



DRAFT

# INSPIRED TO SERVE Year 2 Internal Evaluation Report

August 18, 2008

---

*This internal evaluation report was prepared by  
Kay Hong, Arturo Sesma Ph.D., Kathleen Fraher, and Eugene C. Roehlkepartain*

INSPIRED TO SERVE: YOUTH-LED INTERFAITH ACTION is a three-year pilot project to enhance the capacity of America's 350,000 churches, mosques, synagogues, temples, and other faith-based organizations to engage young people in effective service-learning that increases interfaith cooperation and contributes to young people's healthy development.

The approach combines Interfaith Youth Core's (IFYC's) innovative model of interfaith service-learning with Search Institute's (SI's) framework of Developmental Assets and its asset-based approach to community and social change.

The project focuses on building the will and capacity of faith-based organizations to strengthen their programs and impact in the following four critical-shift areas:

- ❑ Toward effective service-learning
- ❑ Toward interfaith engagement
- ❑ Toward asset-building approaches with youth
- ❑ Toward city-wide movements

This project is made possible with major support from the Corporation for National and Community Service through its Learn and Serve America's community-based grants program.

The project includes both an internal evaluation and an external confirmatory evaluation, in order to track project activities and impact on young people, participating faith-based organizations, and the broader community. In terms of participating young people, the project is examining the relationship between service-learning practices and youth outcomes within a faith-based content.

---

## **Project Goals for Evaluation**

These goals for evaluation are from the logic model created for the project in Year 1.

- A1. National partners will increase the will and capacity of local partners and faith-based organizations to integrate service-learning, interfaith cooperation, and asset building into their programs, practices, and cultures.

- B1. Pilot sites will engage young people in effective service-learning.
- B2. Pilot sites will increase interfaith understanding and engagement among youth, congregations, and other community organizations.
- B3. Pilot sites will integrate asset-building principles and practices into their service-learning programs and activities.
- B4. Pilot sites will expand the number of sustained interfaith networks engaged in service-learning.
- C1. Project will institutionalize service-learning in community-based organizations.
- C2. Project will strengthen youth outcomes in civic engagement (performance measures).
- C3. Project will address community needs through service-learning.

---

## Sites and Participants

The four sites participating in this pilot project are St. Paul, Chicago, Philadelphia, and New Orleans. The project's major strength is also an interesting challenge: the uniqueness of each of the four pilot sites. Their individuality brings great richness to the team's endeavors, and requires a good measure of creativity from the leadership team to leverage the sites' strengths and help them achieve the project outcomes in their particular contexts. We have learned it is not a "one size fits all" approach.

*St. Paul:* The partner is the Saint Paul Area Council of Churches, working through its Congregations in Community program. Inspired to Serve's mission fits well with their mission to embed interfaith, asset-based service-learning into the regular activity of the faith communities in the Twin Cities.

*Chicago:* The partner is Interfaith Youth Core, which is both a leadership partner and a pilot site. Their work is to facilitate youth from diverse religious backgrounds to come together to act on the inspiration of service in their own tradition, deepen mutual understanding, and cooperate to serve the common good. To do this, they develop effective and innovative interfaith youth service-learning models that are implemented in communities.

*Philadelphia:* The Interfaith Center of Greater Philadelphia leads this site. Its mission is to advance mutual trust, understanding, and cooperation amongst Philadelphia's diverse communities, in order to work together for the common good of the region. Their efforts focused on supporting service-learning networks in a year-long program of dialogue, community service, and reflection.

*New Orleans:* The New Orleans partner is Interfaith Works, a small nonprofit that works on a consultancy basis to partner with a wide range of faith traditions, a variety of community, service, youth, and other groups, along with foundations and other funders. Its goal is "to create socially entrepreneurial projects and initiatives that meet critical civic-society needs, build on community assets, and create positive cultural change." A prime focus is on interfaith youth leadership via service-learning in post-Katrina recovery and renewal.

## Demographics: Year 2

*Youth:* Ages 5-17, with the majority in the range of 14-17; 38% African-American, 44% White, and the remainder being Asian, Hispanic, biracial, or unknown.

*Community Partners:* total of 181 partners; faith traditions include Jewish, Muslim, Christian, Unitarian Universalist, Buddhist, Baha'i, Hindu, Quaker; organization forms include faith communities, faith-based schools, and community foundations and organizations.

## Interventions

In each site, the main activity is to initiate and support partnerships among diverse faith communities, to involve each congregation's young people in asset-based, interfaith service-learning. As the project develops models for this activity, each site is implementing the project in a way that responds to its community's unique situation, resources, and needs.

Key Activity	Progress to date
Conduct an intentional community mapping process to identify community resources and hopes; use this information to identify opportunities to strengthen the community via service learning.	All sites, except St. Paul, have implemented at least one community mapping process and linked the findings to their service-learning work. One site has created a modified version of the listening process to enable them to listen to stakeholders at multiple points in the service-learning work.
Organize and implement a series of interfaith service-learning (ISL) projects that model/teach the principles and practice of effective service-learning; increase interfaith understanding and provide a positive youth activity which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Includes youth from different faiths and different faith communities</li> <li>- Implements quality components of service-learning</li> <li>- Includes actions to increase interfaith understanding;</li> <li>- Offers one-time positive interfaith service-learning activities</li> <li>- Offers multiple-session (regular) positive interfaith service-learning activities.</li> </ul>	Each site has accomplished this in its own way, with different successes and challenges.
Engage in networking, generating publicity, and awarding of mini-grants to expand the number and diversity of faith-based organizations who are active in interfaith service-learning.	Each site has done this for Year 2.
Develop and implement site-specific sustainability plans.	St. Paul and Philadelphia have plans in place.

## Evaluation Methods and Procedures

*Permissions:* All sites were requested to have their youth volunteers take home and bring back a signed permission form, either active or passive, giving a parent/guardian's permission to

participate in the various methods of research used in evaluating the project. At least one site ran into a challenge with this, when a partner organization refused to administer the permission form, but for the most part, permissions were received.

*Instruments:* The following instruments were created to gather data for answering the Performance Measures (project proposal requirement), the annual Progress Reports (CNCS [Corporation for National and Community Service] monitoring requirement), the LASSIE system (LSA [Learn and Serve America] reporting requirement), and the project's own evaluation questions. The first five forms are described in more detail in the attached Logic Model.

1. Youth Record Form
2. Adult Volunteer Record Form
3. Service-Learning Activity/Program Record Form
4. Site Implementation Report
5. Youth Impact Survey (baseline and follow-up; this survey includes the required questions from CNCS)
6. Community Partner Survey

The Community Partner Survey, which was created to be administered to the partners of the sites in their communities, asks about the value and impact of their participation in an interfaith service-learning network or activity. The LASSIE system report, when completed by the four sites, provides aggregated data for all four sites, as well as a comparison of the four sites' statistics with those of the other Community-Based Organizations who have LSA grants.

*Qualitative Data:* Each site has produced a variety of stories, reports, and other information, shared with the leadership team through site visits, email, phone calls, and documents.

*Methodology:* Each site has young people fill out the Youth Record Form and adults complete the Adult Volunteer Record Form at the beginning of each project year and subsequently at new events, activities, or programs. The Service-Learning Activity/Program Record Form is filled out by a site leader after each activity or program. The information from these three forms is entered into the LASSIE system by a site leader in June of each program year.

In Year 1, only one site used the Youth Impact Survey for both baseline and follow-up reporting. Philadelphia was the only site, at that time, providing activities of sufficient dosage and duration to allow measurement of change over time. After analysis, the survey was revised considerably for Year 2. In Year 2, both Philadelphia and St. Paul administered the two surveys to their youth. (The goal for Year 3 is for all four sites to have at least one activity/program of sufficient dosage and duration to allow use of the survey.)

*Analysis:* The data from the various sources was subjected to forms of analysis appropriate to the type and quality of the data and the size of the samples. Due to the small sample sizes in both the Philadelphia and St. Paul Youth Impact Survey datasets, only basic analyses (e.g., frequencies, descriptives, cross-tabs) were conducted. These data must be seen as only suggestive of possible trends, as the low numbers of youth with valid Time 1 and Time 2 data preclude making any

recommendations (based on these data, at least) with confidence. Data from the LASSIE system were downloaded and are presented in Appendix B.

---

## Strengths and Limitations of the Evaluation

The creation of the evaluation logic model and instruments has been a core part of the project from its inception. The multiple modes of data gathering have resulted in the ability to formulate answers to the evaluation questions from several angles. Sites have made strong efforts to be compliant with the use of the various data-gathering methods, despite their general unfamiliarity with the demands of evaluation and the sometimes burdensome nature of the gathering process.

The departure of the Lead Evaluator from Search Institute and the addition of an outside evaluation were unexpected changes beginning in Year 2.<sup>1</sup> The loss of the evaluator brought with it a lapse in progress on implementing the evaluation plan, as the remaining staff adjusted to cover the gap. The internal evaluation team is now expanded and fully engaged in the project.

While all sites have met the basic requirements of data gathering and entering for the LASSIE system, unfamiliarity with the federal terminology and varying interpretations of the meaning of some questions may have resulted in some suspect results in the LASSIE report. During the early part of Year 3, the leadership team will walk through the LASSIE questions with the site leaders to ensure shared understandings.

Low response rate was an issue with this year’s first administration of the Community Partners survey, with only about half of those e-mailed the survey responding with a fully filled out questionnaire.

The Youth Impact Survey (YIS) was administered in two sites. Unfortunately, site difficulties with tracking the anonymous responders resulted in a loss of data and hence a rather small sample size. The project staff at the Interfaith Center of Greater Philadelphia and the St. Paul Area Council of Churches administered the surveys to youth participants in grades 7 through 12, at the beginning and end of this year’s project.

---

	<i>Youth Impact Survey</i>		
	Time 1 Baseline Fall 2007	Time 2 Follow-Up Spring 2008	Valid T1 → T2 Matched Data
Philadelphia	32	23	13
St. Paul	83	91	26
TOTAL	115	114	39

---

<sup>1</sup> The initial grant proposal and requirement did not demand external evaluation and the evaluation was focused on formative evaluation. However, through discussions with the project’s program officer, it was determined that adding an external confirmatory evaluation would be strategic for the unique project.

These administrations at Time 1 and Time 2 resulted in 39 matching surveys from T1 to T2. As indicated in the table above, the Ns across the two sites were quite disparate: relatively few valid surveys were completed at either time point at the Philadelphia site, whereas many more surveys were administered at the St. Paul site. More problematically, however, is the number of valid matched T1 to T2 surveys – 13 and 26, respectively, for Philadelphia and St. Paul. As noted above in the *Analysis* section, any analyses with Ns this low should be interpreted with caution. Thus, as we describe data from the *Youth Impact Survey*, in particular the longitudinal data from this survey, it is important to keep this caveat in mind.

---

## Evaluation Findings

### **A1. National partners will increase the will and capacity of local partners and faith-based organizations to integrate service-learning, interfaith cooperation, and asset building into their programs, practices, and cultures.**

Quantitative: Most of the quantitative data pertaining to this overarching goal are to be found in findings B1-C3 below.

However, it is worth noting that 70% of the sites’ local community partners who responded to the Community Partners Survey reported that their organization has formally or informally committed to being in an ongoing network/partnership focused on interfaith service-learning. Approximately 70% also reported their organization being committed specifically to the three critical shifts around effective service-learning, interfaith engagement, and positive youth development, while a slightly smaller number (60%) noted a commitment to being part of a citywide movement of FBOs engaged in interfaith service-learning.

In regard to capacity building, in Year 2 the Site Implementation Report asked the pilot sites to rate the various forms of training and technical assistance provided by Search Institute and/or IFYC. As this chart shows, Funding, Training, Conference Attendance, and Ad Hoc Technical Assistance were considered highly effective by most sites, whereas other forms of technical assistance (Monthly Site Calls, Written Resources, and Formal Plan of Technical Assistance) received lower ratings. To begin to respond to these ratings, the joint IFYC/SI leadership team instituted a revision in the monthly site calls, changing them to quarterly calls and formatting them to be fully participatory learning conferences. The first, in May, was focused on Sustainability, and was perceived as very helpful by all four sites; this format will be continued in Year 3.

Training and TA received	Very effective	Somewhat effective, neither effective nor ineffective, or not at all effective
Funding	xxxx	
Training	xxxx	
Monthly site calls		xxxx
Conference attendance	xxxx	
Written resources	x	xx

Technical assistance (formal plan)	x	xxx
Technical assistance (ad hoc)	xxx	x
Other: program curriculum review	x	

In the LASSIE survey (Table B11), two or more participants reported the following strengths in program management: program design, strategic planning, developing community partnerships, and service site recruitment. Multiple sites reported a technical assistance need related to assessing community impacts, and one indicated a need for technical assistance related to program evaluation strategies and performance measurement.

In program content, two or more sites reported a strength in curriculum/program design, while two or more reported needing program content technical assistance in reflection techniques. In Year 3, one of the leadership team strategies will be to link sites with matching strengths and needs to be peer learners/teachers together.

One of the indicators of effective service-learning has to do with sufficient dose and duration. This is expressed in the LASSIE documents as the difference between a youth *volunteer* (who attends a one-time service-learning activity) and a youth *participant* (who engages in multiple or regular service-learning activities). One of the explicit goals of Year 2 (and year 3) is to make strides in converting the many youth volunteers into youth participants; in Year 1, sites reported 101 participants and 1,028 youth volunteers; in Year 2, sites reported 383 participants and 818 volunteers, which indicates a move in the right direction. For Year 3, we will press for further conversion as well as much-increased inclusion of these participants in the Youth Impact Survey.

Table B5 suggests progress in several program quality areas, based on data submitted to LASSIE. Across all sites, the proportion of engagement shifted from programs lasting less than 2 months to semester-long and year-long programs. For example, the average number of participants in year-long programs increased from 43 to 57 between the 2006-07 program year (Year 1) and the 2007-08 program year (Year 2). Total hours of reflection increased significantly as well. Finally, in Year 1, a total of 1,144 of the total hours of service were by youth who engaged in service projects that lasted less than 2 months, compared to only 946 service hours among those who participated in programs that lasted at least most of the school year. In comparison, 2,700 hours of service were completed in Year 2 by youth who participated in year-long programs. In addition, the average hours of service per participant increased in each category of duration.

Qualitative: Community partners who responded to an open-ended question about the value of being involved in an interfaith network noted “the depth of the interfaith relationships” that develop among the youth, the learning about people of different faiths, and the opportunity to do the important work of service with a diverse group of young people as a way to bridge differences and understand shared values.

One area that is important to review in regard to increased will and capacity is sustainability. All four sites report continued and/or growing interest in interfaith service-learning activities in their communities and among their networks and partners. At the same time, all four sites note that

funding is difficult to come by; it is to be hoped positive evaluation results at the end of Year 3 will assist the sites in their fundraising efforts. The sites also learned more about how to position this work to tap into a variety of funding streams—youth civic engagement, youth leadership and service-learning, interfaith dialogue.

The four sites are using a variety of methods to increase the likelihood of their INSPIRED TO SERVE projects to continue, including increasing staff time on the project (St. Paul), experimenting with congregation financial contributions (Philadelphia), offering training to networks to help them be self-sustaining (Chicago), and establishing high-level partnerships with other community and national organizations (New Orleans). By the end of year 3, all four sites will have site-specific sustainability plans in place.

### **A2. National partners will provide models for infusing effective practice into national faith-based service programs and systems.**

No data are gathered for evaluation of this goal; the goal has been and is being met through increasingly focused and detailed training and technical assistance. A number of conference presentations and workshops were also conducted, including presentations at Search Institute's Healthy Communities • Healthy Youth Conference, Interfaith Youth Core's National Conference, the National Service-Learning Conference, and the National Conference on Volunteering and Service. These presentations both featured the new service-learning quality standards and involved CBO and FBO organization in the discussion about strengthening quality. In addition, they were presentations that provided tangible tools to increase reflection and foster asset-based community engagement.

### **A3. National partners will develop an interfaith model for use by national youth service and youth development organizations.**

No data are gathered for evaluation of this goal; the goal will be met by the end of year 3 of the project through the creation of training and an interactive, online toolkit for youth organizations that want to initiate and sustain interfaith service-learning.

### **B1. Pilot sites will engage young people in effective service-learning.**

Quantitative: In regard to youth perceptions that indicate effectiveness of service-learning, of the young people surveyed with the YIS follow-up in Spring 08, approximately 85% agreed that “I can make a difference in my neighborhood or town,” indicating a commitment to and sense of purpose around their service-learning experiences. Interestingly, in Philadelphia, only 57% agreed with the statement that “People my age can do things to make the world better,” suggesting that the respondents were more comfortable reporting on their own concrete experience than generalizing their individual experience to their age cohort.

The LASSIE data (Table B8) suggest that the participating programs seek to address various dimensions of quality programming (at least in terms of self-reported intent). They indicate having clear learning objectives, intentionality in linking service and learning, and structure time for reflection. The participants are less consistent in offering sustained programs (though, as noted earlier, there appears to be progress in this area) or in giving young people strong voice and leadership in the projects and programs.

The site coordinators' self-reports in regard to B1, B2, and B3 are shown in Table 1. These data suggest that the sites have developed a strong sense of goal setting. Significant gaps remain in cultivating a strong youth voice (particularly in project design).

Other data that have some bearing on this goal also come from the *Youth Impact Survey*, in particular, those items asking youth to reflect on their service-learning activities and projects through the interfaith program. Table A1 (in the appendix) presents the distribution of responses for these items across both the Philadelphia and St. Paul sites. A review of this table suggests at least two points:

First, large majorities of youth across both sites felt that their service-learning projects had an impact. For example, more than 70% of the youth agreed or strongly agreed on the items *I believe the service we did made a real difference in the community* and *I learned how to be more involved in my community* at both the St. Paul and Philadelphia sites.

Second, since these data were collected post-service-learning experiences, they suggest that items with low percentage responses indicated areas where greater attention could be paid to ensure that youth are provided with these experiences. For example (and consistent with the site coordinators' self-reports), only 37% and 24% of the samples felt that they were integral in helping to plan the service learning projects (item a), and only slightly more youth felt that they helped take the lead on their service learning projects (item b). Unfortunately, no Fall 2007 data were collected on these items, so gauging any movement due to participation in service-learning projects must fall to the next evaluation effort. Generally speaking, a goal for Year 3 that is reflected in current workplans is to build capacity of the sites so that they can all check "consistently" in response to all of the features.

Qualitative: One example of how an activity can be planned to include multiple elements of effective practice was evident in Chicago. The Jewish Council on Urban Affairs, Catholic Visitation Scholarship Program, Beth Shalom B'nai Zakem Congregation, and Imagine Englewood If... came together to increase awareness of the dangers of lead poisoning to members of the greater Englewood community, which contends with the highest level of lead poisoning among children of any Chicago neighborhood. As part of this project, the site partners focused on the shared value of life. They first researched the negative effects of exposure to lead poisoning and the health of community members, specifically children. They compiled packets, containing resources the community members could use to take action if exposed to lead. They distributed the packets to sites within the community. Youth directors facilitated interfaith discussions at the events.

**Table 1: Site Coordinators' Self-Reports on Aspects of Effective Practices in Year 2**

	Status of Implementation for Each Feature				
	Consistently	Mixed or Partially	Sometimes	Rarely	Not sure
The activities were guided by clear goals for:					
Learning	XXX	X			
Serving the community	XXX	X			
Building young people's assets	XXX	X			
Strengthening interfaith relationships	XXXX				
<b>Aspects of Effective Service-Learning</b>					
Youth played major roles in identifying and selecting projects.		XXX	X		
The recipients of service were involved in designing and implementing the service projects.	XXX			X	
Young people received training or an orientation in the skills and issues they would encounter during the project.	XX	XX			
Youth wrote, talked, or intentionally reflected on what they did and learned.	XXX	X			
Youth were recognized for the service they provided.	XXX		X		
Young people talked about their service with others in their faith community.	X	XXX			
<b>Aspects of Interfaith Engagement</b>					
Youth reflected on how the service related to their values, faith, and/or spirituality.	XXX	X			
Young people gained a greater appreciation for people from religious traditions other than their own.	XXXX				
Young people learned about the beliefs and practices of faith traditions other than their own.	XXX	X			
The projects were intentionally designed to avoid mixing church and state.	XX	X			X
<b>Aspects of Asset Building</b>					
Relationships were strengthened among the participating youth.	XXX	X			
Relationships were strengthened between participating youth and adults.	XX	X			
<b>Aspects of City-Wide Movement Building</b>					
The interfaith network developed new relationships in the community.	XXX	X			

## **B2. Pilot sites will increase interfaith understanding and engagement among youth, congregations, and other community organizations.**

Quantitative: As shown in Table 1, the site coordinators perceive that they are fairly consistent in addressing interfaith goals (which were the primary focus of each of the sites prior to this project). However, ongoing attention needs to be paid to appropriate ways to maintain separation of church and state in activities that are sponsored with federal funding.

Qualitative: Evidence of impact in this area is seen in an excerpt from the award-winning essay written by one of the mini-grant-recipient youth participants in the St. Paul site (from the Minnesota International Middle School/Minneapolis Jewish Day School collaboration):

“Our school had an intercultural delegation where Jewish students and Somali students come together and engage in activities together where we can learn about each other more. At first I thought our discussion wasn’t going to be smooth because of what is happening in Palestine, and I thought they would hate us because they probably think all Muslims are crazy terrorist, but I was wrong. They were kind people who were interested learning about our culture and religion. We learned that both of our religions have many similarities that were beyond my thoughts and predictions. This raised our awareness on what is happening around the world. A wise man once said ‘man is hateful to what he is ignorant of’. I admit that I was ignorant and poorly informed about their culture, but at the end of the day I destroyed a wall and built a bridge and created new friends.”

## **B3. Pilot sites will integrate asset-building principles and practices into their service-learning programs and activities.**

Quantitative: As shown in Table 1, the Site Implementation Report only addresses two relationship-based indicators of an asset-building focus in the sites’ projects. They suggest that, at this basic level, the sites are focused on the core principle of asset building. Additional data will be collected in Year 3 to deepen perspective from the site coordinators on this dimension of the project design and implementation.

A number of items in the Youth Impact Survey ask directly about the kinds of asset-building experiences youth feel are present in their lives (Table A2). The data for both the Philadelphia and St. Paul sites are remarkably similar – the great majority of youth at both sites report in high frequencies “very or often” or “extremely or almost always” for all of these asset-related items. As can be seen in Table A2, this finding held at both Fall and Spring data collections. For example, the items *I think it is important to help other people*; *I accept others who are different*; and *I am developing respect for other people* each had 90+% of youth responding at least “very or often” (the 2<sup>nd</sup> highest response option) at both time points. This suggests that there may be ceiling effects associated with this set of items.

When looking at matched Time 1 to Time 2 data, there is great stability across most of these items. As indicated in Table A3, the percentage of youth whose responses remained stable across time was far greater than any change – either in increases or decreases. For example, for item c) in Table A4 – *I think it is important to help other people* – 13 out of the 14 responses were stable for the Philadelphia sample, while 24 of the 26 responses were stable for the St. Paul sample.

Where there does seem to be an inkling of change – say, in item i) for the St. Paul sample (where 6 youth changed from “rarely/sometimes” to “often/almost always” on trying to solve social problems)—there is a corresponding decrease in responses as well. What this all suggests is that there is no consistent pattern of change over time, certainly no pattern that we could, with any confidence, attribute to participation in the service-learning programs and activities.

Again, though, any changes in these data cannot be confidently attributed to service-learning programs, as the questions did not specifically ask youth to comment on whether the skills, beliefs, and attitudes measured by these items came as a direct result of service-learning projects. Thus, in addition to the caveats regarding the interpretation of these data as a result of sample size, we also need to caution against over-interpretation of these findings as providing evidence of program effects.

Two implications: The items in #12 may not be discriminating enough to capture effective change as a result of the program; questions need to be more explicitly tied to whether these effects came as a result of the programs themselves. Two ways of approaching this – asking a dosage-type question (e.g., how often did you attend service-learning activities?) and specifically asking at Time 2: “As a result of participating in the service-learning program, do you feel you...” and so on.

Qualitative: One way the New Orleans site has deeply incorporated asset-building principles into its work is with its emphasis on youth involvement, leadership, and empowerment. They worked through a number of challenges to create a youth philanthropy program for distributing the mini-grant funds.

#### **B4. Pilot sites will expand the number of sustained interfaith networks engaged in service-learning.**

Quantitative: In Year 2, the number of sustained interfaith networks engaged in service-learning expanded from 6 in Year 1 to a total of 22 across the four sites, as evidenced in the sites’ listings of networks in their Site Implementation Reports.

Qualitative: The project goal for the end of Year 3 is to have expanded the number of sustained interfaith networks engaged in the service learning to 64. The intentional use of the mini-grant process in Year 3, as well as expanded press and other media coverage, will likely be critical to reaching that goal.

Despite some success in all four sites, leaders have expressed disappointment and frustration about recruiting participants and partners; it has shown itself to be a time-consuming process, with multiple barriers to overcome, including the newness of the concept of interfaith service-learning and low levels of resources among faith communities. At least one site (St. Paul) has proposed, as a variation in method, that a two-stage process be used, first engaging congregations/faith communities in general service-learning, and then moving them toward interfaith service-learning in following years.

## **C1. Project will institutionalize service-learning in community-based organizations.**

Quantitative: It is important to contextualize findings on institutionalization in the reality that these programs and networks are quite new. According to LASSIE data (Table B3), 4 out of 5 of the subgrantees or mini-grantees that responded have never before received funding from LSA. Furthermore, 80% indicate that their organization has been engaged in service-learning less than 5 years (or they don't know). Furthermore, all respondents indicate that they have formed new partnerships through the LSA funding, with a total of 73 being new (a median of 3 per site). (See Table B7.)

The level of institutional support varies across the participating organizations. Only 40% indicate that service-learning is supported in their strategic plan, though 70% indicate that their curriculum has board approval. Many are utilizing operating support, individual contributions, and foundation grants to support their efforts, suggesting a broader internal capacity to sustain the efforts beyond reliance on federal funding.

Another factor in institutionalization is the level of coordinator support and engagement. Many of the sites do not have a paid coordinator, and when they do, it's likely to be a part-time person with other responsibilities (Table B10). However, these coordinators, when present, often have significant service-learning experience and preparation. It is also likely that some of these positions are precarious, because they are supported by grant funding rather than operating funds.

In addition to the institutionalization within the partner organizations in the project, INSPIRED TO SERVE also seeks to spread the approach across the community. Data from the Community Partners Survey point toward this expanding impact. Of the 28 community partners who responded to the survey, 100% reported that involving young people in service-learning experiences is related to their organization's mission. Seventy-three percent reported that their organization has "made a commitment to advancing interfaith service-learning as an ongoing way" of fulfilling their mission. On a more practical level, 35% reported that their organization had made changes in policies and programs related to service-learning or interfaith service-learning, while 35% said no changes had occurred, and about 30% were unsure.

## **C2. Project will strengthen youth outcomes in civic engagement (performance measures).**

Quantitative: Four measures of youth's level of civic engagement were included in the Youth Impact Survey: 1) if they have ever volunteered or provided community service; 2) their willingness to volunteer throughout their life; 3) their intention to vote as an adult; and 4) how much time they spent engaged in service-learning through the interfaith program over the school year. The first three of these indicators were assessed at both Fall and Spring administrations in Philadelphia and St. Paul.

The first civic engagement indicator (whether youth have ever volunteered or provided community service) was created by adding up all of the different contexts (i.e., school, youth organization, faith community, family, and/or neighborhood) in which youth had volunteered.

Thus, the sum score could range from 0 contexts to 5 contexts. Table A4 shows the percentage of youth who indicated they had engaged in volunteer activities in each of the five contexts. For the most part, about half of the youth had volunteered in each of the contexts, with the exception being within the neighborhood, where far fewer youth were part of community volunteer efforts.

Table A5 shows how the distribution of responses in volunteering changed or stayed the same. As we saw above, relatively little change over time occurred for those youth for whom we have valid Time 1 and Time 2 data. Two data points do stand out though: first, for the Philadelphia site, we see that 5 youth who were previously uninvolved in volunteer activities through their faith community in the Fall of 2007 were involved in the Spring of 2008. This is counterbalanced by only one youth who had been involved in 2007 but was not in 2008. For the St. Paul site, 8 youth who were previously uninvolved in school volunteer activities in 2007 now were engaged in volunteer projects in 2008. Whether this is a direct result of interfaith activities is unknown.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> civic engagement indicators (volunteering through adulthood and voting as an adult) are presented in Table A6. For the most part, youth responses are hitting the ceiling, as nearly 80% of the youth are endorsing that they will engage in these activities into adulthood. The only variability in responses is for the St. Paul site, where less than half of the Fall 2007 youth indicated that they intend to volunteer through their life, while a slightly higher percentage—69%—indicated that they would do so at the Spring 2008 assessment.

Looking at change over time in these two indices in Table A7 indicates great stability from the Fall to the Spring data collections. All the youth at Time 1 indicated that they plan on voting when they are eligible; this same unanimity of response was repeated at Time 2. With respect to volunteering throughout life, our limited change data suggest little movement in how youth view their future volunteer activities.

Finally, we looked at youth-reported number of hours spent, total, in service-learning projects and activities. The data in Table A8 indicate that there are marked differences in the distribution of responses across the two sites, with over three-fourths (79%) of Philadelphia youth reporting 21+ hours of service-learning work, while for the St. Paul youth, the same percentage (79%) reported 20 or fewer hours. With no baseline data to compare how many hours youth were engaged in *any* volunteer or service-learning activities (not necessarily guided by interfaith programs), it is difficult to put these numbers in context.

Qualitative: Program alumni from Philadelphia often feel ready to go out and confront diversity with a new mentality. They leave the program with the tools to create a safe multicultural environment wherever they are, as reflects program alumna Nicole, two years after participating in the program: “As a sophomore in a diverse college in a diverse city, my participation in the pilot year of the Walking the Walk program [the name of the local program in the Inspired to Serve project] continues to be an important influence in my life as I seek to live out my values of multiculturalism and plurality. Although these beliefs were extremely important to me before my senior year in high school, it was only upon joining the program that I was able to participate in a safe, multicultural space that enabled me to ask difficult questions of people with very different ethnic, national, and religious backgrounds from myself. More than just putting a ‘human face’ on issues like racial diversity, class differences, and religious plurality, the memory of my friends from Walking the Walk reminds me of the importance of trying my best to actually live

the values – to truly walk the walk – that I know to be important. It is not enough to recognize the importance of diversity and respect, but rather I must commit myself to actually live that ethical mandate.”

### **C3. Project will address community needs through service-learning.**

Quantitative: As noted on the sites’ activity/program record forms, a total of 16,536 people have been beneficiaries of the young people’s interfaith service-learning activities in Years 1 and 2. Programs and projects reported activity in the following areas: Education, health/nutrition, environmental, homeland security, public safety, general human needs, and community and economic development (Table B6). The service categories in which they spent the most time were general human needs (55% of the time) and community and economic development (51%).

Qualitative: Three of the four sites have made good strides toward a project objective of ensuring that the community is consulted about the needs it wishes to have addressed through service-learning. By doing a version of the Community Listening Project provided, they and their young people and adult volunteers were able to chose service-learning activities (ranging from Civil Rights movement history presentation to school rehabilitation, from book drives for prisons to removing invasive species from a conservancy, from teaching a community about lead poisoning to addressing anger and violence) that responded to expressed community needs.

---

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

INSPIRED TO SERVE was launched as a pilot project to engage a community-based sector in the service-learning field in a way that it had not been previously. The faith-based sector is typically characterized by deep passion and commitment (its historic strength) with less emphasis on formal structures, evaluation, and accountability. As has been true in much federal funding for faith-based work, these local partners have had to engage in new kinds of work and different levels of external accountability. Furthermore, these partner sites are, in general, emergent interfaith networks (not established programs and institutions)—though some are hosted by well-established, formal systems.

The national project leadership has sought to balance the realities of building grassroots networks with the expectations for quality, growth, impact, and accountability that are integral to the LSA funding expectations. The Year 2 data suggest progress in moving toward greater impact and effective practice as well as ongoing challenges and areas for improvement. Our hope is that the participating sites value, as we do, a commitment to continuous improvement and ongoing learning and development. Thus, we highlight the need in Year 3 to build on the strengths of Years 1 and 2 while also attending to the ongoing challenges and gaps.

### **Strengths of the program as revealed by the evaluation findings**

- A clear focus on bringing diverse young people and institutions together for service and reflection.
- Evidence of an increasing emphasis on sustained engagement of young people across a semester or the school year.

- High engagement of youth of color, particularly African American youth.
- A clear awareness of the elements of quality programming, suggesting an ongoing intention to improve practice.
- A greater awareness of the available technical assistance and the kinds of technical assistance and training needed.

Though some of the findings are suggestive of potential impact, data from the *Youth Impact Survey* cannot be extrapolated to suggest a level of impact on the lives of participating young people. So while the stories and anecdotal evidence suggest that young people’s engagement is formative in shaping their commitments, their civic engagement, and their values, we must reserve judgment until we have more high-quality data from all participating cities.

### **Recommendations for improving the program services provided**

- The program quality areas that appear to continue to need particular attention include increasing youth leadership and voice throughout the process.
- Program duration and continued emphasis on converting volunteers to participants remain important to address (as is the case for other domains of service-learning).
- Given the project’s performance measures related to civic engagement, the project as a whole needs to be more explicit in emphasizing learning objectives regarding civic engagement.
- As they move into the third year of operation, sites need to establish targets for expanding the number of networks present and the strategies needed to cultivate these networks.

### **Improving future evaluation activities**

The quality of the INSPIRED TO SERVE evaluation hinges on the diligence and care that each site invests in data collection. The major limitation of this evaluation report is that we did not receive high-quality, consistent data from all sites, thus greatly diminishing the ability to interpret patterns and impact. Because of this gap, site workplans for Year 3 must show clear plans for:

- Getting parental permission to participate in the project and its evaluation activities;
- A commitment to and process for collecting data on *all* youth and adult participants in each project activity;
- A commitment to conducting the Youth Impact Survey at the beginning and end of the program year, including an accurate method for linking the pre-post youth surveys to allow for longitudinal comparisons;
- A commitment to collecting data through the Community Partners Survey, including an appropriate response rate; and
- Readiness to host evaluation site visits by RMC Research and to support the other data collection activities needed for this project.

Site liaisons and other national staff will work closely with the site leaders to monitor all data collection and to address issues that may compromise data quality.

APPENDIX A

Youth Impact Survey Data

Frequencies, percentages, and change over time metrics for selected items from the *Youth Impact Survey*.

**Table A1**  
**Percentage of Responses on YIS Item 18 across the Two Sites**

	Spring 2008 Data					
	Philadelphia N = 18 – 19			St. Paul N = 87 – 89		
	% Strongly Disagree +	% Not Sure	% Strongly Agree +	% Strongly Disagree +	% Not Sure	% Strongly Agree +
<b>Please think about the service-learning activities and project(s) that you have done <u>through the interfaith program</u> in the past school year. How much do you agree or disagree with each statement?</b>						
a. I helped plan the service projects.	63%	0%	37%	60%	16%	24%
b. I helped lead the service projects.	47%	0%	53%	64%	14%	23%
c. We worked side by side with the people we helped.	16%	0%	84%	23%	3%	74%
d. We had clear goals for what we wanted to do.	0%	5%	95%	11%	12%	76%
e. I received training before doing the service projects.	44%	0%	56%	55%	20%	25%
f. I got to know people who live in the community.	26%	5%	68%	36%	9%	55%
g. Our group reflected on our service project together.	16%	5%	79%	12%	5%	83%
h. I got a certificate or other recognition for the service I provided.	11%	11%	79%	67%	15%	18%
i. I believe the service we did made a real difference in the community.	0%	5%	95%	20%	7%	73%
j. I learned about my community's strengths and needs.	21%	11%	68%	29%	14%	57%
k. I learned information and skills that could help me in a job.	16%	5%	79%	26%	12%	62%
l. I learned information and skills that could help me in a job.	16%	0%	84%	24%	15%	62%
m. I learned how to be more involved in my community.	0%	0%	100%	23%	7%	71%

Note. There are no baseline data; data were collected only at the Spring 2008 time point.

**Table A2**  
**Percentages of Youth Responses on YIS Item 12 at both Fall and Spring Administrations**

Below is a list of positive things that you might have in yourself, your family, friends, neighborhood, school, and community. For each item, check how true it is for you <u>now or within the last 3 months.</u>	Percent who responded “Very or Often” or “Extremely or Almost Always”			
	Philadelphia		St. Paul	
	Fall 2007 N= 31 – 32	Spring 2008 N= 22 – 23	Fall 2007 N= 81 – 84	Spring 2008 N= 86 – 91
a. I stand up for what I believe in.	73%	54%	92%	90%
b. I stay away from tobacco, alcohol, and other drugs.	97%	87%	98%	99%
c. I think it is important to help other people.	94%	96%	98%	95%
d. I take responsibility for what I do.	97%	78%	87%	82%
e. I accept people who are different from me.	96%	100%	96%	92%
f. I am helping to make my community a better place.	56%	64%	60%	60%
g. I am involved in a religious group or activity.	71%	78%	73%	69%
h. I am involved in a sport, club, or other group.	90%	87%	77%	76%
i. I am trying to help solve social problems.	76%	61%	55%	56%
j. I am given useful roles and responsibilities.	87%	74%	77%	78%
k. I am developing respect for other people.	100%	100%	93%	91%
l. I am involved in creative things such as music, theater, or art.	70%	70%	46%	42%
m. I am serving others in my community.	58%	70%	46%	44%
n. I have a safe neighborhood.	88%	86%	86%	84%
o. I have good neighbors who care for me.	69%	65%	82%	76%
p. I have neighbors who help watch out for me.	57%	65%	77%	71%

Note. Differences in percentages from Fall 2007 to Spring 2008 should not be interpreted as meaningful change over time. A lack of significant overlap in within-site across-time samples militates against inferring any kind of relevant increase (or decrease) from the Fall to the Spring administrations.

**Table A3**  
**Stability and Change on YIS Item 12 across the Two Sites**

	Philadelphia N = 12 – 14			St. Paul N = 25 – 26		
	# Stable	# Decrease	# Increase	# Stable	# Decrease	# Increase
Below is a list of positive things that you might have in yourself, your family, friends, neighborhood, school, and community. For each item, check how true it is for you <u>now or within the last 3 months.</u>						
a. I stand up for what I believe in.	14	0	0	22	4	0
b. I stay away from tobacco, alcohol, and other drugs.	12	2	0	25	1	0
c. I think it is important to help other people.	13	1	0	24	2	0
d. I take responsibility for what I do.	12	2	0	24	1	0
e. I accept people who are different from me.	14	0	0	22	3	0
f. I am helping to make my community a better place.	8	1	5	17	3	5
g. I am involved in a religious group or activity.	12	1	0	16	5	4
h. I am involved in a sport, club, or other group.	13	0	1	16	4	5
i. I am trying to help solve social problems.	12	0	0	16	4	6
j. I am given useful roles and responsibilities.	12	1	1	19	3	4
k. I am developing respect for other people.	14	0	0	18	3	2
l. I am involved in creative things such as music, theater, or art.	12	0	1	18	5	3
m. I am serving others in my community.	9	1	3	21	3	1
n. I have a safe neighborhood.	12	1	0	21	3	1
o. I have good neighbors who care for me.	11	2	1	13	7	5
p. I have neighbors who help watch out for me.	11	1	2	16	8	1

Note. All figures are raw numbers. N represents the total number of youth for whom valid Time 1 and Time 2 data were collected.

Response options were dichotomized, such that the bottom two response options, “Not At All or Rarely” and “Somewhat or Sometimes” were combined, and the top two response options “Very or Often” and “Extremely or Almost Always” were combined.

How to read this table: “# Stable” refers to the number of youth respondents who at both Time 1 and Time 2 responded the same way. “# Decrease” represents the total number of youth who responded at the top end of the response scale for the item at Time 1, but then reported at the bottom end of the response scale at Time 2. “# Increase” is the opposite – youth who responded at the bottom end of the scale at Time 1 but responded at the top end of the scale at Time 2.

**Table A4**  
**Percentage of Responses for #5 – Contexts of Volunteering**

Have you ever been a volunteer or provided community service? Please check all that apply.	% of Youth Who Responded “Yes”			
	Philadelphia		St. Paul	
	Fall 2007 N= 32	Spring 2008 N= 22	Fall 2007 N= 83	Spring 2008 N= 90 – 91
a. Yes, in school before this year.	59%	68%	49%	66%
b. Yes, with a youth organization.	47%	55%	42%	40%
c. Yes, with my faith community.	53%	68%	43%	41%
d. Yes, with my family.	53%	32%	52%	49%
e. Yes, with my neighborhood.	3%	14%	22%	21%
f. No.	0%	5%	6%	10%

Note. Differences in percentages from Fall 2007 to Spring 2008 should not be interpreted as meaningful change over time. A lack of significant overlap in within-site across-time samples militates against inferring any kind of relevant increase (or decrease) from the Fall to the Spring administrations.

**Table A5**  
**Stability and Change for YIS #5 – Contexts of Volunteering**

Have you ever been a volunteer or provided community service? Please check all that apply.	Philadelphia N = 14			St. Paul N = 25		
	#	#	#	#	#	#
	Stable	Decrease	Increase	Stable	Decrease	Increase
a. Yes, in school before this year.	7	4	3	16	1	8
b. Yes, with a youth organization.	12	1	1	17	4	4
c. Yes, with my faith community.	8	1	5	21	2	2
d. Yes, with my family.	10	3	1	16	5	4
e. Yes, with my neighborhood.	13	0	1	13	7	5
f. No.	13	0	1	20	1	4

Note. All figures are raw numbers. N represents the total number of youth for whom valid Time 1 and Time 2 data were collected.

How to read this table: “# Stable” refers to the number of youth respondents who at both Time 1 and Time 2 reported the same way. “# Decrease” represents the total number of youth who reported that they did engage in volunteering opportunities for that context at Time 1, but not for Time 2. “# Increase” is the opposite – youth who reported that they did not engage in volunteering in that context at Time 1 but did volunteer in that context at Time 2.

**Table A6**  
**Percentages of Youth Responses on YIS Item 9 at both Fall and Spring Administrations**

Please check how much you disagree or agree with the following statements.	Percent who responded “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”			
	Philadelphia		St. Paul	
	Fall 2007 N= 32	Spring 2008 N= 22	Fall 2007 N= 81 – 84	Spring 2008 N= 86 – 91
a. I intend to volunteer through my whole life.	79%	91%	48%	69%
b. I intend to vote when I am an adult.	100%	100%	98%	94%

Note. Differences in percentages from Fall 2007 to Spring 2008 should not be interpreted as meaningful change over time. A lack of significant overlap in within-site across-time samples militates against inferring any kind of relevant increase (or decrease) from the Fall to the Spring administrations.

**Table A7**  
**Stability and Change for YIS #9 – Volunteering and Voting in Adulthood**

Please check how much you disagree or agree with the following statements.	Philadelphia N = 6 – 11			St. Paul N = 14		
	# Stable	# Decrease	# Increase	# Stable	# Decrease	# Increase
c. I intend to volunteer through my whole life.	5	1	0	9	2	3
d. I intend to vote when I am an adult.	11	0	0	14	0	0

Note. All figures are raw numbers. N represents the total number of youth for whom valid Time 1 and Time 2 data were collected.

How to read this table: “# Stable” refers to the number of youth respondents who at both Time 1 and Time 2 reported the same way. “# Decrease” represents the total number of youth who reported that planned on volunteering/voting in adulthood at Time 1, but not for Time 2. “# Increase” is the opposite – youth who reported that they did not envision voting/volunteering in adulthood at Time 1 but indicated they would at Time 2.

**Table A8**  
**Distribution of Responses on YIS #10 – Time Spent in Service-Learning Project Activities**

How much time did you spend, in total, doing service-learning <u>through this interfaith program</u> during the past school year? Include all the time you spent in sessions or meetings for planning, as well as doing preparation, service, and reflection.	Percent who responded “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”			
	Philadelphia N=19		St. Paul N=89	
	N	%	N	%
e. 10 hours or fewer	2	11%	27	30%
f. 11 – 20 hours	2	11%	44	49%
g. 21 – 30 hours	7	37%	13	15%
h. 31 – 40 hours	1	5%	2	2%
i. 41 hours or more	7	37%	3	3%

Note. Data were collected only at the Spring 2008 time point.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **2007 – 2008 LASSIE Data**

Ten sub-grantees or mini-grantees submitted data to the LASSIE database for the 2007 – 2008 program year. This included three local sites that aggregated data (Philadelphia, New Orleans, and St. Paul) plus one mini-grantee in Philadelphia, two in St. Paul, and four mini-grantees in Chicago.

**Table B1**  
**Summary and Comparison to All CBO Grantees**

	<b>Inspired to Serve</b>	<b>All CBO Grantees</b>
<b>Service Learning Participants</b>		
Total number of participants	383	24,920
Median number of participants in a program	20	50
<b>Teachers/Faculty/Staff</b>		
Total number of teachers, faculty and staff	54	1,677
Median number of teachers, faculty and staff in a program	5	5
<b>Service Hours</b>		
Total number of service hours	3,519	489,563
Median number service hours in a program	750	1,868
<b>Community Volunteers</b>		
Total number of youth volunteers	818	6,535
Median number of youth volunteers in a program	20	6
Total number of adult volunteers	781	4,128
Median number of adult volunteers in a program	6	9
<b>Partner Agencies</b>		
Total number of partners	181	1,800
Median number partners in a program	5	7
% of partners that are regularly and actively involved in planning and managing LSA funded service learning	23.80%	28.20%

**Table B2**  
**Performance Indicators**

	<b>Inspired to Serve</b>	<b>All CBO Grantees</b>
1. Percent of K-12 schools with 50% or more of their students in a free/reduced lunch program.	0%	49%
2. Number of service-learning participants supported by Learn and Serve America.	383	940,126
4. Percent of student participants who are part of a minority population.	48%	38%
5. Percent of student participants who are Hispanic.	5%	20%
6. Estimated number of youth beneficiaries of LSA supported activities who are economically disadvantaged.	5,121	341,579
7. Estimated number of youth beneficiaries of LSA supported activities who are foster children.	0	9,192
8. Estimated number of youth beneficiaries of LSA supported activities who have incarcerated parents.	11	6,502
9. Estimated number of youth beneficiaries of LSA supported activities who are adjudicated youth.	0	5,728
10. Estimated number of youth beneficiaries of LSA supported activities who are disabled or in special education.	0	38,277
12. Percent of adult volunteers in LSA supported activities who are Baby Boomers	41%	41%
13. Percent of participants in service-learning programs that last at least a semester and serve a minimum of 20 hours.	12%	28%
14. Percent of organizations that partner with faith-based organizations.	90%	35%
15. Percent of organizations that 'frequently' or 'always' have at least 6 of the 9 high-quality service-learning program characteristics. 1	90%	90%
16. Percent of organizations that have adopted at least 6 of the 9 institutional supports for service-learning. 2	30%	21%
19. Percent of organizations with service-learning requirements for students or participants.	50%	33%
20. Number of service-learning classes offered that were created because of Learn and Serve funding.	14	5,522
21. Number of Learn and Serve programs that are involved in disaster preparedness and response activities.	1	221
22. Number of service-learning participants that were certified in disaster training.	0	4,150
23. Number of local disasters to which service-learning participants responded.	1	281

**Table B3**  
**Funding Sources**

	N	Measure
<b>LSA Funding</b>		
First LSA Grant	6	60%
Received Prior LSA Grants	2	20%
Don't Know	2	20%
<b>Non-LSA Funding Sources</b>		
Individual Contributions (CBO Only)	6	86%
General Operating Funds	5	50%
Foundation Grants	5	50%
Community/Private Contributions	3	30%
Corporate Grants	1	10%
Other Sources	1	10%
State Service-Learning Funds (Non-LSA)	0	0%
Other State Grant or Program Funds	0	0%
Other CNCS Grants	0	0%
Other Federal Funds	0	0%

**Table B4  
Participants**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Measure</b>
Total Number of Individual Service-Learners (2)	10	383
Median Number of Individual Service-Learners (2)		
<b>Ethnic Background of LSA Participants (Percent of Student Participants) (3)</b>		
Hispanic	7	5%
Non-Hispanic	10	95%
Ethnicity Unknown	3	<1%
<b>Racial Background of LSA Participants (Percent of Student Participants) (3)</b>		
American Indian/Alaskan Native	4	0%
Asian	4	3%
Black/African-American	9	38%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	2	0%
White	9	44%
Two or More Races	5	7%
Race Unknown	3	8%
<b>Gender (Percent of Student Participants)</b>		
Male	10	43.60%
Female	10	56.40%
<b>Other Youth and Adult Volunteers</b>		
Total Number of Youth Volunteers	9	818
Median Number of Youth Volunteers	9	20
Total Number of Adult Volunteers	10	781
Median Number of Adult Volunteers	10	6
Total Number of Baby Boomers	8	320
Median Number of Baby Boomers	8	6

	<b>N</b>	<b>Measure</b>
<b>Staff</b>		
Total Number of Staff	10	54
Median Number of Staff	10	5
<b>Disadvantaged Youth</b>		
Total Number of Disadvantaged Youth that Provided Community Service through LSA Supported Service Activities	4	423
<b>Provided Service to Disadvantaged Youth</b>		
Yes	6	60%
No	1	10%
Don't Know	3	30%
Economically Disadvantaged Youth	4	5,121
Foster Children	1	0
Adjudicated Youth	1	0
Youth with Incarcerated Parents	3	11
Service Learners Who Are Disabled/In Special Education	1	0

**Table B5**  
**Program Duration (with Comparisons between 2007 – 2008 Data and 2006 – 2007 Data)**

	Year	Service-Learning Programs Lasting Less Than 2 Months (1)		Service-Learning Programs Lasting Most or All of a Semester (1)		Service-Learning Programs Lasting Most or All of the School Year (1)	
		N	Measure	N	Measure	N	Measure
Average Number of Participants	07-08	2	51	5	25.6	3	57.3
	06-07	4	66.5	0	ND	2	43
Total Number of Participants	07-08	2	102	5	128	3	172
	06-07	4	266	0	0	2	86
Average Hours of Reflection per Participant (2)	07-08	2	11	5	11.6	3	20.7
	06-07	4	9	0	ND	2	27
Total Hours of Reflection (3)	07-08	2	1,122	5	1,485	3	3,560
	06-07	4	2,394	0	ND	2	2,322
Average Hours of Service per Participant	07-08	2	8.5	5	10	3	15.7
	06-07	4	4.3	0	ND	2	11
Total Hours of Service (3)	07-08	2	867	5	1,280	3	2,700
	06-07	4	1,144	0	ND	2	946

(1) Includes only the organizations that run this program.

(2) In order to account for variations in the number of participants and the average number of service and reflection hours at the program level, the average provided in this report is calculated by dividing the total number of hours (see footnote #3) by the total number of participants.

(3) The totals for service and reflection hours are calculated by summing the total service and reflection hours [Average Hours \* Total participants] at the individual program level. Due to variations in the size of programs and the average hours of service and reflection, the total number of hours should not be calculated by multiplying [Average Hours \* Total participants] at an aggregate level.

**Table B6**  
**Service-Learning Activities by Category**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percentage of all programs reporting activities in category (1)</b>	<b>Average percent of time spent on activities in category (2)</b>
Health/Nutrition	1	10%	5%
Education	4	40%	39%
Environmental	5	50%	20%
Homeland Security	1	10%	15%
Public Safety	2	20%	30%
Housing	0	0%	0%
Human Needs-General	4	40%	55%
Community and Economic Development	5	50%	51%

(1) Total Sites reporting on percentage of activities or programs by service category.

(2) Respondents reported the approximate percentage of time that they spent on activities in each category. The percent reported here is the average percentage of time that all programs spend on activities in each category.

**Table B7**  
**Partners**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Measure</b>
<b>Partnership Organizations</b>		
Total Number of Partnerships	10	181
Median Number of Partnerships	10	5
Percent of All Partnership-Organizations that are Faith-Based (1)	10	50%
<b>Partnership Roles/Activities (1)</b>		
Number Regularly and Actively Involved	10	43
Percent Regularly and Actively Involved		24%
Number Periodically Involved	10	45
Percent Periodically Involved		25%
Number Advised on LSA service-learning, but not directly involved in planning/ managing service-learning	10	51
Percent Advised, but Not Involved		28%
Number served only as Service Site	10	42
Percent served only as service site		23%
<b>Advisory Board</b>		
Program has Advisory Board	3	30%
No Advisory Board	5	50%
Do not know	2	20%
Number of Partners on Advisory Boards	3	15
Median Number of Partners on Advisory Boards	3	3
<b>New Partnerships</b>		
Total Number of New Partnerships	10	73
Percent of Sites Reporting 1 or More New Partnerships as a Result of Current LSA Funding	10	100%
Median Number of New Partnerships Per Site	10	3
<b>Sites Reporting Collaboration with Other CNCS Programs (1)</b>		
AmeriCorps	2	25%
AmeriCorps*VISTA	1	13%
Senior Corps	0	0%
None /Don't know	6	75%
Don't Know	2	20%

(1) Respondents who didn't know the number of faith-based partners, or partnership roles/activities have been excluded from these calculations.

**Table B8**  
**Characteristics Present in the SLA-funded Service-Learning Initiatives and Programs in Participating Organizations**

*(Percent Reporting "Frequently" or "Always")*

	<b>N</b>	<b>Measure</b>
Service activities are of sustained or significant duration (e.g. more than 40 hours per participant per year).	10	40%
Service projects have clear and specific learning objectives.	10	100%
Program staff (teachers, faculty, program coordinators, etc.) work with participants to draw the connections between the service that participants are providing and what they should be learning.	10	100%
The service that participants perform is accompanied by opportunities to learn that are strongly related to the service.	9	67%
The relationship between service and civic participation, responsibility, skills and concepts are made explicit.	10	90%
Project participants are given organized time to reflect on their service.	10	100%
Participants have a leadership role in all phases of a project, including making decisions about the development of the project as well as its execution.	10	70%
Projects are based in strong partnerships with community groups that include mutually agreed upon goals, roles and responsibilities.	10	90%
Both learning and service are emphasized in all projects.	10	90%

(1) Respondents are allowed to select more than one choice, therefore percentages may not total 100%.

(2) Respondents who didn't know the number of faith-based partners, or partnership roles/activities have been excluded from these calculations.

**Table B9**  
**Institutional Support**

	N	Measure
<b>Number of Years Organized Service-Learning Activities Have Taken Place at Organization/Institution</b>		
One Year or Less	2	20%
Two to Five Years	5	50%
Six Years or More	2	20%
Don't Know	1	10%
<b>Policy Support: Service-Learning is included in the Strategic Plan.</b>		
Yes	4	40%
No	3	30%
Don't Know	3	30%
<b>Policy Support: Service-learning is part of the board approved curriculum in at least one subject, discipline, major, or program at the institution.</b>		
Yes	7	70%
No	1	10%
Don't Know	2	20%
<b>Policy Support: Service-Learning is part of the official core curriculum in at least one required course, discipline or major, or part of activities in all programs at the institution</b>		
Yes	5	50%
No	4	40%
Don't Know	1	10%

**Table B10  
Coordinator**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Measure</b>
<b>Percent of Sites with a Full or Part-Time Service-Learning Coordinator</b>	4	40%
Full-Time	2	50%
Part-Time	2	50%
<b>Percent of Time Service-Learning is Part of Coordinator's Job Responsibilities</b>		
100%	1	25%
75%	1	25%
50%	1	25%
25%	0	0%
Less than 25%	1	25%
<b>Professional Experience of Service-Learning Coordinator</b>		
Less than 1 Year	1	25%
1 to 4 Years	0	0%
5 Years or More	3	75%
<b>Training/Professional Development Background of Service-Learning Coordinator</b>		
No Formal Education/Training/Professional Development Related to Service-Learning	0	0%
One Workshop, Conference, or Training Session	1	25%
Multiple Workshops/Conferences, Training Sessions OR One or More Semesters of Formal Education in Service-Learning	1	25%
Combination of a Semester or More of Formal Education and Multiple Workshops/Training Sessions	2	50%
<b>Funding Sources for Service-Learning Coordinator Position</b>		
Average Percent of Coordinator Salary Supported by Grants	3	75%
Average Percent of Coordinator Salary Supported by Operating Funds	3	25%

**Table B11**  
**Technical Assistance**

	Technical Assistance Strengths (1)		Technical Assistance Needs (2)	
	N	Measure	N	Measure
<b>Program Management</b>				
Program Design	2	50%	0	0%
Strategic Planning	2	50%	0	0%
Developing Community Partnerships	3	75%	0	0%
Assessing Community Impacts	1	25%	2	50%
Building Community/Institutional Support	0	0%	0	0%
Service Site Recruitment	2	50%	0	0%
Volunteer/Service Site Training	0	0%	0	0%
Staff Development/Teacher Education	0	0%	0	0%
Managing/Overseeing Service Sites	0	0%	0	0%
Program Evaluation Strategies/Performance Measurement	0	0%	1	25%
Financial/Grant Management	0	0%	1	25%
Marketing	1	25%	1	25%
Other	0	0%	1	25%
Total Responses	11		6	
<b>Program Content</b>				
Curriculum/Program Design	3	75%	0	0%
Development/Leadership	1	25%	0	0%
Orientation	0	0%	0	0%
Reflection Techniques	1	25%	2	50%
Youth Voice/Youth Governance	1	25%	1	25%
Individual Assessment Strategies (Portfolios, etc.)	0	0%	0	0%
Promotion and Tenure	0	0%	0	0%
Other			0	0%
None	1	25%	1	25%
Total Responses	7		4	

(1) Results indicate the percentage of respondents who reported that their organization was particularly strong in the given area of program management.

(2) Respondents are allowed to select more than one choice. Therefore percentages may not total 100%.

This total is based on the sites that checked at least one item in this area.