the importance of positive youth-counsellor relationships (c.f., Brendtro, Brokenleg, & Van Bockern, 1990; Richardson, 2001; Ricks & Charlesworth, 2000; Sharpe, 2001a; Sharpe, 2001b; Van Bockern, 1998). With respect to relationship, Clark (2001) stresses a very important point: it is the youth's assessment of the alliance [relationship] that matters. If a youth does not feel the relationship with the counsellor is positive, the relationship is not really workable, regardless of how it may be defined by the worker. Some factors that may inhibit the formation of a positive working relationship identified in the literature include differences in age, gender, income, social class and religious affiliation (Sue, 1981), cultural differences (Reisman & Ribordy, 1993) and lack of time (Redl, 1966).

Prominent in the literature is the suggestion that challenging behaviours should be read as signals of need, that is, as compensatory behaviours (Adler, in Corey, 2001; Dreikurs & Cassel, 1990). When counsellors understand misbehaviour in this way, they can work with youth in a way that gets at the *foundation* of troubling behaviours. They can also work more effectively towards establishing a positive relationship with their clients by approaching misbehaviours in this way.

Further, the literature suggests that counsellors must pay attention to their theories about how problems develop and how change occurs in order to make sure that their assessments have the potential to be followed by positive results (Reisman & Ribordy, 1993). Choices about intervention depend heavily on the orientation and philosophical assumptions of those choosing the intervention (Hyman, 1997). The choice of explanation lies with the helper, and is not necessarily immediately evident in the presenting problem. It is, therefore, vitally important that counsellors recognize their theoretical biases and strive to remain open to multiple explanations for the same behaviour challenges before definitively deciding on one.²

As well as understanding their own theoretical orientations, counsellors must understand their clients' orientations. How clients see their problems has a direct effect on their willingness to engage in behaviour change. Prochaska, DiClemente and Norcross (1992) outline the importance of assessing readiness for change when working with youth on needs assessment. They posit that people move through five stages in the process of personal change: precontemplation, contemplation, preparation, action and maintenance. Youth who appear unmotivated or resistant may well be reacting to interventions that are inappropriate to their location in the change process. Richardson (2001) suggests the importance of, "intervention, which meets the youth where they are," and stresses that unless we engage in interventions based on these understandings, "we are seldom helping the youth learn, grow and develop" (p. 40).

The literature points to the importance of avoiding stereotyping and allowing each person's individual sense of gender, culture and sexual orientation to surface during the assessment process.³ Needs assessment should create a space in which youth can express their conceptions about, and experiences with, gender, sex roles, sexual orientation, cultural diversity and ethnic attachments, while carefully avoiding questions that serve to perpetuate stereotypes and essentialism and create barriers to working effectively with youth⁴.

Combining findings: Developing a draft guide. We combined the findings from our analysis of the transcripts with the knowledge gained from the literature review to develop a draft guide. Our research underlined the importance of a relationship-based, ecological approach to assessment that in a respectful and supportive way considers all the systems within an individual's life: intrapersonal, family, peer, social, cultural and community, and pays attention to gender and culture, and emphasizes strength and capability.

To support relationship building and dialogue, we designed the guide to be used as a workbook that is shared by counsellor and youth who ask each other

suggested reciprocal questions that explore areas that our focus groups, interviews and literature review suggest are the key to needs assessment. We chose five domains for ease of use: *Context*, *Caring*, *Connectedness*, *Capabilities* and *Change*, and incorporated questions into each domain such that all the identified areas of needs assessment were covered.

The Context domain includes questions about the young person's world (environment): where he/she is living, school, the neighborhood and community, the youth's cultural and ethnic heritage, and his/her gender identity and level of community support. The Connectedness domain includes questions about the young person's relationships with family and friends, as well as questions aimed at helping the young person and the counsellor to build a working alliance.

The Care domain includes questions that help youth and counsellor talk about self-care and about their emotions, their expectations of each other, and about the youth's feelings and expectations of others involved in the youth's life. The Capability domain focuses on what the youth can already do or has done, emphasizes the young person's strengths and achievements, and helps the youth and the counsellor to plan for the youth's future. Finally, the Change domain explores the youth's sense of responsibility and involvement in facing his or her current identified challenges and problems. The Change domain applies the *Transtheoretical Model for Stages of Change* developed by Prochaska, DiClemente and Norcross (1992) and, thus, allows counsellors and youth to determine the youth's current way of seeing his or her problem(s) so that they can come up with the best way to approach the problem. The draft guide was then provided to our original Phase I focus group members and our interviewees from Phase II, who all gave us positive feedback and encouraged distribution in Phase III.

Phase III: Guide Pilot and Evaluation

In Phase III, the guide was again distributed to the original advisory group, all participants who helped developed the draft guide in Phase II, and to three academic colleagues across Canada and 8 additional counsellors working with 11 youth who were willing to use the guide and provide feedback.

Evaluative feedback from participants. Youth, counselors, and academics told us that overall, they believed that the guide was helpful in building therapeutic relationships because it gave young people an opportunity ask practical questions and to explore how they felt about the challenges they faced. They also agreed that using the guide required time and suggested using the guide in a series of meetings over time. They noted that because of the time requirement, the guide was not conducive to short-term work or to settings where youth are given little time to get to know their counsellors. They also appreciated knowing that questions can be skipped or revisited depending on individual choice.

Male youth pointed out that the notion of expressing need is difficult for them because it does not fit with the "macho boy code." Therefore, especially with boys, a focus on getting to know one another is likely the best way to begin discussing need. Youth appreciated the way in which the guide helped them to

get to know themselves better, and reported that as a result of using the guide, they learned things about themselves and their counsellors that they had never considered before. This knowledge helped them to become motivated to work more closely with their counsellors and to attempt to make changes that they had not previously considered.

Counsellors and academics appreciated the five domains and welcomed the inclusion of a focus on gender and culture. In suggesting revisions, counsellors wanted us to make sure that there were an equal number of questions for youth and counsellors so that the process would be experienced as balanced. The academics wanted us to be certain that a strength-based approach was emphasized, that an assessment for risk would not be left out of the mix, especially when self-destructive behaviours and harm to others were a possibility, and wanted us to be quite specific with regard to our questions about gender and culture.

Creating the final draft

We incorporated all the feedback from participants into our final version of the guide. We balanced the number of reciprocal questions to make them equal, we emphasized a strength-based approach in each domain, we noted in the introduction and the directions that: using the guide requires time, questions are optional and may be revisited, and needs assessment should not replace risk assessment; rather they should be carefully linked. We also included several pages of directions on the application of the *Transtheoretical Model for Changes of Change* (Prochaska, DiClemente, & Norcross, 1992) to assist with planned change.⁵

CONCLUSION

We have learned through this project that in order to help youth meet their needs, counsellors must strive towards a continually evolving understanding of each youth individually, developmentally, and culturally. We recognize that needs assessment is inherently subjective, transitional and grounded in social values. We believe that subjectivity of the assessor and the client, the transitional nature of any intervention, and the social, cultural and gender-based values that are the context for the assessment must always be taken into account. Finally, we believe unequivocally that focusing on client strengths and capabilities in the context of a strong positive relationship augers well for high quality needs assessment.

Notes

- ¹ See <http://web.uvic.ca/cyc/naty> to download this tool.
- ² For an in-depth analysis of theories of behaviour change the reader may refer to among others, Corey (2001) or Mahoney (1991).
- ³ Excellent references exist pointing to the importance of gender (Artz, 1998; Baines & Alder, 1996; Canada, 1998; Garbarino, 1999; Gilbert, 2000; Gilligan, 1982; Leadbeater, Blatt & Quinlan, 1995; Miller, 1988; Okamoto & Chesney-Lind, 2000; Pipher, 1994; Plummer, 1999; Pollack, 1998; Tanenbaum, 1999). Similarly, cultural issues are well highlighted by Lezak (1995), Neisser, et al. (1996) and Sattler (1992). Finally, the importance of awareness

around sexual orientation in assessment work is attested to by Daley (1998) and DuBeau (1998)

- 4 Additional discussion of the role of gender in youth-counsellor relationships and the needs assessment process can be found in the introductory section of the Guide and in the full project report (Artz et al., 2001) available on-line at <http://web.uvic.ca/naty>.
- 5 To view the guide and download it for personal use, please go to <http://web.uvic.ca/cyc/naty>.

References

- Altschuld, J. W., & Witkin, B. R. (2000). *From needs assessment to action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Artz, S., Nicholson, D., Halsall, E., & Larke, S. (2001). *Developing a gender-sensitive needs assessment tool for youth*. Unpublished final report and needs assessment guide. Ottawa, ON: National Crime Prevention Centre. <http://web.uvic.ca/cyc/naty>
- Artz, S., Blais, M., & Nicholson, D. (2000a). *Developing girls custody units, Phase I reports to Justice Canada*, Ottawa, ON.
- Artz, S., Blais, M., & Nicholson, D. (2000b) *Victoria Youth Custody Centre gender sensitive staff training curriculum*. Justice Canada, Ottawa, ON.
- Artz, S. (1998). *Sex, power & the violent school girl*. Toronto: Trifolium Books.
- Baines, M., & Alder, C. (1996). Are girls more difficult to work with?: Youth workers' perspectives in juvenile justice and related areas. *Crime and Delinquency*, 42, 467-485.
- Bradshaw, J. (1972). The concept of social need. *New Society*, 19, 640-43.
- Brendtro, L., Brokenleg, M., & Van Bockern, S. (1990). *Reclaiming youth at risk: our hope for the future*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.
- Canada, G. (1998). *Reaching up for manhood: transforming the lives of boys in America*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Clark, M. (2001). Influencing positive behaviour change: Increasing the therapeutic approach of juvenile courts. *Federal Probation*, 65, 18-28.
- Colton, M., Drury, C., & Williams, M. (1995). Children in need: Definition, identification and support. *British Journal of Social Work*, 25, 711-728.
- Corey, G. (2001). *Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy* (6th ed.) Scarborough, ON: Brooks/Cole.
- Daley, A. (1998). Lesbian invisibility in health care services: heterosexual hegemony and strategies for change. *Canadian social work Review*, 15, 57-71.
- Dreikurs, R., & Cassel, P. (1990). *Discipline Without Tears*. New York, NY: Dutton.
- DuBeau, T. (1998). Making a difference in the lives of gay and lesbian students. *Reclaiming children and youth*, 7, 164-168.
- Ernst, K. (2000). *Hull outcome monitoring and evaluation system: Agency administration package*. HOMES-Muttart Research Project.
- Garbarino, J. (1999). *Lost boys: Why our sons turn violent and how we can save them*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Garmazy, N. (1971). Vulnerability research and the issue of primary prevention. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 41, 101-116.
- Gilbert, S. (2000). *A field guide to boys and girls*. New York, N.Y.: HarperCollins.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goetz, J., & LeCompte, M. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Henderson, L., Aydlett, L., & Bailey, D. (1994). Evaluating family needs surveys: Do standard measures of reliability and validity tell us what we want to know? *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 11, 208-219.
- Hyman, I. (1997). *School discipline and school violence: The teacher variance approach*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Hodges, K. (1999). Child and adolescent functional assessment scale (CAFAS). In M. Maruish (Ed.), *The use of psychological testing for treatment planning and outcomes assessment* (2nd ed.) (pp. 321-364). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Johnson, D. E., Meiller, L. R., Miller, L. C., & Summers, G. F. (1987). (Eds.) *Needs assessment: Theory and methods*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.
- Kroll, L., Woodham, A., Rothwell, J., Bailey, S., Tobias, C., Harrington, R., & Marshall, M. (1999). Reliability of the Salford Needs Assessment Schedule for Adolescents. *Psychological Medicine*, 29, 891-902.
- Leadbeater, B. J., Blatt, S. J., & Quinlan, D. M. (1999). Gender-linked vulnerabilities to depressive symptoms, stress, and problem behaviors in adolescents. In R.M. Lerner & C.M. Ohannessian (Eds.). *Risks and problem behaviors in adolescence* (pp. 101-129). New York, NY: Garland.
- Lezak, M. (1995). *Neuropsychological assessment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maguire, P. (2001). *Reflections on co-operative inquiry in this historic moment. Systemic practice and action research*, 14. Retrieved December 12, 2002 from: <http://www.bath.ac.uk/carpp/SPAR/Commentary.htm>.
- Mahoney, M. (1991). *Human change processes: The scientific foundations of psychotherapy*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Mangham, C., McGrath, P., Reid, G., & Stewart, M. (1995). *Resiliency: Relevance to health promotion discussion paper*. [Electronic Version] <http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hppb/alcohol-otherdrugs/pub/resiliency/discus.htm>.
- Masten, A. (1999). Commentary: The promise and perils of resilience research as a guide to preventive interventions. In M. Glantz & J. Johnson (Eds.) *Resilience and development: Positive life adaptations: Longitudinal research in the social and behavioral sciences* (pp. 251-257). New York, N.Y.: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- McKillip, J. (1987) *Need analysis: Tools for the human services and education*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Miller, J.B. (1988). *Connections, disconnections and violations: Work in progress*. Wellesley, Mass: The Stone Centre, Wellesley College.
- Neisser, U., Boodoo, G., Bouchard, T.J., Boykin, A. W., Brody, N., Ceci, S. J., Halpern, D. F., Loeihlin, J. C., Perloff, R., Sternberg, R. J., & Urbina, S. (1996). Intelligence: Knowns and unknowns. *American Psychologist*, 51, 77-101.
- Okamoto, S., & Chesney-Lind, M. (2000). The relationship between gender and practitioner's fear in working with high-risk adolescents. *Child and Youth Care Forum*, 29, 373-383.
- Ottensbacher, K., Taylor, E., Msall, M., & Braun, S. (1996). The stability and equivalence reliability of the functional independence measure for children (WeeFIM). *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, 38, 907-916.
- Pipher, M. (1994). *Reviving Ophelia: Saving the selves of adolescent girls*. New York, NY: Grosset/Putnam.
- Plummer, D. (1999). *One of the boys: Masculinity, homophobia and modern manhood*. New York, NY: Harrington Park Press.
- Pollack, W. (1998). *Real boys: Rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood*. New York, NY: Henry Holt.
- Posavac, E. J., & Carey, R. G. (1985). *Program evaluation: Methods and case studies* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Prochaska, J., DiClemente, C. & Norcross, J. (1992). In search of how people change: Applications to addictive behavior. *American Psychologist*, 47, 1102-1114.
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2001). *Handbook of action research: Participatory inquiry and practice*. London: Sage. [Electronic version] Retrieved January 8, 2002 from: <http://www.bath.ac.uk/~mnsprw/Papers/HandbookIntroduction.htm>.
- Redl, F. (1966). *When we deal with children*. New York, N.Y.: Free Press.
- Reisman, J. M., & Ribordy, S. (1993). *Principles of psychotherapy with children*. New York, NY: Lexington Press.

- Richardson, B., (2001). *Working with challenging youth: Lessons learned along the way*. Philadelphia, PA: Brunner-Routledge.
- Ricks, F., & Charlesworth, J. (2000). *Emergent practice planning*. Victoria, B.C.: University of Victoria.
- Sattler, J. M. (1992). *Assessment of children's intelligence and special abilities* (3rd ed.). San Diego, CA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sharpe, J. (2001a, August). Presentation of *The education of young people* at the 2001 Civicus World Assembly Conference, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Sharpe, J. (2001b, August). Presentation of *National youth policies: A working document from the point of view of "non-formal education" youth organizations*, at the 2001 Civicus World Assembly Conference, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Stringer, E. (1999). *Action research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sue, D. W. (1981). *Counselling the culturally different: Theory and practice*. New York, N.Y.: Wiley.
- Tanenbaum, L. (1999). *Slut!: Growing up female with a bad reputation*. New York, NY: Seven Stories Press.
- Towberman, D. (1992). National survey of juvenile needs assessment. *Crime and Delinquency*, 38, 230-238.
- Van Bockern, S. (1998) Meeting the needs of our youth. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 7, 172-175.
- Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (1992). *Overcoming the odds: High risk children from birth to adulthood*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Wolin, S., Wolin, S. & Wiczorek, W. (1999, June). Resilience: Pros, cons, & unresolved issues. Prepared for a Canadian Mental Health Services workshop, Washington, DC.
- Wright, J., Williams, R., & Wilkinson, J.R. (1998). Development and importance of health needs assessment. *British Medical Journal*, 316, 1-10.

About the Authors

Dr. Sibylle Artz is Associate Professor in the School of Child and Youth Care at the University of Victoria. Before beginning her career as an academic, Sibylle worked as a school-based child and youth care worker, as an outreach worker with street kids, as a special care foster parent in group and foster homes, and as a contract child and youth care worker with clients of all ages. She also acts as a trainer in the area of learning styles and ways of knowing for conflict resolution. Her research interests include the problems of practice in child and youth care, the constructive use of emotion in every day life, and family conflict and youth violence, with a special focus on violence among adolescent females.

Diana Nicholson has drawn on her graduate training in child and adolescent learning and development to coordinate a variety of community-based research projects. Past research areas have included multidisciplinary family health care practice, early childhood educator training in First Nations communities, youth in custody, and participatory inquiry for community groups.

Elaine Halsall has over twenty years of experience working with children and families in various roles. Presently, she is the Program Coordinator for *Project Parent* at Pacific Centre Family Services Association and the Clinical Supervisor for the Mobile Services Team for Sexually Exploited Youth in Victoria. She is a Registered Social Worker and is currently finishing a Master's degree in Human and Social Development.

Susan Larke is a foster parent who has also worked with young people for several years in various roles and settings. She possesses an M.Sc. in Clinical Neuropsychology and is working on an interdisciplinary doctorate degree in Human and Social Development.

Address correspondence to Dr. Sibylle Artz, School of Child and Youth Care, University of Victoria, P.O. Box 1700, Stn. CSC, Victoria, B.C., V8W 2Y2. Phone: 250-721-6472. Fax: 250-721-7218. Email: <sartz@uvic.ca>.