

**The *Building Active Citizens and Social Capital* Project:  
Summative Evaluation Report**

*Submitted to:*

**Executive Directors of State Campus Compacts:**

Sandra Hansen, Iowa  
Catherine Reid Day, Minnesota  
Pamela Proulx-Curry, Wisconsin

*Submitted by:*

**External Evaluators:**

Dean A. Pribbenow and Christine Maidl Pribbenow  
CDP & Associates, LLC

June 29, 2007

## Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>METHODS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>DOCUMENTATION OF GOAL ACHIEVEMENT.....</b>	<b>3</b>
STATUS OF PROJECT GOALS.....	3
<i>Goal 1: Infusing Service-Learning into Departmental Cultures and Curricula .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Goal 2: Mobilizing Students as More Powerful Civic Engagement Leaders .....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Goal 3: Deepening Impact on Communities.....</i>	<i>8</i>
SUMMARY OF GOAL ACHIEVEMENT .....	11
<b>IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GRANT.....</b>	<b>11</b>
SUCCESSES.....	12
<i>Impact of the UMCCC Partnership on Compacts .....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Impact of UMCCC/Grant on Sub-grantees .....</i>	<i>13</i>
CHALLENGES .....	14
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUING THE PARTNERSHIP.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: EVALUATION REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: SUMMATIVE EVALUATION INTERVIEW PROTOCOL.....</b>	<b>19</b>

## INTRODUCTION

The Upper Midwest Campus Compact Consortium (UMCCC) is comprised of Iowa Campus Compact (IACC), Minnesota Campus Compact (MCC), and Wisconsin Campus Compact (WiCC). Staff representing each of these states' Compacts applied for and received federal Learn & Serve America funding<sup>1</sup> to support a three-year project entitled *Building Active Citizens and Social Capital*. This project has been in existence for approximately 3 ½ years. As External Evaluators, our<sup>2</sup> intent in this report is to provide the Executive Directors of the three Compacts with a summary of activities and accomplishments over the life of the grant and the status of goal attainment.

## METHODS

We relied on a number of sources of information and data gathering opportunities to inform the writing of this report. We attended the initial planning sessions for the implementation of the grant,<sup>3</sup> communicated through email and telephone discussions, reviewed progress reports, completed a number of evaluations of grant activities (see Appendix A), and provided consultation when needed during the previous three years. At a mid-point in the implementation of the grant (February 2005), we conducted a formative evaluation study and interviewed six key implementers and stakeholders. These interviews were completed in December 2004 and January 2005. For the summative report, we interviewed six key implementers and two sub-grantee site contacts. These interviews were completed in April - June of 2006. (See Appendix B for the interview protocol.) Our analysis and results primarily stem from the combination of participant observation, formative evaluation study, document review, and analysis of the interview text.

## DOCUMENTATION OF GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

As evaluators, we were most concerned with knowing if the project's goals, as stated in the initial proposal, had been met. The first section identifies the goals and provides commentary on the degree to which the goal has been achieved. The next section identifies summative comments from the staff about the success, challenges, and impact of the grant-funded activities, along with their perspectives on future directions. Finally, this report concludes with recommendations for the partnership beyond the funding of the project.

### Status of Project Goals

#### *Goal 1: Infusing Service-Learning into Departmental Cultures and Curricula*

The first goal, which was designed to provide opportunities to infuse service-learning (SL) into departments, was clearly achieved. All of the sub-goal measures were

---

<sup>1</sup> Corporation for National and Community Service/Learn and Serve in the amount of \$950,454.

<sup>2</sup> The evaluators are Christine Pribbenow, Ph.D., and Dean Pribbenow, Ph.D., of CDP & Associates, LLC.

<sup>3</sup> September 15, 2003

exceeded in terms of number of activities and events, with particularly strong offerings under sub-goal 1.3, Advanced Service-Learning Workshops. In addition to implementing the planned activities, UMCCC sponsored or co-sponsored dozens of additional professional development events.

<b>Status of Goal 1</b>			
<p><b>Goal 1.1: Completed</b></p> <p>Plan six discipline-specific workshops on Service-Learning (SL)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <u>SL in Engineering</u>, 33 participants from 21 campuses (Oct 2003)</li> <li>✓ <u>SL in History</u>, 54 participants from 29 campuses (Nov 2003)</li> <li>✓ <u>SL in Psychology</u>, 35 participants from 20 campuses (May 2004)</li> <li>✓ <u>SL in Management</u>, 52 participants from 16 campuses (Sept 2004)</li> <li>✓ <u>SL in Political Science</u>, 29 participants from 9 campuses (Oct 2004)</li> <li>✓ <u>SL in the Arts</u>, 60 participants from 23 campuses (Oct 2004)</li>   <li>✓ <u>SL in Biology</u>, 27 participants from 10 campuses (March 2005)</li> <li>✓ <u>SL in Teacher Education</u>, 12 faculty from 10 campuses; 98 teachers/administrators from K-12 schools (June 2005)</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Goal 1.2: Completed</b></p> <p>Sponsor one Institute for Chairs and Deans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <u>Civic Engagement Institute for Academic Leaders</u>, 104 participants from 30 campuses (Oct 2004)</li> <li>✓ <u>Chief Academic Officers Meeting</u> (IA, Spring 2006)</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Goal 1.3: Completed</b></p> <p>Coordinate four advanced SL workshops</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <u>Engaged Department Institute</u>, 17 participants from 3 campuses (June 2004)</li> <li>✓ <u>Engaged Department Institute</u>, 22 participants on 4 campus teams (April 2005)</li> <li>✓ On-line Forum Series (August 2005 – March 2006) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Reflection</i>, 20 registrants</li> <li>○ <i>Power Dynamics in Campus-Community Collaboration</i>, 37 registrants</li> <li>○ <i>Assessment and Evaluation of Civic Engagement Initiatives</i></li> <li>○ <i>Risk Management and Service Learning</i>,</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ <u>Civic Engagement and Graduate Education</u>, 40 participants (March 2006)</li> <li>✓ <u>Deepening Our Partnerships</u>, 45 participants (June 2006)</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Goal 1.4: Completed</b></p> <p>Award mini-grants</p>	<p><b>ROUND 1 ('04-'05)</b></p> <p>✓ 6 grants</p>	<p><b>ROUND 2 ('05-'06)</b></p> <p>✓ 7 grants</p>	<p><b>ROUND 3 ('06-07)</b></p> <p>✓ 9 grants</p>

<b>Status of Goal 1</b>	
<b>Goal 1.5: Completed</b>  Develop a network of faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ SL listserv for faculty developed and used</li> <li>✓ Regional meetings to help faculty network across departments and campuses (IA, MN, and WI)</li> <li>✓ <u>Scholar-Practitioner Nexus Dialogue</u>, 28 participants (April 2006)</li> <li>✓ Created and distributed a paperback text capturing the On-line Forum resources</li> <li>✓ Maintain forum resources and other dialogue/blog resources on at on-line domain</li> <li>✓ <u>Campuses are Citizens: What's Your Story</u> dissemination conference (October 2006)</li> </ul>

Evaluations were conducted of participants' experiences in all of these individual activities. To gather a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of these workshops, we conducted a comprehensive evaluation process in Fall 2006 to follow up with all workshop attendees.<sup>4</sup> The survey was sent to 309 individuals, with 64 responses obtained.

When asked specifically about the value of their participation in the workshops, in general, the respondents had a very positive view of the workshops with 89% indicating they were either *Excellent* or *Good*. Only 11% indicated they were either *Average* or *Fair* and none indicated they were *Poor*. Furthermore, as the table below indicates, attendees responded that their understanding and abilities grew as a result of their participation in the workshop.

Please indicate your skill or knowledge levels in the following areas BEFORE attending the workshop(s) and AFTER.				
	Very High	Somewhat High	Somewhat Low	Very Low
<b>Understanding service-learning: BEFORE</b>	13	29	14	7
	21%	46%	22%	11%
<b>Understanding service-learning: AFTER</b>	35	28	0	1
	55%	44%	0%	2%
<b>Ability to implement service-learning: BEFORE</b>	10	21	18	15
	16%	33%	28%	23%
<b>Ability to implement service-learning: AFTER</b>	22	33	7	2
	34%	52%	11%	3%
<b>Understanding how service-learning fits in my discipline: BEFORE</b>	7	26	21	10
	11%	41%	33%	16%
<b>Understanding how service-learning fits in my discipline: AFTER</b>	28	30	5	1
	44%	47%	8%	2%
<b>Ability to teach others about service-learning: BEFORE</b>	5	26	19	14
	8%	41%	30%	22%
<b>Ability to teach others about service-learning: AFTER</b>	21	32	9	2
	33%	50%	14%	3%

<sup>4</sup> Pribbenow, C.M. & Pribbenow, D.A. (February 2006). *The Upper Midwest Campus Compact Consortium's Learn and Serve America Grant: Results of Surveys of Workshop Attendees and Community Partners*.

In addition to changes in specific levels of skill- and knowledge-development, we also evaluated the impact of workshop attendance on a number of specific outcomes. The table below indicates their responses. *I advocated service-learning to faculty in my department or on campus* and *I advocated service-learning to administrators at my institution* were the two most frequently identified outcomes, following by *I improved the way that I implement service-learning*. The two least frequently identified outcomes – *I implemented service-learning for the first time* and *I implemented service-learning into additional courses* – suggests that those who responded were experienced service-learning faculty or that they were trying to enrich the service-learning component of classes already being offered.

<b>Which of the following occurred due to attending the workshop(s)? Check all that apply.</b>		
<b>I implemented service-learning for the first time.</b>	11	18%
<b>I improved the way I implement service-learning.</b>	21	34%
<b>I implemented service-learning in additional courses.</b>	11	18%
<b>I taught others to implement service-learning.</b>	18	30%
<b>I advocated service-learning to faculty in my department or on campus.</b>	44	72%
<b>I advocated service-learning to administrators at my institution.</b>	30	49%
<b>I served on a planning committee to move service-learning forward on my campus.</b>	15	25%
<b>I advocated service-learning or led a workshop within my disciplinary association.</b>	14	23%
<b>Other, please describe:</b>	14	23%

Examples of “Other” outcomes identified by the participants included:

- We are doing two separate modified SL projects
- We plan to hold a seminar in our college
- Wrote a Learn and Serve Grant
- Added reflection step to close my intern projects
- I began planning for incorporation into class
- I incorporated service activities into Psych Club
- I implemented S.L. into a non-science course
- Just created a new course that will implement it
- Presented on SL at other conferences

The results of this comprehensive evaluation reflect an overall high level of quality of the workshops that UMCCC offered as part of the LSA grant program. This is congruent with the finding that we identified in the formative evaluation report:

*On evaluations completed by participants who attended the discipline-based service-learning workshops, the majority left with an increase in understanding in at least three,*

*if not more, of the outcomes intended from the workshops. Often, these events drew national interest, where the participants requested the agenda with the intent of replicating the workshop in their states. (SL in the Arts may be replicated in Rhode Island and Florida, for example.) Participants noted that they were “energized,” “felt like they had the tools and resources to implement service-learning,” and “had an understanding of why SL is important.”<sup>5</sup>*

*Goal 2: Mobilizing Students as More Powerful Civic Engagement Leaders*

The second goal – intended to mobilize students as leaders in civic engagement – has also been achieved. Three “Student Civic Leadership Institute” have occurred with positive evaluations from the participants. “Citizen Scholar” mini-grants were awarded during three rounds of proposals. And lastly, a listserv for student leaders was developed.

<b>Status of Goal 2</b>			
<b>Goal 2.1: Completed</b> Organize three annual Student Civic Leadership Institutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <u>Student Civic Leadership Institute-WI</u>, 40 participants from 32 campuses (Sept 2004)</li> <li>✓ <u>Student Civic Leadership Institute-IA</u>, 40 participants (Sept 2005)</li> <li>✓ <u>Student Civic Leadership Institute -MN</u>, 28 participants (Sept 2006)</li> </ul>		
<b>Goal 2.2: Completed</b> Offer “Citizen Scholar” mini-grants to students and their partners	<b>Round 1</b>	<b>Round 2</b>	<b>Round 3</b>
	✓ 9 grants	✓ 5 grants	✓ 3 grants
<b>Goal 2.3: Completed</b> Establish a listserv for student leaders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Listserv developed at UW-Parkside (2004)</li> </ul>		

Evaluations of activities in this goal area indicate that resources invested resulted in positive effects. For example, the Student Civic Leadership Institutes (SCLIs) have been evaluated positively. Using the 2006 gathering as an example, results indicate that 88% found the two-day activity to be “positive” or “very positive.”

<b>My overall impression of the 2006 SCLI:</b>		
<b>Very Negative</b>	0	0%
<b>Negative</b>	1	5%
<b>Neutral</b>	1	5%
<b>Positive</b>	11	55%
<b>Very Positive</b>	7	35%

<sup>5</sup> Pribbenow, C.M., & Pribbenow, D. (2005). *The building active citizens and social capital project: A formative review*. McFarland, WI: CDP & Associates.

When asked about what they gained from attending the institute, the following skills and knowledge outcomes emerged:

- Basic principles related to civic engagement in higher education settings (90%);
- Resources (written, people, etc.) available related to civic engagement in higher education settings (90%);
- The distinctions between various forms of experiential education (65%);
- How to organize and lead civic engagement activities at my campus (65%).

*Goal 3: Deepening Impact on Communities*

Providing grants to campuses and community organizations to foster campus-community partnerships was one of the key activities identified in this goal. The original grant proposal was amended to allow for “planning grants” before the implementation grant process occurred. This proved to be a successful idea as thirteen of the original planning grant awardees applied for implementation grants. Further, UMCCC staff developed and attended the grantee meetings, and they communicated with sub-grantees and provided technical assistance through site visits.

Of particular note was the successful implementation of the *Campuses Are Citizens: What’s Your Story?* dissemination conference in October 2006.

<b>Status of Goal 3</b>	
<p><b>Goal 3.1: Completed</b></p> <p>Award 15-25 “Building Social and Economic Capital” (BSEC) planning grants in Year 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Seventeen planning grants were awarded to campuses and community organizations (Dec 2003)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Goal 3.2: Completed</b></p> <p>Award 5-7 BSEC 2-year sub-grants in Year 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Six implementation grants were awarded to campuses and community organizations (Sept 2004)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Goal 3.3: Completed</b></p> <p>Provide training and technical assistance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <u>BSEC Planning Grant Meeting</u> (Feb 2004)</li> <li>✓ <u>BSEC Implementation Grant Meeting</u> (Nov 2004)</li> <li>✓ Site Visits: 29 completed with sub-grant awardees</li> </ul>
<p><b>Goal 3.4: Completed</b></p> <p>Disseminate models and principles for effective partnerships</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <i>Campuses are Citizens: What’s Your Story?</i> Dissemination Conference, 162 participants (Oct 2006)</li> <li>✓ Several regional meetings in each state to promote best practices in service-learning and campus-community partnerships</li> <li>✓ Created and distributed a paperback text capturing the On-line Forum resources</li> </ul>

Evidence of impact in this goal area is reflected in various sources of evaluation data. For example, a survey of community partners (40% response rate) conducted in Fall 2006 indicated the following:<sup>6</sup>

- 94% of respondents indicated that the originally identified objectives of the project had been met due to the grant.
- To obtain more specific information from the respondents, we asked them to *identify the 1-2 most significant outcomes achieved due to this project*. Responses included:
  - Students have been educated
  - Brochures were developed for our agency
  - Students gained a broad understanding of what our agency does
  - Better communication
  - Individuals are more likely to engage and get involved
  - Peer mentoring
  - Changed stereotypes by working with certain groups
  - First-ever annual report
  - A technology plan
  - A fully functioning network and website
  - A survey was completed
  - A deeper understanding of barriers to education
- All of the respondents indicated that they would be willing to enter into campus-community partnerships again, if given a chance. They felt that they received adequate training and support and that the grant expanded capacities and fostered deepened campus-community partnerships.

In addition, the evaluation of the *Campuses are Citizens* Dissemination Conference reflected a positive impact on the participants.<sup>7</sup> For example, when asked about what they gained from the conference, over 90% said they *Absolutely* or *Somewhat* left with an enhanced understanding of each of the following outcomes:

	Absolutely	Somewhat	Not at all
<b>Basic service-learning principles.</b>	28	24	4
	50%	43%	7%
<b>Issues around civic engagement.</b>	32	23	2
	56%	40%	4%
<b>How service-learning and civic engagement can contribute to institutional objectives.</b>	27	27	3
	47%	47%	5%
<b>Resources related to service-learning and civic engagement.</b>	30	26	1
	53%	46%	2%
<b>The evidence base for service-learning and civic</b>	19	31	7

<sup>6</sup> Pribbenow, C.M. & Pribbenow, D.A. (February 2006). *The Upper Midwest Campus Compact Consortium's Learn and Serve America Grant: Results of Surveys of Workshop Attendees and Community Partners*.

<sup>7</sup> Pribbenow, C.M. & Pribbenow, D.A. (2006). *Campuses are Citizens: What's Your Story? Final Survey Results*.

<b>engagement.</b>	33%	54%	12%
<b>Building community-campus partnerships.</b>	24	30	3
	42%	53%	5%
<b>How to lead change efforts around college access and success.</b>	18	33	6
	32%	58%	11%

When asked about some of the ways they will implement the information, the following are direct quotes from a sample of participants:

- I would like to improve and create international service learning opportunities.
- Work harder to co-create partnerships with community organizations and schools.
- Examine “diversity training” that is in place for students involved in service-learning, and look for ways to improve this.
- I am going to try to get one of the presenters to speak at a teaching and learning event on my campus.
- Many actions around streamlining systems on campus related to service-learning.
- Improve reflection activities in service-learning course I coordinate.
- I am going to continue participating in service-learning at my campus while pushing for a greater degree of service learning in the future.
- I am going to talk to my supervisor about the projects that I found out about and maybe try to replicate them. Also I plan to talk about new ways to lead reflection.
- I will discuss ideas from the “paradigm shift” and “spirituality” sessions with my co-workers, I think there are some ideas from those sessions that we can incorporate into our pre-service training and reflection sessions
- Build some support for our role in the assessment/accreditation process.
- I feel that I have a stronger viewpoint of the action needed to make institutional change, which is what I have been hired to do. I am inspired to get out in the community and help create the bridge between them and the college and, hopefully, create lasting, meaningful relationships.
- I am going to develop a grid with specific goals and evaluation for my service-learning project using reflection as a criterion. I probably will participate in our community-wide initiative around service-learning and civic engagement.
- Explore opportunities for expanding and utilizing technology to engage our various “customers.”
- Work more on cultural competency training, especially involving the key step of clarifying one's own identity; continue to work on maintaining and strengthening relationships with community partners.
- I will be visiting with our president this week to discuss some of the things I think we should take a look at.

### Summary of Goal Achievement

At this time, all of the planned activities originally proposed have been completed and the goals have been met. Below, we highlight some of the more significant accomplishments and challenges for each goal.

Regarding Goal 1, the partnership is to be commended for their continued efforts to promote and support service-learning and civic engagement among faculty, departments and community members. Despite less participation than expected, the implementation of on-line forums was an innovative attempt to engage faculty in a context other than face-to-face. Although more people observed the on-line dialogues than actually participated in exchanges, most seemed to appreciate the resources offered. Another positive result of these web-based events was the ability to archive the dialogues and related resources. “Develop a Network of Faculty” (Goal 1.5) remains an ongoing challenge. Efforts to develop on-line networks were limited and project leaders found that the most successful way to establish a “network” continues to be through face-to-face gatherings, mostly in the form of regional meetings.

Regarding Goal 2, there was a sense among the project leaders that – although the goals were achieved – the overall impact could have been greater in this area. Still, citizen-scholar grants were awarded and all three Student Civic Leadership Institutes were implemented with demonstrable impact on the students involved. Although the number of participants dropped in the last year, UMCCC views these as successful events. Nearly all of the project leaders indicated that more follow-up was needed with SCLI participants and citizen-scholar sub-grantees, which should be integrated into future offerings. Conversations are underway as to whether the SCLIs will continue in the same format (drawing from all three states), be modified to be primarily state-based, or be discontinued.

Regarding Goal 3, the shift to award initial “Building Social and Economic Capital” (BSEC) planning grants was described as “critical” and “a good move.” Seventeen of these were awarded in the first year and of these, thirteen applied for a BSEC Implementation Grant. Six implementation grants were awarded, and numerous site visits occurred. In addition to supporting the BSEC sub-grantees, a particular emphasis was placed on dissemination of lessons learned and models for campus-community partnerships. Much of this effort culminated in the *Campuses are Citizens: What’s Your Story* conference in October 2006.

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GRANT**

Overall, the three-state design of this grant has developed into an effective partnership, and there appears to be some interest on behalf of all three state leaders to continue working together. During the last half of the project, State Compact leadership transitions in two of the three states presented challenges to implementation efforts. In effect, none of the current executive directors of the three state compacts was involved in the writing of the original grant. Despite this lack of initial involvement, the goals of

the grant were achieved or exceeded, and the UMCCC has committed itself to redefining its partnership according to priorities and goals of the current leaders.

In general, project leaders (the three executive directors and two others from Minnesota Campus Compact) indicated that approximately 25-50% of their work time was geared toward implementing grant-related activities, yet they acknowledged that most of their work related to their Compacts is consistent with the grant's goals, as well as the goals of *Learn and Serve*. In their words, "it's hard to parcel out what is grant-related and what [we] normally do in [our] positions." Minnesota Campus Compact – Julie Plaut initially and then JoAnn Campbell – served as the "point person" for the grant by maintaining communication with Nancy Walters at the Minnesota Higher Education Services Office (MHESO), which is the fiscal agency for the grant, facilitating the reporting process, and assuring accountability with the sub-grantees. All staff members were involved in the RFP process for funding sub-grants, planning and executing professional development opportunities, providing technical assistance, communicating to stakeholders within their states, and completing reporting requirements.

### Successes

As is already readily evident, this grant can claim numerous successes. Sub-grants seeded myriad civic engagement efforts; as one leader put it, "The partners just raved that they couldn't have done the work without the grant...without [our] involvement." Sponsored events, on the whole, were well received and accomplished their goals of educating attendees about service-learning, supporting implementation efforts, and stimulating civic engagement efforts. For example, Sandra emphasized the impact of the *Civic Engagement in Graduate Education Summit* (2006) held at Wingspread. Because of this event, in January 2007 "the University of Iowa held their first Institute for Graduate Education. Fifteen graduate students (fully funded) went through a week-long training...to implement [civic engagement activities] throughout their graduate work....If you're an art graduate student, what does it mean to do public art...Really thinking about what civic engagement meant in terms of their discipline." According to Sandra, "This says a lot about what this funding did" for civic engagement efforts.

Beyond the success of the programmatic offerings, the grant also had a positive effect on the partnering state compacts that comprise UMCCC through such things as:

- Enhanced relationships with campus and community partners;
- The development of models to promote to others; and
- Increased opportunities for networking.

As one executive director concluded: "Things happened that wouldn't have happened without the grant." We elaborate below.

### *Impact of the UMCCC Partnership on Compacts*

First, as a result of this grant, all three of the State Compact leaders identified positive effects on the work of their respective state's Compact. There was a general sense that each of the individual State Compacts improved because of the UMCCC partnership, despite the fact that each state was at a different place in terms of organizational and membership development. Perhaps the most significant impact has been on the Iowa Campus Compact (IACC). At the time of the formative review for this grant, IACC had grown (added five new schools) and offered more opportunities because of the grant, increasing grant applicants and participant in events by almost four-fold.

In 2005, Sandra noted, "This has been the biggest thing to get the state of Iowa actively moving forward as a State Compact." This sense of impact was even more pronounced in 2007: "We wouldn't be at the place we are now without the grant. It was the impetus for many things that have now continued beyond the funding.... The Iowa Compact would have died without this grant; it had nothing going for it." According to Sandra, while the grant has affected students, communities, and faculty, one of the more pronounced affects has been on Community-Service and Service-Learning Directors who, because of funding, are able to promote and implement service-learning efforts that would have not otherwise happened.

Wisconsin and Minnesota had similar perspective. Pamela (WiCC) shared Sandra's perspective: "For me it was huge, because I was brand new, and it was a relationship that I walked into....It seems like it was instrumental in launching Wisconsin Campus Compact, in bringing people together and helping to create a movement around service-learning in the state. I think it was very useful in that way." Catherine (MCC) emphasized the value of the regional connections, and JoAnn (MCC) described the powerful sense of community and connection: "For me, especially just coming into the Compact, being connected to Iowa and Wisconsin was just essential. I felt like I had a community and I just really enjoyed working with these people...it's just been nice to feel...some continuity." Indeed, some indicated that the three-state consortium, which required regular communication, was a source of professional development for all of them.

### *Impact of UMCCC/Grant on Sub-grantees*

As noted in the 2005 formative evaluation report, there were already strong indications that many sub-grantees from all of the grant initiatives were positively affected. According to UMCCC staff, BSEC planning grant recipients – even those who did not receive implementation grants – were engaged in projects that were having positive effects on their campuses and communities. When identifying effects, staff mentioned that institutions and partnerships have been mobilized, much training and professional development has been provided, many resources have been identified or developed, and relationships have been enhanced both within and between Compacts. The "grant creates community," mentioned one of the staff.

Current survey data and examples from progress reports indicate that—on the whole—grant resources resulted in significant positive effects on sub-grantees. Each of the three states’ leaders readily identified projects that had been successful in accomplishing their goals with the support of the grant. Certainly, a few projects were never completed or underachieved, but many others met or exceeded the original goals of the project. For example, Pamela (WiCC) noted the successful Building Social and Economic Capital (BSEC) grant that resulted in the Nonprofit Institute at UW-Parkside; others suggested numerous additional examples.

As a component of this summative evaluation, we interviewed two sub-grantees about the impact of their grant-funded work. Dr. Louis Mendoza (University of Minnesota, Chicano Studies Department) was one of the individuals. By combining an Engaged Department grant with a Citizen-Scholar grant, he was able to lead a significant service-learning effort addressing challenges faced by Latinos when considering higher education. His project resulted in the creation of service-learning courses, partnerships with multiple community sites, and the strengthening of several on-campus partnerships. “It has increased community ownership of the university and motivated [the Latino youth] to see college as a goal,” Louis emphasized. These civic engagement efforts are now integrated in the curriculum and the project is being sustained because of the newly-formed campus partnerships. In addition, Louis indicated that they were able to leverage the LSA grant into other smaller grants to advance their work. According to Louis, the fact that the LSA grant required them to develop a plan with a community partner made all the difference in the overwhelming success of the project.

Community partner, Merry Rankin (Iowa Department of Natural Resources), was another individual we spoke with as part of this summative evaluation. Merry is Director of the Volunteer Program for the DNR program, Keepers of the Land. She was the community partner in an Engaged Department grant through Central College. In addition to forging an ongoing partnership with a particular academic program (Environmental Studies), this grant-funded partnership has led to at least 5 completely different strands of partnerships, including having a college staffer do training for DNR AmeriCorps members. What began as a focused partnership with Central College as now expanded to include developing links to other institutions of higher education.

### Challenges

We identified four broad areas of challenge related to the implementation of the grant. First, as stated earlier, the transition in leadership at the Minnesota and Wisconsin Campus Compacts presented a challenge. Even Sandra Hanson, IACC Executive Director, came aboard the project after most of it had been designed. Given the transitions, keeping everyone current on the priorities and activities of the grant required significant communication and effort, which given the three state partnership, was difficult to achieve at times. Related, the transition required a affirming of ownership regarding the goals and required time and resources required to ensure its success. Interestingly, the transition in leaders did allow for “new eyes” to provide

insight on various aspects of the grant and how to maximize the impact as the grant period concluded.

A second challenge was the sheer size of the grant. Beyond the fact that this was a three state partnership, one of the leaders indicated that at one point during the grant they had between 45-50 sub-grantees. Coordinating grant-mandated events, creating numerous forms to facilitate the grant process, and establishing sub-grant review committees and site visits were all identified as challenges at the time of the formative review and continued as challenges. Dealing with the myriad activities and details of communicating with, supporting, and obtaining progress reports from these sub-grantees was, at times, overwhelming, and required the development of processes and systems that were not in place. To their credit, the staff recognized the critical importance of regular communication and committed to regular, scheduled conference calls and occasional face-to-face meetings.

A third challenge presented a creative challenge to the group– how to reach faculty and staff to promote and support their development of service-learning and community engagement activities. The strategies evolved from “Service-learning in the Discipline” workshops to the on-line forums to regional meetings focusing on topics/issues (that brought together faculty from multiple disciplines) rather than the discipline itself. The leaders’ commitment to developing innovative and creative ways to reach faculty and community members demonstrates their ability to actively grapple with challenges and respond appropriately.

Finally, a challenge that nearly everyone discussed was how to best capture and tell the stories of all the good work and lessons learned through the many grant-funded initiatives. Catherine stressed the following: “I think one of the things I’m most concerned about is figuring out a way to communicate this work to our constituencies....We are at a critical point where we need to say something meaningful about this project and what it has met to people across the states.” To be sure, the dissemination conference, other regional meetings, videotaping presentations, and archiving materials represent significant efforts to address this challenge. Still, there was consensus that more and better ways need to be developed to share the best practices and wisdom “in a format that is inviting and people will actually use, so that there is cross-pollenization,” as one leader stated it. If this could be done, it would present opportunities not only for sharing wisdom but also establishing networks of individuals and promoting sub-grantees leadership.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUING THE PARTNERSHIP

In conclusion, we recommend that the UMCCC partnership consider the following:

1. *Review the recommendations from the 2005 Formative Review.*<sup>8</sup> A review of the 2005 recommendations will demonstrate that some have been accomplished while others remain in progress. We encourage the partners – if committed to the partnership – to revisit those recommendations.
2. *Revisit the nature of the UMCCC Partnership.* While all of the project leaders acknowledged the benefits of the partnership – indeed, all three of the state compacts were enhanced by participation in this project – there was less certainty about how the partnership would continue in the absence of the LSA grant. Some indicated interest in continuing to work together; others acknowledged that the transition in state compact leadership may result in a focus on state-based priorities rather than regional efforts. We recommend a dialogue – face-to-face, if possible – to reflect on the status of the partnership and what was accomplished, articulate and document lessons learned, and determine the potential for further collaboration. Remember that participation in a partnership such as this can benefit state compact members while also providing professional development for state compact leaders.
3. *If UMCCC continues, identify one manageable project around which the three states can focus their resources.* Although the funding for a new LSA grant failed, look for other opportunities for the three states to establish a working and effective consortium. Ensure all are involved in the writing of the proposal or initiative to ensure “buy in” and engagement. In addition, each of the partners should include goals and objectives that explicitly interface with their state compact priorities and goals.
4. *If a focused, manageable project is identified, integrate the lessons learned from the implementation of the LSA grant.* Below are what have emerged as a number of the lessons learned from the LSA grant project:
  - Begin your planning with attention to how programs, practices, and outcomes will be captured, and consider drawing upon other non-compact partners for this dimension. For example, consider partnering with a local business, media source, association, etc., who may have a vested interest in the impact of the activities and helping you to “tell your story.”
  - Continue emphasis on requiring multiple constituents involved in the planning and writing of the grant (e.g., faculty and community partners).

---

<sup>8</sup> Pribbenow, C.M., & Pribbenow, D. (2005). *The building active citizens and social capital project: A formative review*. McFarland, WI: CDP & Associates.

- Plan for fewer, longer-lasting sub-grants.
- Plan for enhanced attention to follow-through with sub-grantees, including a reasonable and manageable reporting system to capture “good practices”; focus the measure of impact on one or two stakeholders or outcomes rather than expecting comprehensive evaluations from sub-grantees.
- Develop and document the systems/processes needed to support the grant activities, so that, in the event of staff turn-over, continuity can be maintained.
- Identify overarching goals and measures beyond number of grants awarded and participants involved that make the link between activities and the larger aims. Importantly, make this link evident to sub-grantees.

In sum, it is our assessment that this grant project has met or exceeded all of its initial goals. The impact of the grant has been far-reaching and enhanced by the fact that the three state compacts collaborated. Communities, students, faculty, and campuses have benefited by these grant-supported initiatives. Despite some efforts that did not meet expectations, strong evidence exists of short- and longer-term positive impacts. Geographical challenges notwithstanding, a foundation has been laid for strong consortium and will only be limited by the leaders’ interest and commitment to continuing to grow the partnership.

## APPENDIX A: EVALUATION REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

Pribbenow, C.M., & Pribbenow, D. (2006). *Campuses are citizens: What's your story? Final survey results*. McFarland, WI: CDP & Associates, LLC.

Pribbenow, C.M., & Pribbenow, D. (2006). *How do civic engagement efforts impact students?: Nexus dialogue evaluation*. McFarland, WI: CDP & Associates, LLC.

Pribbenow, C.M., & Pribbenow, D. (2006). *The upper Midwest campus compact consortium's Learn & Serve America grant: Results of surveys of workshop participants and community partners*. McFarland, WI: CDP & Associates, LLC.

Pribbenow, C.M., & Pribbenow, D. (2005). *Evaluation of the "power dynamics in campus-community collaboration" online forum: Evaluation results*. McFarland, WI: CDP & Associates, LLC.

Pribbenow, C.M., & Pribbenow, D. (2005). *Evaluation of the "reflection" online forum: Evaluation results*. McFarland, WI: CDP & Associates.

Pribbenow, C.M., & Pribbenow, D. (2005). *The building active citizens and social capital project: A formative review*. McFarland, WI: CDP & Associates.

Pribbenow, C.M., & Pribbenow, D. (2004). *Civic engagement institute for academic leaders: Survey results*. McFarland, WI: CDP & Associates.

Pribbenow, C.M., & Pribbenow, D. (2004). *Building social and economic capital planning meeting: Evaluation results. Civic engagement institute for academic leaders: Survey results*. McFarland, WI: CDP & Associates.

### Presentations/technical expertise:

- BSEC planning meeting, February 2004, presentation about assessment and evaluation tools and techniques;
- Telephone and in-person discussions, email correspondence, and assessment and evaluation tool review for a small sample of sub-grantees;
- Dialogue facilitators: Assessment and Evaluation online forum, February 2006;
- *How do we know we're making a difference? Assessment and evaluation*. Presented at the Campuses are Citizens: What's Your Story? Conference (2006).

## APPENDIX B: SUMMATIVE EVALUATION INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

### UMCCC-LSA Grant 2003-2007 Summative Evaluation Interview Questions

---

1. What role did you play within the LSA grant? How much time (on average, per week) did you spend on the grant?
2. In your own words, what were the goals of the grant?
3. How well were each of the goals achieved?
4. In general, what impact/difference has the grant made?
  - a. Specifically for faculty?
  - b. For community partners?
  - c. For students?
5. What were some overall successes due to the grant?
6. What were the greatest challenges?
7. Are you aware of any projects that have been institutionalized on specific campuses or within affected communities? Please describe.
8. Please describe the impact of the UMCCC partnership. In what ways, will this partnership continue, if at all?
9. Please identify anything that you will continue to do, despite the ending of the grant's funding.
10. If you could do anything differently related to the implementation of the grant, what would it be?
11. How could we, as evaluators, served you better?
12. Anything else you'd like to share that we didn't ask you about?